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THE FAUST YEARS
I read the article about Drew Faust’s tenure in the July-August issue (“Faust in Focus,” page 46).

Management consultants tell us to measure outputs, not inputs. But the article discussed fundraising, building programs, hiring, and the like—inputs all—with barely a mention of the results.

If I read a similar article about Stanford, I would expect to see discussion of its role as an anchor of Silicon Valley, exactly how important an anchor it had been, and the positive and negative effects of that on Stanford’s academic mission.

What would a parallel discussion of Harvard’s recent history look like?

William F. Pedersen ’65, LL.B. ’68

South Royalton, Vt.

A DIVERSE FACULTY?
The July-August 2018 edition (News Briefs, page 35) mentioned the efforts relative to faculty “diversity,” the aim to be more inclusive in terms of race and gender.

Until Harvard realizes its biggest issue is lack of real diversity, of opinion, such shallow efforts aimed to re-enforce racial and gender-identity politics are doomed to fail.

Critical thinking is the heart of a vibrant center of learning...That requires having a faculty of diverse opinions.

David W. Thompson, M.P.A. ’88
Easley, S.C.

VOTING, IMMIGRATION
In the July-August issue, there is a silly error in the Moorfield Storey Vita (page 44). A “grandfather clause” was not a rule that men whose grandfathers did not vote before the Civil War (i.e., blacks) could not vote. Rather, it was a cynical loophole that men who could vote, or whose fathers or grandfathers could, before 1867 (i.e., whites), were exempt from an onerous requirement like a poll tax or literacy test that most individuals could not meet. Subtle difference and similar effect, but especially given the ubiquity of the term “grandfathering in,” I expect Harvard to get the details right.

The underlying premise of “Crimmigration” (page 24) is that a non-citizen’s commission of a crime should not enter into the decision of whether or not to deport. That is a plausible position for a seriously underpopulated and underdeveloped country, but not in the United States today. If there are going to be limitations on the aggregate numbers of immigrants, one can argue in favor of prioritizing personal considerations (escape from persecution, close family ties, economics (important skills), or even a diversity lottery, but no good argument can be advanced against the proposition that a sine qua non for an immigrant of any kind to be a good citizen and not to commit serious crimes. It is fair to ask what is a serious crime for this purpose, but it is no answer to criminal activity.

If I read a similar article about Stanford, I would expect to see discussion of its role as an anchor it had been, and the important and the effect, but especially given the ubiquitous use of the term “grandfathering in,” I expect Harvard to get the details right.

The underlying premise of “Crimmigration” (page 24) is that a non-citizen’s commission of a crime should not enter into the decision of whether or not to deport. That is a plausible position for a seriously underpopulated and underdeveloped country, but not in the United States today. If there are going to be limitations on the aggregate numbers of immigrants, one can argue in favor of prioritizing personal considerations (escape from persecution, close family ties, economics (important skills), or even a diversity lottery, but no good argument can be advanced against the proposition that a sine qua non for an immigrant of any kind to be a good citizen and not to commit serious crimes. It is fair to ask what is a serious crime for this purpose, but it is no answer to criminal activity.
Beginning Again

It was the summer of 1972, and I had one question on my mind: Will I fit in? I was twenty years old and about to begin a graduate degree program in public policy at the Harvard Kennedy School. As the first day of classes approached, I wondered about what I would discover in a new place with new people, confronted by new challenges and opportunities.

I found a truly extraordinary experience. My fellow students—two dozen remarkable men and women from across the country—had a wide range of experiences and viewpoints, and they taught me at least as much as the faculty members who offered us a veritable intellectual feast. Tom Schelling and a group of colleagues he memorably described as “distinguished misfits”—Francis Bator, Philip Heymann, Fred Mosteller, Dick Neustadt, and Howard Raiffa—challenged us not just to learn but also to lead, and a fabulous group of younger faculty such as Graham Allison, Mark Moore, David Mundel, and Dick Zeckhauser brought to the classroom inspiring ambition and energy. Every day was spent in the presence of greatness, and it was absolutely thrilling.

Forty-six years later, I can still remember the view from Littauer Center. We looked out over Massachusetts Avenue where Harvard Yard meets Harvard Square, a busy thoroughfare bustling night and day with pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists. Room 220 is not a classroom anymore—today it’s the office of economist and Nobel laureate Oliver Hart—but it still reminds me of my earliest days on campus. It was not always easy. My classmates and my teachers tested me in more ways than I could have imagined, but the moments in which I struggled the most often led to the most dramatic personal growth. Harvard made me better, and I hope every student in every program today will find his or her time here as rich and as stimulating as I found mine.

Why do I share my story with you? Since the announcement in February of my election as president, I have been reading histories of Harvard. It’s a peculiar genre. It runs the gamut from prosaic recitations of facts to poetic explorations of values. But there is a single thread that runs through it and through my own experience as well. Harvard changes in looks but not in spirit; its vibrancy remains. The University evolves for the sake of its mission, driving the support of excellence, the provision of opportunity, and the pursuit of truth to the great benefit of all people.

Our work today is a continuation of nearly four hundred years of concentrated effort to improve. What more can we learn? What more can we do? What more can we contribute? These questions must guide us as we seek to do more good for more people across the nation and around the world. I trust that you will join me—and your fellow alumni and friends everywhere—in considering these questions and in reaffirming the tremendous and lasting value of our University.

As I look ahead to my freshman year as president, I am filled with hope. There is no place I would rather be at this moment of enormous consequence for colleges and universities. I could not have asked for a better chance to express my gratitude to Harvard and my confidence in American higher education than the one I have been given. Let’s begin.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
LETTERS

Nor can a charge of criminal activity be parried by repackaging length of stay as a novel asylum criterion (potential for being treated badly back in one’s home country for having lived in the United States).

Buried way in the back of the article is an objection to using “citizenship and immigration status [to allocate] resources based on where people are born.” Sorry, folks; one may advocate the abolition of countries and nationalities, but unless that happens, a country may decide that where and/or to whom one is born forms a core basis for citizenship and for the right to be in the country.

Robert Kantowitz, J.D. ’79
Lawrence, N.Y.

Editor’s note: We thank Mr. Kantowitz for explicating the “grandfather clause” and reminding us to vet wording more carefully when condensing text to fit limited space.

GEN ED, THEN AND NOW

I enjoyed your “Unfinished Business” essay (7 Ware Street, July-August, page 3), and pondered Dean Michael Smith’s statement that “Gen Ed courses ought to challenge students’ ‘ingrained’ ideas...broadening how students think about things they enter the class thinking that they know.” Then I read (page 17) Latin Salutatorian Phoebe Lakin’s statement at Commencement: “Harvard University, as many of you have no doubt already observed, is not so different from the Hogwarts School of Witchcraft and Wizardry.” Looks like Smith, if he gets his wish, has his work cut out for him!

General education courses established in the 1950s by President James Conant (taught by the likes of Paul Tillich) were obviously based on a different conception of what constitutes “general education.” They had an impact on me such that I changed my major from biology to philosophy.

Mark Titus ’58
Washington, D.C.

ADVANCED STANDING

I read with great interest the article on Harvard’s plans to overhaul Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate credits (“Advanced Standing Reduced,” May-June, page 24).

It is a pity that Harlan “Harpo” Hanson ’46, Ph.D. ’59, is not alive to comment. Sixty years ago, as director of Harvard’s Office of Advanced Standing, he worked with the academic departments to provide recognition...
Allston Agonistes

For three decades, “Allston” has represented what an investor might consider Harvard’s ultimate option. It is the way for an increasingly built-out, landlocked institution nearing its 400th anniversary to continue to dream and grow. But at some point, the option has to be realized, or revalued.

Since the first land purchase in 1988, that option has yielded Continuum, a residential and retail complex built privately on a parcel leased from the University. The science and engineering complex and an associated power plant are now under construction. Looking forward, if Harvard is to maximize the value of its option beyond those isolated projects (and the first phase of the “enterprise research campus” to be privately built on 14 more leased acres), three things have to happen:

“Allston” has to be envisioned within an academic plan for the entire University—“One Harvard,” if you will.

That vision has to shape a coherent physical plan for campus development.

And the whole has to work financially.

The institutional master plan unveiled in 2007—the product of Lawrence H. Summers’s administration, then recently ended—blocked out space for new Graduate School of Education and School of Public Health campuses; undergraduate Houses; and multiple millions of square feet of laboratories (the uses, and their users, unspecified). Today, the education and public-health faculties are sheltering in place in Cambridge and Longwood, and the College is about a billion dollars into renovating its residences—very far from erecting new ones. The planned physical grid, in other words, was untethered to academic uses (or the rest of the University)—and, in any event, the 2008 financial crash and Great Recession rendered the scheme moot.

Current development, guided by the 2012 master plan, is far more modest: those privately financed projects, and the School of Engineering and Applied Sciences (SEAS) complex, reduced in scale and repurposed for the burgeoning corps of Harvard engineers. But it is also scattershot and, still, financially ambiguous. (What goes on the rest of the vast foundations for that SEAS center, and beyond? Fundraising hopes appear to have come up short—and is Harvard game to spend another billion dollars to house, say, another 50 SEAS professors?)

At this point, a new administration may wish to consider how it proceeds on what both the Corporation and President Lawrence S. Bacow underscore is a giant opportunity—and a high priority.

Other institutions have proceeded in illuminating ways. Princeton’s last campus plan resulted in, among other gains, an entire new arts precinct at an edge of the campus—the realization of then-president Shirley M. Tilghman’s vision. Now a member of the Corporation, and chair of its facilities committee (and previously the leader of a review of Harvard life sciences), she agrees “completely,” she said recently, that Allston development needs to be set in a broader, comprehensive academic context. Moreover, Tilghman emphasized, the limited current plan is not solely a short-term response to the financial disaster of a decade ago: “One of the challenges for Harvard is that because of its decentralized structure, there has been very little thinking about its physical space as a whole.”

That “makes it harder for Harvard to do the kind of planning...seen at Princeton”—including in the 2017 iteration, under her successor. It envisions as an integrated whole new undergraduate residences (for a larger student body); energy- and environmental-studies facilities; quarters for academic partnerships with corporate, government, and nonprofit entities; and, yes, development of a new “Lake Campus” on land banked nearly a century ago.

The strain on Harvard’s wallet continues to loom large, too. Using back-of-the-envelope calculations (firm guidance is apparently taboo), the Allston “option” has, to date, conservatively cost several hundred million dollars for land purchases; the 2017 financial statement shows among Harvard’s assets nearly a billion dollars of land, much of which must be on the Allston frontier. Planning and permitting have consumed at least tens of millions of dollars. The University paid $1.3 billion to buy out the interest-rate swaps effected in 2004 to hedge borrowing for construction anticipated then (excluding the cost of the swaps themselves), and will have invested about $1.4 billion for the initial science-complex foundations, the new SEAS building, and the energy plant. Certainly, substantial borrowing costs are associated with all of the above, bringing the total, as a guess estimate, to $3 billion to $4 billion, not adjusted for inflation. Unwinding the swaps alone consumed about as much as the fees for Allston expansion that had been assessed on the individual Harvard schools’ endowments from 2001 to that point. Only a Harvard could absorb such costs—and not without constraining faculty growth and limiting other academic aspirations. It isn’t rich enough, or imprudent enough, to repeat that now, with only equivalent outputs to show for the investment.

Hence the need for the academic strategy and associated planning to proceed toward a future Harvard. President Bacow has a background in urban planning. (Additional expertise is close at hand: his wife, Adele Fleet-Bacow, is founding president of Community Partners Consultants, an institutional planning and development firm.) He initiated an update of the campus plan for the very landlocked Tufts during his presidency there, and guided that institution’s budget, building projects, and fundraising by a set of clear academic goals. As a member of Harvard’s Corporation, he chaired both the finance and the facilities committees. And he is avidly interested in partnering with Greater Boston universities and colleges, the affiliated hospitals, and others (see page 32), with Allston as a logical locus (data-driven biomedical research, anyone?).

Crossing the Charles River—moving beyond the Business School to enlarge the campus, not just as a distinct project in an outlying precinct called “Allston,” but as a whole—entails an academic plan suited to Harvard’s mission; a physical design that realizes this community’s aspirations; and realistic fiscal means for effecting both.

Rather than hurrying Allston development, taking the time now to set a practical path forward matters much more. Bacow would seem the right person at the right time to lead this work. He surely knows better than most the scale of the effort required, 30 years on, to begin getting Harvard’s fifth century right.

~John S. Rosenberg, Editor
and credit for AP courses—which he considered essential for students with unique academic qualifications and/or economic constraints. He went on to lead the College Board’s AP program for 25 years, during which time he was instrumental in establishing IB standards among universities from around the world. It would be interesting to have his perspective on the sanctity of Harvard’s “curated eight-semester experience.”

Oh well, Nihil perpetuum, pausa diuturna sunt; alius alio modo fragile est, rerum exitus variatur; ceterum quicquid coepit et desinit [“Nothing is everlasting, few things are even long-lasting; one thing perishes in one way, another in another, though the manner of their passing varies, yet whatever has beginning has also an end,” Seneca the Younger, as translated by John W. Basore for the Loeb Classical Library].

Editor’s note: Several elite private schools in the Washington, D.C., area announced in June that they would discontinue offering AP courses. Their reasons for doing so differ from the faculty’s determination that College work differs from that required in AP classes, but the ground is clearly shifting.

CLOTHING MAKETH THE ATHLETE
Harvard women’s gym suits at the turn of the twentieth century may have been “liberating” (“Gym suits, Pre-Spandex,” Treasure, July-August, page 84), but one wonders how today’s modern collegiate athletes could compete in those outfits. For example, the 2017-2018 Crimson Ivy League runner-up women’s tennis team would have been hard pressed to serve and volley in those bulky uniforms…plus, today’s apparel just looks a lot more attractive and comfortable!

Philip K. Curtis, J.D. ’71, M.B.A. ’74
Atlanta

ALMA MATER ENCORE
In the July-August issue (The College Pump, page 76), it is reported that the last line in “Fair Harvard” has been changed from “Till the stock of the Puritans die” to “Till the stars in the firmament die.” In no way am I from the stock of the Puritans and as a 60-year member of the American Civil Liberties Union I have fought for equality for all for a very long time.

The change is political correctness run riot.

This silly change, if it must happen, deserves an equally silly last line: “Till elephants learn how to fly.”

Charles L. Edson ’56, J.D. ’59
Chevy Chase, Md.

ERRATUM
The name of director of admissions Marlyn McGrath ’70, Ph.D. ’78, was rendered incorrectly in “Commencement Confetti” (July-August, page 19). Our error—and apologies.
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Research the possibilities...

Host your next event in the contemporary New Research Building at Harvard Medical School.

- Distinctive conference center in a unique location
- Elegant Rotunda Room with views of the Boston skyline
- State of the art amphitheater with seating for up to 480
- Catering provided by Restaurant Associates

77 Avenue Louis Pasteur
Boston, MA 02115
617-432-8992
theconfcenter.hms.harvard.edu
Equip yourself with the right frameworks and networks to fulfill your greatest leadership ambitions. Harvard Business School Executive Education offers the Women on Boards: Succeeding as a Corporate Director program to empower women leaders to navigate the board selection process and make a greater impact as a corporate director. Join other high-achieving women on the Boston campus in November and strengthen your ability to contribute to corporate governance at the highest level.

AN EXCEPTIONAL PROGRAM FOR EXTRAORDINARY WOMEN LEADERS

Learn more www.exed.hbs.edu
Fixing America’s Heartland

In Flint, Michigan, more than half the men between the ages of 25 and 54 are unemployed—and no longer looking for work either, 2016 data show. The city has become mired in poverty, substance abuse, and homelessness. These problems echo across America’s heartland. In a new research paper published by the Brookings Institution, Eliot University Professor Lawrence H. Summers, Glimp professor of economics Edward Glaeser, and third-year doctoral student Benjamin Austin argue that the best way to help such chronically depressed and jobless areas—particularly the states east of the Mississippi River extending from Mississippi to Michigan—is by implementing policies that explicitly promote job creation in that region.

Historically, U.S. economists have advocated geographically uniform policies that help low-income individuals across the entire country. Yet one of the most famous exceptions to this theory—the place-based Tennessee Valley Authority, established in 1933—not only delivered electricity and improved infrastructure in one of the poorest parts of the country, but also increased agricultural employment in the region.

For their paper, the researchers focused on men in the 25 to 54 age range because this group, until recently, has had very high levels of employment. The current negative effects associated with joblessness in this cohort—relatively high rates of opioid abuse, suicide, mental-health problems, and imprisonment—make it especially urgent to understand the nature of their non-employment (i.e., their failure to search for work in the preceding four weeks), and its secondary effects on their communities.

The researchers determined that clustered populations of non-employed men can lead to lower demand for local products: because the non-employed lack the money to support local businesses, the resulting decreased demand may prompt layoffs of other local workers—further reducing regional labor opportunities.

Widespread non-employment can also undermine the stigma of not working, creating a self-reinforcing culture, especially if those not working tend to spend time in one another’s company.

According to the authors, the
strongest justification for implementing place-based policies to remedy this entrenched problem is that “a dollar spent fighting non-employment in a high not-working-rate area will do more to reduce non-employment than a dollar spent fighting non-employment in a low not-working-rate area”—even though, as Austin acknowledges, “historically some place-based policies have been very expensive relative to the outcome.” They discuss in the paper some studies of prior place-based policies that found that interventions “did generate jobs, but sometimes at a very high cost per job.” A 2013 study of enterprise zones in the United States, for example, “found that each job cost about $18,000 to create, which is actually at the low end of the spectrum.” Other studies suggest the cost per job can be significantly higher... and therefore the evidence on the cost effectiveness of these programs is mixed.

To address that issue, the authors recommend an intervention based on strengthened employment subsidies, such as through an expanded Earned Income Tax Credit. Although that benefit is currently constructed to benefit single parents, who are often women, the paper suggests it could be modified to target men of prime working age in distressed regions by means of a uniform hourly wage subsidy, which the authors’ analysis shows would disproportionately benefit those areas. Place-based policies that explicitly offer subsidies to Americans living in certain geographic regions might also work, the authors write—while cautioning that such subsidies could encourage migration to those regions, in turn causing an unwanted increase in housing costs and rents that disproportionately benefits homeowners and landlords. “It’s possible that those costs might partially offset the positive impact of the program, although the declining rate of mobility in the United States suggests this may be less of a problem than in the past,” Austin points out.

Politicians have traditionally leaned toward promising infrastructure to improve living and working conditions in the poorest parts of the country, but the paper argues that “targeting infrastructure spending towards distressed areas risks producing projects with limited value for users.” Instead, it suggests that allocating funds to employment subsidies that would naturally flow to regions with high levels of non-employed men is more likely to be a permanent solution for persistent stagnation, and perhaps would provide the greatest economic and social benefit to the country as a whole.

~OSET BABÜR

BEN AUSTIN EMAIL: benjamin_austin@g.harvard.edu
ED GLAESER EMAIL: edward.glaeser@gmail.com

**PREDICTIVE PALEOBIOLOGY!**

**Extinctions’ Ecological Impact**

**D**uring the last 500 million years, the fossil record shows, the ecology of life on Earth has been disrupted and irrevocably altered half a dozen times. After the Great Ordovician Biodiversification had produced an order of magnitude increase in the number of species, five mass extinctions successively wiped out much of the life on the planet. The causes of these events have been the subject of renewed scrutiny ever since 1980, when Luis Alvarez (a Nobel Prize-winning physicist) and his son Walter (a geologist) advanced the theory that a meteor wiped out the dinosaurs and many other creatures 66 million years ago. Now, a study that quantifies the impact of such events on marine ecosystems—communities of ocean organisms living together in non-random associations—may help develop a more nuanced understanding of paleoecology that could ultimately shed light on the threat of species losses today.

As a paleontologist and geobiologist, post-doctoral fellow Anthony “Drew” Muscente investigates the interactions between the biosphere and the physical planet. He uses the fossil record to study what is known as “co-occurrence data”: “what lived with what in the distant past.” By examining these data using network analysis, he and his colleagues identified ecologically significant associations among ancient marine animals, and then investigated how these individual species and communities changed over geologic time. The approach enabled them to rank the ecological impacts of mass extinctions.

Muscente says that once these “pulses of ecological reorganization throughout the fossil record” have been recognized, researchers can begin to measure them and try to quantify the consequences of such mass extinctions on entire ecosystems. This is relevant now because some scholars have argued that a sixth mass extinction is under way today. “That may or may not be true,” he adds, “but we need some historical context for understanding what species losses have
done in the past to change the biosphere.”

“What’s interesting,” says Muscente’s postdoctoral adviser and collaborator on the paper, Andrew Knoll, Fisher professor of natural history and professor of earth and planetary sciences, is that the size of a mass extinction doesn’t reveal whether it will change the ecosystem. There’s “no necessary correlation between the taxonomic import of a mass extinction and the ecology,” Knoll explains. For example, even though the first great extinction, at the end of the Ordovician period, eliminated half the then-existing genera and some 80 percent of all species, an ocean reef in the wake of that event still looked “tolerably like” it did before the die-off—and the existing localized marine ecologies of trilobites, brachiopods, and corals largely persisted. In other instances—such as during the Permian extinction of 252 million years ago—the communities of fauna that eventually arose, millions of years later, were substantially different.

### During major extinctions, sometimes whole ecosystems disappear even when relatively few species are affected.

The findings support a long-standing observation by paleontologists “that mass extinctions tend to be selective,” says Muscente. “If you have an ocean anoxic event versus a glaciation, or an asteroid impact, you are going to affect different things. The research supports the idea that even when a lot of species disappear, the changes to ecosystems can be minor, but that sometimes whole ecosystems disappear even when relatively few species are affected. Ecological and taxonomic impacts, in other words, may be decoupled during such episodes. In the Permian extinction, Knoll explains, two million years of volcanism in Russia’s Siberian Traps region occurred “at a rate a million times greater than anything ever witnessed by humans or their close relatives.” The magma “plumbed through thick limestones,” releasing massive quantities of carbon dioxide. The greenhouse gas warmed the planet—and because CO₂ dissolves in seawater, it also caused ocean acidification, harming reefs and shellfish alike. At the same time, “because warm waters can carry less oxygen than cold waters,” anoxia spread through the sea. Fish can swim away from oxygen-poor water, but an anoxic body of water settling over an immobile reef can cause permanent damage. “The effects of these changes are synergistic physiologically,” he says, and because a reef’s physical structure also hosts a diverse ecosystem, “the result was the biggest extinction we know of.”

Ironically, by far the most ecologically disruptive marine event, Muscente and Knoll’s study found, was the Ordovician Biodiversification itself. Massive increases in biodiversity completely changed the ecology of the seas. “It isn’t only loss of diversity that can and does have an effect on ecosystem structure,” Knoll continues. “Major diversification events” (this one driven by causes unknown, perhaps a cooling and simultaneous oxygenation of the oceans) drive profound change as well.

Earlier efforts by Knoll and his colleague Richard Bambach, an associate in the Harvard Herbarium, to predict which organisms should be physiologically vulnerable to rapid buildup of CO₂, and which more tolerant of it, “turned out to give a very good first-order prediction of what went extinct in the Permian. That’s relevant,” Knoll says, because what happened then—a rapid rise of CO₂, ocean acidification, warmth, and loss of oxygen in the oceans—is similar to the pressures building in the twenty-first century.

The data don’t reveal whether a sixth extinction is now under way. Even so, Knoll notes that there have been significant decreases in population sizes among both land and sea animals “and the first step toward extinction is a reduction in population size.” “I don’t want to overplay the predictions of this work for the future,” he adds, “but at least it gives us an ecological framework for thinking about what comes next. In many of these major extinction events, reef-building organisms are particularly at risk.” This has some real relevance to this century and the next “because if you look at statistics, such as the loss of half the reef cover in the Great Barrier Reef during the last 30 years, it’s really sobering.”

Jonathan Shaw
Her focus moved southward when visiting professor Stanley L. Engerman of the University of Rochester, a quantitative economic historian and pioneer in studying the economics of slavery, gave her a copy of Thomas Affleck’s *Cotton Plantation Record and Account Book*, published annually between 1848 and 1860. A standardized journal kept by plantation owners, the *Account Book* tracked metrics like slave productivity. From this interaction was born *Accounting for Slavery*, just published by Harvard University Press, in which Rosenthal examines such records to understand slaveholders’ management and accounting techniques. “The goal of the project,” which began with her dissertation, she says, “was to write slavery back into the history of American business.”

Slavery is often understood as an impediment to the development of American capitalism—a failure of both morals and business. From this mindset, Rosenthal explains, “it is possible to craft a really triumphant narrative of American business,” in which economic freedom and human rights advance together.

Plantation account books, she argues, undermine this narrative of mutual progress. Instead, they demonstrate that plantation owners employed innovative management techniques, from multidivisional organizational structures and standardization (like the use of identical records that “could be compared across multiple plantations and over time”) to depreciation and nascent forms of scientific management, whereby workers are thought of as “inputs of production” and tracked meticulously to increase productivity.

The control and consistency of an enslaved workforce facilitated these innovations, allowing managers to keep careful records and experiment freely—even as hints of escape or resistance in the account books demonstrate enslaved people’s efforts to subvert that control. As Rosenthal writes, “Systematic accounting practices,” like maintaining records of individual productivity, “thrive[d] on antebellum plantations—not despite the chattel principle, but because of it.”

Drawing on Rosenthal’s interdisciplinary background in labor and business history as well as economics, *Accounting for Slavery* has what the author calls an “eclectic setup.” Rather than delving into a single geography and moment in time, as an historian might, Rosenthal organizes chapters by specific “innovations of business history, like the development of organizational hierarchies.”
She tracks these innovations on plantations throughout the nineteenth-century West Indies and the American South, drawing parallels to the nineteenth-century North and modern economy. She finds her sources in archives from Britain and Barbados to Harvard’s Baker Library (and even Engerman’s basement, where he keeps original records acquired through decades of research). In a choice reminiscent of business journals, she focuses on “exceptional cases:” the largest and most productive plantations, or those that kept the most diligent records.

This choice also reflects broader dilemmas in archival research. Often (though not always), a source’s survival indicates the wealth, power, or foresight of someone who owned it. In England, for example, Rosenthal found decades’ worth of pristine, preserved annual reports sent from Caribbean managers to absentee plantation owners across the Atlantic. In the West Indies, by contrast, she often located mere “scraps” of corresponding day-to-day records lost to humidity and the relative lack of resources for preservation.

Despite this survivor bias, she suggests that the obsession with record-keeping and productivity-tracking extended down the management hierarchies on plantations throughout the slave economy. Discussing the work of using records that survived in England to study plantations in the West Indies, for example, Rosenthal reflects, “You look back from the available records that survived in England to ascertain what system they lay on top of.”

In doing so, she hopes to bridge current debates in the history of slavery. Historians and economists, for example, have long disputed the cause of a mid-nineteenth-century spike in Southern productivity. Economists argue for agricultural innovations, such as new cotton seeds, while historians contend that greater levels of violence drove heightened production. Plantation account books point to both answers: slaveholders, Rosenthal writes, “pursued multiple strategies in combination, weaving agricultural innovation and coercion together in strategies to grow more cotton.”

These innovations, she insists, should not be celebrated. On the contrary, “the tone of the project is one of critique.” According to its author, Accounting for Slavery is “a cautionary tale about what capitalism can look like, and has looked like, when the rules allow capital almost unlimited control over labor.” Nor is this critique limited to the South: “We have grown used to separate conversations about the slave South and the North,” Rosenthal explains, “when really they were two settings in one connected economy, evolving together.” Slaveholders’ “business innovations were as central to the emerging capitalist system as those in free factories.”

Given this insight, a reader might ask how Americans should grapple with an economic system that thrived in the absence of human freedom. For Rosenthal, history suggests that regulation can help rein in the excesses of capitalism. The abolition of slavery, in her framing, was not just a moral triumph, but also a regulatory victory that limited planters’ economic freedoms in order to protect the rights of enslaved people. As Rosenthal, now an assistant professor of history at the University of California, Berkeley, reflects, “I hope that businesspeople will pick up my book and find inspiration for developing ethical practices, but that will never be enough. Protecting people from the extremes of profit-seeking will always require regulation.”

Rosenthal is optimistic that by heeding the history of slavery and innovation, Americans can “rethink the kinds of data we record and how we use it” in labor settings. In antebellum America, when sophisticated accounting practices upheld an economy dependent on racialized slavery, she finds innovation and violence behind the dry figures.

—JOHN A. GRIFFIN

CAITLIN ROSENTHAL EMAIL: crosenthal@berkeley.edu

Illustration by Martin Hargreaves
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The Newman School is a coed, private college preparatory high school in the heart of the Back Bay. We have small class sizes, quality college acceptances, and a vibrant sports program. Students have the option to pursue an International Baccalaureate diploma.

For more information, please contact Patricia Lynch, Ph.D., Director of Admissions plynch@newmanboston.org
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ST. PETER SCHOOL
A Co-ed Catholic School from Pre-K to Grade 8
Teaching to the heart, mind, and soul of each child since 1901

OPEN HOUSE
Sunday, October 14, 2018 • 12:00 pm - 2:00 pm

For more information, please contact: Mr. Mark Smith, Director of Admissions 617-547-0101 ext 126
admissions@saint-peter-school.org | 96 Concord Ave, Cambridge, MA 02138 | www.saint-peter-school.org

Dedham Country Day School
Coed • Pre-K–Grade 8

Dadham COUNTRYDAY.ORG

BALANCED. CONNECTED. WHOLE.

Join Us This Fall!

Open House: October 28
1:00–3:00 p.m.

Classroom Observations:
October 24 & November 14
8:30–10:30 a.m. (parents register online)

www.DEDHAMCOUNTRYDAY.ORG

Gould
Bethel, Maine

2018 OPEN HOUSE DATES
MONDAY, OCTOBER 8, 2018
MONDAY, NOVEMBER 12, 2018

Contact Admissions to plan a visit
207-824-7777
admissions@gouldacademy.org

Bard Academy
at SIMON'S ROCK
High School. Reimagined.

Bard College at
SIMON'S ROCK
the Early College

OPEN HOUSE
Saturday, September 22 & October 20
admit@simons-rock.edu | 1-800-235-7186 | simons-rock.edu | Great Barrington, MA
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Extracurriculars
Events on and off campus during September and October

**SEASONAL**

**Ingmar Bergman Centennial**

www.hcl.harvard.edu/hfa/bergman.html

The Harvard Film Archive, Brattle Theatre, and Coolidge Corner Theatre celebrate the filmmaker and his “naked pursuit of the most profound metaphysical and spiritual questions.” Highlights include screenings of *Autumn Sonata*, with a visit by actress and Bergman muse Liv Ullmann, and of *Wild Strawberries*, shown at sundown in Mount Auburn Cemetery. (August 31-October 14)

**Boston Book Festival**

www.bostonbookfest.org

This free, day-long fête features 200 authors, children’s activities, and an outdoor dance party. Copley Square. (October 13)

**LECTURES**

Mahindra Humanities Center

www.mahindrahumanities.fas.harvard.edu

---

From left: A detail of *The New City of Salt* (2001), by Kahn & Selesnick, the deCordova Sculpture Park and Museum; Ingmar Bergman’s *All These Women*, Harvard Film Archive; and View from Mount Holyoke (ca. 1845) by Thomas Chambers, Fruitlands Museum.
BUILDING COMMUNITY
ONE HOME AT A TIME

CALL US TO LEARN ABOUT OUR NEW PROPERTIES COMING THIS FALL


Gail Roberts & Ed Feijo

617 245-4044 · gail@gailroberts.com · WWW.GAILROBERTS.COM
**Spotlight**

**Something bugging you?** Head to the Harvard Museum of Natural History to marvel at The Rockefeller Beetles. The largest order (Coleoptera) of insects, beetles have been honored, eaten, and studied since ancient times. They also comprise a full quarter of the planet’s animal species, says Brian D. Farrell, entomology curator at the University’s Museum of Comparative Zoology (MCZ), which holds 7.5 million insect specimens—among the largest collections in North America—including four million beetles.

Those on display starting this fall are part of the 150,000-beetle private collection of David Rockefeller ’36, G ’37, LL.D. ’69, that was donated to the MCZ after he died last year. In the course of nine decades, the prominent banker and philanthropist, a longtime Harvard supporter and former Overseer, also amassed insects, primarily beetles, from across the globe, such as the “rare and nearly impossible-to-obtain Brazilian specimens,” Farrell says.

Rockefeller and Farrell had met and shared their fascination with these adaptable, industrious creatures, which come in a mind-boggling array of colors and sizes—and have been trained to fight, coveted as pets, and turned into jewelry and religious totems. Beetles speak to the “extraordinary variety and organization of nature,” Farrell said of Rockefeller’s penchant during a speech last year: “He saw what Darwin saw: evolution in action.” Collecting any natural object, Farrell added, offers that “discovery of the meaning in everything.”

**Harvard Museum of Natural History**
http://hmnh.harvard.edu

**Opens October 20**

---

**Nobel Prize-winning writer J.M. Coetzee visits campus to receive The Mahindra Award for Global Distinction in the Humanities, and to read from his work. The event is free and open to the public, but tickets are required. Sanders Theatre. (October 17)**

**Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study**
www.radcliffe.harvard.edu

**Schlesinger Library 75th Anniversary Celebration**
Singer/songwriter Shaina Taub performs music from her new show about the life and work of Alice Paul, author of the original Equal Rights Amendment, followed by a panel discussion. Knaefel Center. (October 29)

**Nature and Science**
The Arnold Arboretum
www.arboretum.harvard.edu

In Continuation: Seasons at the Arboretum, Cambridge-based photographer Jim Harrison, a longtime contributor to this magazine, captures nature as a “living, ever-
changing laboratory in which to explore the simple but fundamental act of observation.” (Through October 2)

**EXHIBITIONS & EVENTS**

**Harvard Ceramics Program**
https://ofa.fas.harvard.edu/ceramics

*The In-Between*. Signature ceramicware and illustrated storytelling by New Bedford-based potter and educator Seth Rainville, among the 2017-2018 artists-in-residence. (August 27-September 30)

**Harvard Art Museums**
www.harvardartmuseums.org

*Mutiny: Works by Géricault* looks at some 40 works by Romantic-period artist Théodore Géricault. (Opens September 1)

*Animal-Shaped Vessels from the Ancient World: Feasting with Gods, Heroes, and Kings* highlights nearly 60 ornate objects used for social or ceremonial functions. (Opens September 7)

**Houghton Library**
https://houghton75.org/exhibitions-list

*Stage Fright: Or the Fate of Frankenstein* reveals how nineteenth-century playwrights transformed Mary Shelley's original vision of her “monster.” (Opens September 1)

**The Harvard Map Collection’s 200th Anniversary**
www.harvardmaps200.org

From hand-drawn surveys of nineteenth-century Bavaria and Japanese charts from World War II to bird’s-eye images taken by camera-toting pigeons, *Follow the Map: The Harvard Map Collection at 200* (open through October 27) reflects timeless efforts to chart the universe. A symposium on the history and future of collecting, researching, and teaching with cartographic materials is also set for October 25-26. Pusey Library.

**Davis Museum**
www.wellesley.edu/davismuseum

New shows include: *Christiane Baumgarten: Another Country* (monumental woodcuts and prints by the German artist); *A Critical Eye: James Gillray and the Art of Satire* (the influential political cartoonist harpooning Napoleon-era Britain); and *Sky Hopinka: Dislocation Blues* (the short film...
Harvard Art Museums

Animal-Shaped Vessels
from the Ancient World
Feasting with Gods, Heroes, and Kings

At Brookhaven

lifecare living is as good as it looks.

Brookhaven at Lexington offers an abundance of opportunities for intellectual growth, artistic expression and personal wellness. Our residents share your commitment to live a vibrant lifestyle in a lovely community.

Call today to set up an appointment for a tour!

A Full-Service Lifecare Retirement Community
www.brookhavenatlexington.org
(781) 863-9660 • (800) 283-1114

Harvard Squared
Harvard Art Museums
September 7, 2018–January 6, 2019

Feasting with Gods, Heroes, and Kings
from the Ancient World

deCordova Sculpture Park and Museum
www.decordova.org
Lived Space: Humans and Architecture explores psychological and physical attachments to our built environments through works by more than 25 artists, including Walker Evans, Sarah Malakoff, and Arno Rafael Minkkinen. (Through September 30)

Fuller Craft Museum
www.fullercraft.org
Uneasy Beauty: Discomfort in Contemporary Adornment. Some 75 examples of wearable art that test the limits of endurance and potentially provoke candid conversations. A curatorial lecture, reception, and fashion show (in partnership with the Massachusetts College of Art and Design) are slated for October 13. (Opens October 6)

Fruitlands Museum
www.fruitlands.thetrustees.org
More than 50 romantic depictions of America are on display in A New View: Landscapes from the Permanent Collection. (Through November 5)

MUSIC
Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum
www.gardnermuseum.org
The Boston debut of Russian violinist and violist Sergey Malov, playing the intriguing violoncello da spalla, a small cello held like a guitar and played high against one’s chest. (September 30)

Sanders Theatre
www.boxoffice.harvard.edu
The Harvard Wind Ensemble, Saturday Jazz Band, and Harvard University Band join forces for the annual Montage Concert. (October 12)

THEATER
American Repertory Theater
www.americanrepertorytheater.org
Singer, actress, and comedian Tori Scott sails into town for a one-night cabaret performance of her signature pop-torch-satirical songs. Oberon. (October 11)

Events listings are also available at www.harvardmagazine.edu.
STAFF PICK: Lowell Kinetic Sculpture Race

On September 22, about 20 teams will gather to propel their human-powered machines—without their feet ever touching the ground—through downtown streets and a 50-foot mud pit, and then into the Merrimack River, before returning to land to cross the finish line near the Lowell Heritage State Park.

Fun and ingenuity are prized over winning, says race co-producer and artist Michael Roundy, a studio art professor at the University of Massachusetts, Lowell—and the contest supports the national STEM/STEAM educational initiative. The creations utilize all of that knowledge—the physics and mechanics involved in knowing “how to make your way through mud, how to float, how steering works,” he says—along with hands-on skills and artistry, as in welding and carpentry.

Last year, a machine featuring three bicycles and two canoes was built as a summer project by fifth- and sixth-graders in a Lowell STEM-based program. In another apparatus, “Ice Cream Floats,” co-pilots ably pedaled along asphalt but, once they hit the mud, climbed up front atop an attached, geodesic-dome-like orb made of lightweight plastic and foam tubing and manually rolled their machine (and themselves) through the pit, says Roundy. “People were really amazed at that!”

A record 5,000 spectators turned out, many in funky hats, make-up, and costumes, from hot dogs and queens to Vikings and superheroes. The festivities begin at 8:30 a.m. on Market Street—where anyone can meet the teams and see their machines—and end around 4 p.m. with an award ceremony (there’s even one for the next-to-last finisher) at the park. But throughout the day, there are live bands and street performers, along with family-friendly games and food trucks.

The Lowell event, now in its third year, was inspired by the first known kinetic sculpture competition, held in Ferndale, California, in 1969. That began, Roundy says, with artist Hobart Brown’s efforts to improve his son’s tricycle, and a neighbor who thought he’d do it even better and then challenged Hobart to a race. That friendly rivalry has blossomed into a three-day spectacle that covers 40 miles of water, mud, and sand dunes and spawned similar events across the country. Given the intensive creative process required by these inventions, the Lowell race has no registration deadlines or fees (although there is a list of safety-conscious technical requirements). “We’ll even take people up until the last day,” Roundy declares, “because we like to leave it all open.” ～N.P.B.

Every human-powered vehicle must stand the test of traveling successfully on asphalt, through mud, and into the Merrimack River.

The Lowell Kinetic Sculpture Race

www.lowellkinetic.com
September 22

1860’s Greek Revival on a quiet side street in Kirkland Village. 3+ bedrooms, 2 baths, open family room and kitchen with a deck that extends to a large yard with beautiful gardens. Off-street parking. Fabulous location convenient to shops, restaurants, transportation, and Harvard University. Exclusively Offered - $1,050,000

WWW.BARBARACURRIER.COM

BARBARA CURRIER • VICTORIA KENNEDY • RYAN FERRO

Photographs courtesy of the Lowell Kinetic Sculpture Race
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The Fells

Just north of Boston, a wild park is filled with forests, lakes, and rocky hills.

by NELL PORTER BROWN

On a Sunday afternoon, 20 people troop gamely into the Middlesex Fells Reservation for a free “Tree Walk” with Harvard botanist Walter Kittredge. Along the Dark Hollow Pond Trail, in the Stoneham section of the park, he points out a “forest seep community” rich with ferns, a grove of beeches, and a sunnier swath conducive to pignut hickory and hop hornbeam trees nestled in a sea of bright green, feathery Pennsylvania sedge.

In all, more than a dozen habitats are flourishing along the trail in a landscape essentially left to grow wild for more than a century. “This is an amazing place that was set aside,” says Kittredge, a senior curatorial assistant with the University Herbaria & Libraries. “Very few cities have anything like this.”

Aptly honoring an ancient word for rugged, rocky hills, The Fells, as the state-owned park is commonly called, is also a haven for urbanites. Its woodlands and abundant reservoirs sprawl across 3,400 acres that abut five communities—Malden, Medford, Melrose, Stoneham, and Winchester—and include more than 100 miles of walking and hiking paths. Visitors can also mountain bike, picnic, sail and paddle on Spot Pond, or romp with their dogs (off-leash!) at the Sheepfold. On a beautiful day, the meadow is often more alive with happy canines than with humans.

That 10-acre tract, accessible from I-93 in Stoneham, also connects visitors to jaunts of varying lengths and rigor that zigzag across the whole preserve. Routes hugging the shorelines of North and Middle Reservoirs have the feel of being in rural Maine. A northerly trail leads to historic Bear Hill Tower, built in 1910. Or head south and take the long way to Wright’s Tower, the stone building that looms over Interstate 93, offering panoramic views of the region. The 1937 Works Progress Administration project was restored in 2008 by the state’s Department of Conservation.
IGNITE SOMETHING

ONLY THE PERFECT CUT CAN UNLEASH A DIAMOND’S BRILLIANCE.
and Recreation (DCR) and named for Elizur Wright, an abolitionist, mathematician, and pioneering insurance regulator. In the mid-1800s, as the American industrial revolution gathered strength, he and Wilson Flagg (a writer and naturalist who attended Harvard) were among the first to call for protection of land that became the Fells in 1894.

DCR organizes hikes to Wright’s Tower, along with other events and activities year-round. Check the website for fall calendar listings, public transportation and parking options, and maps.

Harvard botanist Walter Kittredge leading one of his monthly tree hikes; and a scenic slice of Quarter Mile Pond

with recommended bikeways and hikes, from the easy one-mile Spot Pond Brook Historic Trail to the “difficult” 6.9-mile Skyline Trail loop. Through mid September, Boating in Boston also rents rowboats, canoes, and paddleboards on Spot Pond.

Balancing multiple uses of public space is tricky. “We have had some user-conflicts among the dog walkers, hikers, walkers, and mountain bikers,” allows Thomas M. Walsh, DCR director of north region park operations. “People in general should be respectful of others in public and adhere to our regulations. We try to create the best experience here for everybody.”

The park is open from dawn to dusk. Mountain bikers are allowed only on certain trails on certain dates (outside of mud season), to limit the environmental damage. And, although dogs and their owners love to roam the Fells, there are leash and pooping rules in place for aesthetic reasons, and because nearly a quarter of the park is covered with water. “The Fells is the watershed—the kidneys—for the Mystic River. And that is extremely important to the Boston area,” says Ron Morin, executive director of the nonprofit Friends of the Fells. Spot Pond and the Fells Reservoir are back-up water supplies controlled by the Massachusetts Water Resources Authority; the other reservoirs, by the Town of Winchester.

The 1,500-member Friends group, celebrating its twenty-fifth anniversary this year, promotes “harmonious use” of the park, he says, and preservation of “ecological, historical, and recreational resources.” To that
end, it offers responsibly enjoyable ways to explore the natural world, including Babes in the Woods and Hide ‘n Seek (at Bellevue Pond), and StoryWalk™ (a self-led walk featuring the hunt for pages of a picture book posted along the trail) for younger children and their caregivers. The Friends also sponsors volunteer-led activities, such as Kittredge’s monthly tree hikes, historic walks with Douglas Heath (co-author, with Alison Simcox, of the Images of America books Middlesex Fells and The Lost Mill Village of Middlesex Fells), the annual Coastsweep Clean-up (September 29) and Fall for the Fells festival and trail run (November 4).


Yet without the activists Flagg and Wright, and others who joined their effort, sketchers would have scant trees, plants, and wildlife to record. Though the land had long been used as a respite by city-dwellers, it had also been farmed and logged since the 1700s. From 1640 to 1896, Spot Pond Brook was a locus of mill development, including the Hayward Rubber Company, founded by Nathaniel Hayward, co-inventor, with Charles Goodyear, of the vulcanization of rubber, according to Simcox and Heath. Hikers can still find archaeological remnants of the industrial community of Haywardville, like mill ponds and ancient foundations.

In 1879, Sylvester Baxter, a newspaper writer and city-planning promoter, took up the conservation cause, introducing the term “fells” in a piece for the Boston Herald supplement: “…northerly from Boston lies a great tract of country, all stony hills and table-lands, almost uninhabited, and of wonderful picturesqueness, and wild rugged beauty…The nature of this region cannot be better characterized than by the application of the old Saxon designation fells, a common enough word in England, meaning a tract of wild stone hills, corresponding to the German word Felsen.”

George E. Davenport, a fern expert, botanical writer, and photographer (some of his papers and about 700 of his specimens...
are housed at Harvard), was also a tireless advocate, along with landscape architect Charles Eliot, A.B. 1882, son of Harvard president Charles William Eliot, and a founder of what’s now the Massachusetts-based Trustees, the first private, nonprofit conservation organization in the country.

Wright and Flagg formed the Middlesex Fells Association in 1880, and by 1893, the fledgling Metropolitan Park Commission (in which Eliot and Baxter played pivotal roles) had established not only the Fells, but the Blue Hills, Stony Brook, and Beaver Brook Reservations. The firm founded by Frederick Law Olmsted, A.M. 1864, LL.D.

CURIOSITIES: A Trip To “The Dark Side of Boston”

On a Friday evening, Boston’s North End is buzzing. Done with tours of Old North Church or the Paul Revere House, or just arriving for a fun night out, visitors stroll through cobblestone streets, pile into Italian restaurants, or head to Copp’s Hill Terrace for romantic views of Boston Harbor.

The city’s oldest neighborhood wasn’t always so charming. Certainly not in the mid 1800s, when it was home to poor immigrants packed into tenements and a thriving red-light district, says guide Bob Perkins during his walking tour of “The Dark Side of Boston.” Hundreds of brothels, gambling dens, bars, and dance halls catered especially, he says, to sailors eager to relieve their frustrations after so many years at sea.

The 90-minute walk is one among dozens offered by the nonprofit organization Boston By Foot. All tours are led by volunteers, typically history buffs like Perkins, who passionately aim to enlighten. “I just love Boston,” he says. “I gave 167 tours last year alone.”

The “Dark Side” also delves into a range of other unsavory, immoral, and horrifying events. Among them: the anti-Stamp Act mob that in 1765 destroyed the North End mansion of lieutenant governor Thomas Hutchinson (class of 1727), and the Colonial era’s annual “Pope Night,” celebrated throughout New England, during which North End and South End gangs fought for the honor of burning an effigy of the Catholic leader. George Washington finally forbade his troops to participate, in part because he wanted the French Catholic Canadians’ help in invading Canada, Perkins notes.

Moving to the early twentieth century, he highlights the Spanish flu epidemic of 1918, the first American cases of which appeared among sailors living on Commonwealth Pier. By the end of that year, some 4,794 Boston-area residents had died, many in the overcrowded North End. Within a few months, that community was also hit, literally, by the Great Molasses Flood. A Commercial Street storage tank full of the sticky stuff burst, releasing a 25-foot wave that roared down the street at 35 miles an hour. “Most of the 21 people killed were not drowned,” Perkins reports. “They were crushed….It spawned one of the first class-action suits in the country.”

He stops at the site of the Great Brink’s Robbery, near the corner of Prince and Commercial Streets. What’s now a garage was, in 1950, a Brink’s vault building from which an armed crew extracted nearly $3 million (almost $30 million today) in a meticulously planned theft; then authorities “spent another $29 million investigating,” he adds, and finally caught the robbers a few days before the statute of limitations ran out—thanks only to a snitch seeking leniency for a different crime.

By far, the most haunting story Perkins tells on his signature tour is that of slaves Mark and Phillis, driven to poison their Charlestown master John Codman (a man known to be violent) in 1755. Mark, also distraught by being separated from his family, procured arsenic from another slave who worked for a doctor in the North End, and after seven doses were hidden in his food, Codman died. When the plot was uncovered, the two slaves were tried (all three justices and the prosecutor were Harvard alumni), and executed: she burned at the stake and he hung at Gallows Lot, on what is now Avon Hill, in Cambridge. Mark’s body was then moved to a spot along a Charlestown (now Somerville) thoroughfare. And 20 years later, in Paul Revere’s own account of his famous midnight ride, he mentions passing “‘Charlestown Neck, and got nearly opposite where Mark was hung in chains.’” Perkins says: either the spot was by then still a well-known landmark, or “the bones of Mark were still there.”

These are, Perkins notes, “maybe some of the Boston stories the Chamber of Commerce doesn’t want you to hear.” —NELL PORTER BROWN
’93, with Eliot in a new lead role there, was commissioned to design many elements of the multi-park system.

Everywhere across the Fells is evidence of these concerted—and continuing—efforts to protect and enjoy the land. On the tree hike, Kittredge highlights the threats of invasive plants, the dire need for trees in society, and the problem of mountain bikers gouging “rogue trails” that destroy the forest floor. Walkers snap photos and scribble notes about leaf and branch configurations. Kids skip about, finding pinecones. Parents carrying babies, and elders with walking sticks, take the trail more slowly, talking together. “It’s nice to connect people with trees and the natural history here,” says Earthwise Aware president O’Neill, a regular on Kittredge’s walks. “There are more than 60,000 species of trees in the world, 1,000 native in the United States. You cannot know them all. It’s very humbling. But, you are going to learn something new each time you go out.”

Kittredge has researched plant life in the Fells, co-authoring a nine-year study of changes in vascular fauna, and is currently conducting work on mosses and lichen. His hikes help people “value the forest for more than just recreation,” he says, making up for the “lack of nature education in our school systems.” He stops, for example, to explain a talus slope, and how the zone’s rich topsoil has long nourished a sugar maple-oak-hickory forest. “And you see that?” He points off the trail to a bitternut hickory tree. At 90 feet and 30 inches dbh (diameter at breast height), “it’s the largest tree of its kind in the Fells. It’s huge. And it’s probably not long for this world,” he adds, as walkers look on, wide-eyed. Then he smiles. “But its progeny are all over these woods.”

Reflections of fall in Quarter Mile Pond (above); a woodsy view of the High Service Reservoir (at left)
Comedor

A homey Chilean-American restaurant in Newton
by NELL PORTER BROWN

Billed as “creative Chilean cuisine with a dose of American ingenuity,” the dishes at Comedor begged to be deciphered. It turns out that the restaurant’s owners, Jakob and Fernanda White, freely cook what they like—and we mostly did, too.

The husband-and-wife team met as culinary-arts students at Boston University, and play with food inspired by their respective backgrounds: his American, hers Chilean. But they also happily incorporate other culinary influences, like Greek and Middle Eastern. One evening, the specials featured fried chicken ($13) cooled with a dollop of Meyer lemon labne and a zippy, fresh strawberry salsa (we’d gladly have brought a pint home). Two skewers of lamb anticucho were less successfully paired with chili butter (perhaps too oily for such fatty meat) and a dauntingly peppery “baby cress” salad with too few chunks of nectarines and avocados ($16).

The couple’s flexibility is embodied in their tidily decorated, one-room storefront space. The open kitchen, which includes part of the street-side wall of windows, is surprisingly calm and quiet, and the bar is a welcoming strip of stools at a wooden countertop. Shelves hold liquor bottles, spices, and pickled goods like ginger, lemons, and celery, that are enticingly arrayed along a brick wall with high arched windows. Tables for diners take up the other side of Comedor, but the layout fosters easy rapport among those consuming, waiting, and cooking, lending a chattering...
warmth to the place, which can draw a crowd for Sunday brunch.

The interior is all muted tones of brown, gray, and vanilla except for the artwork. One painting features a swath of sugary pink horizon and a toothy shark cresting the surf, depicted with splotches of color like a pop-art patchwork quilt. The work is by the international artists known as the Couto Brothers, who also created the world map by the bar. An image of the U.S. and the Chilean flags spliced together hangs nearby, but little else at Comedor seems to explicitly reflect Chile. And for a place so thoughtfully designed otherwise, the background music might lend more of a South American flavor. Instead, we heard only overplayed pop tunes.

Maybe that’s because so much attention has been poured into the drinks. Try the autumnal Black Unicorn, a milk punch of bourbon, brandy, cardamom, and black tea, with a touch of fogginess ($12) or the Prince of Cats, a sultry mix of rye infused with urfa biber (Turkish chile pepper), chocolate and vanilla liqueur, and sour-cherry mash ($12). The house-made white or red sangrias ($12, or $29 for a pitcher) are always refreshing, and we also liked the non-alcoholic honey rosemary limeade ($5). The bartenders, meanwhile, seem game to concoct whatever cocktail or mocktail suits your mood.

Menu standouts include the Chef’s Burger ($13) with rotating toppings and sides, and the salmon with a basil tzatziki and almond couscous ($15). The carrot dip, with walnuts and cardamom ($11), was too sweet alone, but came alive when spread over house-made black-sesame crackers.

The French fries ($7) will make the “extra-crispy” groupies happy, but the salty scallop and cotija-cheese crumble (a zesty alternative to the standard ketchup offering) wouldn’t stick to them; we had to resort to a tricky press-it-on-with-your-greasy-fingers maneuver.

Desserts were a highlight. “Jakob’s ice cream” ($7) is reliably delicious, as is the quivering cup of buttermilk panna cotta ($9) with Meyer lemon jam. That’s another foodstuff worth bottling for take-out, along with the strawberry salsa.

The service is fine—the wait staff is knowledgeable and relaxed. Everything was appealing. But we couldn’t help but hope that this talented couple who promise creativity push for more from themselves, and for us.
**Falling for Art: Creative Classes in Cambridge and Boston**

School’s back in session for students—but those of us with diplomas can learn new things, too, thanks to autumn classes, lectures, and workshops at cultural hubs in Harvard Square and beyond. Here’s where to brush up on ballet, practice poetry, or even design your very own Greek animal-head mug.

Stuck in a recipe rut? Visit the Cambridge Center for Adult Education to cook staples from the American South, the Caribbean, and Africa in a six-week, three-hour Sunday night class. “Oldways: A Taste of African Heritage” focuses on spices and herbs, leafy greens, whole grains, beans, tubers, fruits, and vegetables. Cook, eat, and take home recipes from Roxbury-based chef Samantha Anson. www.ccae.org

Or bring smaller chefs to the Boston Public Market to cook alongside vendors at the family-friendly, hour-long Saturday morning Kids in the Kitchen series, each with a theme that spotlights local products. Make chocolate éclairs using ingredients from Somerville’s Taza Chocolate, or join farmers from Phillipston’s Red Apple Farm to bake apple bread pudding. Classes are geared toward “toques” ages 6-12. www.bostonpublicmarket.org

Speaking of novices: Brush up on ballet at the José Mateo Ballet Theatre, which holds 10-week, 90-minute introductory fall sessions for adults—no experience required. If you’re confident, drop into 90-minute classes designed for dancers who have mastered the basics and want to sharpen their skills. www.ballettheatre.org

Or leave dancing to the professionals and visit the Boston Ballet for Genius at Play, a celebration of choreographer Jerome Robbins, staged at the Boston Opera House. The performance highlights three Robbins works: *Interplay*, set to jazz; *Fancy Free*, a collaboration with composer Leonard Bernstein set in 1940s New York; and *Glass Pieces*, a tribute to urban life scored by Philip Glass. The company joins the audience for a lecture on September 7. www.bostonballet.org

If you long to adopt a pet but worry about maintenance, consider Plan B: form and decorate ceramic vessels in the style of ancient Greek animal-head mugs, guided by Harvard Ceramic Studio’s Kathy King. Tuesday and Saturday workshops dovetail with the Harvard Art Museums’ exhibition “Animal-Shaped Vessels from the Ancient World: Feasting with Gods, Heroes, and Kings.” www.harvardartmuseums.org

For a more laid-back experience, visit the Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum’s Bertucci Education Studio, which hosts drop-in art-making activities every Saturday throughout the fall, inspired by current exhibits. The workshops are family-friendly and free with museum admission. www.gardnermuseum.org

The Museum of Fine Arts launches a collaboration with advocacy group Mass Poetry this season. Notable poets guide guests through writing exercises during free drop-in classes on Wednesday evenings through the fall. www.mfa.org

Or find your voice (literally) at the New School of Music. Their weekly, audition-free group vocal classes focus on classical and folk songs. They’re designed to help beginners learn basics such as breath. www.newschoolofmusic.org

Meanwhile, Cambridge comedy studio ImprovBoston—known for its interactive shows—hosts free, introductory workshops for aspiring comics on Saturday afternoons throughout the fall, led by the theater’s improvisers. No experience is required, but as with any new class, a sense of humor always helps. www.improvboston.com

— Kara Baskin
Day One

Monday, July 2, Lawrence S. Bacow’s first business day as Harvard’s twenty-ninth president, found him literally, but not physically, in office: with Massachusetts Hall under renovation, he worked, as shown above, in Loeb House (the former president’s residence, now the home of the governing boards—of which he was a member, as a fellow of the Corporation, since 2011). As was his wont during his leadership of Tufts, he reached out to one and all in an email. In it, Bacow highlighted his close friendship with his predecessor, Drew Gilpin Faust, and then emphasized a theme he sounded throughout his Tufts tenure—the joint responsibility of all members of a university community to further its common purpose:

“Every one of us who works here plays a role in advancing our academic mission. Collectively, we all help to educate new students and create new knowledge—whether we teach classes or work in a lab, shelve books in the library or maintain our beautiful grounds.”

As is also his custom, he wrote in an approachable voice (“If you see me around campus this summer, please come up and say hello”), signing off informally, “All the best, Larry.” A fuller report appears at harvardmag.com/bacow-welcome-18.

The same themes punctuated the July 23 announcement of his first senior appointment: Claudine Gay, as Faculty of Arts and Sciences dean (see page 23). He wrote that she “inspires trust. She is broadly curious and eager to engage with new ideas and diverse views. She listens intently and speaks incisively. She relates to people with warmth and ease. She is committed to free expression and robust dialogue across lines of difference and to inclusion as a pillar of Harvard’s strength. She radiates a concern for others—and for how what we do here can help improve lives far beyond our walls.”

A profile of President Bacow’s lifetime in higher education begins on page 32.
Litigating Admissions

In the course of a lawsuit initiated in 2014 alleging that Harvard College discriminates against Asian-American applicants, the plaintiff and the University outlined their arguments in court filings on June 15. The filings provide an expansive look into Harvard’s normally shrouded admissions process—and expose sharply contrasting views about the propriety of a private institution’s standards for composing its student body.

The plaintiff, Students for Fair Admissions (SFFA), presented its analysis of more than 90,000 admissions documents that the U.S. District Court in Boston compelled Harvard to share earlier this year, as well as information from depositions of admissions staff members and senior University officers. After statistical analysis, SFFA claimed in its filing that the “subjective” factors Harvard considers in evaluating applicants—personal qualities and an “overall” rating assigned to each student—disadvantage Asian-American applicants.

Harvard assigns applicants scores in five broad categories: academic, athletic, and extracurricular achievement, plus “personal qualities” and an “overall” rating, which is given once the reader of a file “steps back” and considers “all the factors” of an admission file. The personal rating includes assessments of such traits as whether a student has a “positive personality,” is “widely respected,” or has good “human qualities” (“likeability,” “courage,” and “grit”). Asian Americans, by SFFA’s analysis, consistently receive the lowest score of any racial group on the “personal” rating, despite rating higher on average than any other racial group in the academic and extracurricular categories.

SFFA also filed as exhibits a series of studies dating back to 2013 conducted by Harvard’s Office of Institutional Research (OIR) that concluded the College’s practices produce “negative effects” for Asian-American applicants. The reports—which were shared with some of Harvard’s top administrators but otherwise not disclosed to the public or discussed with other members of Harvard’s staff—concluded, based on data from a 10-year period, that

• Asian-Americans would comprise 43 percent of the annual incoming class (more than double their current share) if Harvard relied on an admissions model that considered only academic factors; and
• “Asian high achievers have lower rates
of admission.” (Applicants who scored a “1” or “2” on their academic rating—the highest scores on a 6-point scale—were admitted 12 percent of the time, versus 18 percent of the time for non-Asian applicants.)

A draft of another OIR report found that although “low income students clearly receive a ‘tip’ in the admissions process, our model also shows that the tip for [legacy, athletes, etc.] is larger. On the flip side, we see a negative effect for Asian applicants.” (The rate of admission for legacy applicants for the classes of 2014 to 2019 is 33 percent: five times that for non-legacy students, the filings show.) In its filing, the University maintained the OIR reports were “incomplete, preliminary, and based on limited inputs.”

In its own filings, Harvard was largely dismissive of SFFA’s claims, arguing that the plaintiff had cherry-picked variables from the six years of admissions data Harvard provided to the group during the legal discovery process. David Card, Class of 1995 professor of economics at the University of California, Berkeley, as Harvard’s expert witness, wrote that SFFA’s report “reveals a significant misunderstanding of Harvard’s admissions process by focusing so much of [its] analysis on academic achievement and accounted for other aspects of the ‘multi-dimensional evaluation Harvard employs’ in ‘only a crude and limited way.’” He noted that SFFA’s analysis omitted legacy and recruited-athlete admissions and other metrics Harvard considers (such as the rigor of an applicant’s high school, socioeconomic circumstances, and parental occupation). Card said his own analysis “shows that the purported ‘penalty against Asian Americans’ identified by [SFFA] does not actually exist.”

The SFFA lawsuit, Harvard’s lawyers wrote, is but “the latest salvo by ideological opponents of the consideration of race in university admissions,” drawing attention to the fact that Edward Blum—who chairs SFFA—has organized other challenges to race-conscious admissions, most recently Fisher v. University of Texas at Austin (see harvardmag.com/fishercase-16). In that case, finally decided in 2016, the Supreme Court ruled against the plaintiff, a white woman, who alleged that she was rejected from the school based on her race.

While the ruling itself was narrow in scope, the Court did mandate that college affirmative-action programs must be narrowly tailored to accomplish a specific goal, and universities must prove that race-neutral alternatives to their policies are not feasible. Given the history of litigation over the use of race in admissions, Harvard’s prominent role in defending affirmative action to enroll diverse classes, and the pending change in the composition of the Supreme Court following the retirement of Justice Anthony M. Kennedy, LL.B. ’61 (he was the swing vote in Fisher), Blum’s pursuit of the SFFA litigation is the next high-profile suit in which the state of race-conscious admissions practices might be challenged.

Harvard has argued that a number of race-neutral alternatives proposed by another of SFFA’s experts—Century Foundation senior fellow Richard Kahlenberg ’85, J.D. ’89, who calls for prioritizing economic background in admissions (see “Harvard’s Class Gap,” May-June 2017, page 35)—are either infeasible or would not achieve the institution’s goals, in some cases leading to a significant decline in the population of African-American and Hispanic undergraduates. Among Kahlenberg’s proposals were reducing or eliminating preferences for legacies, children of donors, and relatives of faculty and staff; increasing preferences for socioeconomic diversity in admissions; and eliminating the early-action admissions option.

Julie Reuben, Warren professor of the history of American education, said the case represents a “serious threat” to the future of affirmative action, but cautioned that concerns about the ability of universities to consider race when making admissions decisions should not prevent them from assessing their practices to ensure they are not discriminatory. “[F]rom what I understand about this behavior and how most admissions work, these types of personality measures have been disadvantageous for Asian Americans,” she said. “And that’s an important thing to acknowledge, and that’s an important thing to address.”

Natasha Warikoo, an associate professor of education who has written extensively on diversity in higher education, said she worries that a conversation about discrimination against Asian Americans in admissions is being conflated with a conversation about the benefits of affirmative action. She sees race-conscious admissions as a lever to obtain more diverse classrooms and to address historical legacies of oppression. “There are
very good reasons for why we would want to give underrepresented minorities a leg up in college admissions,” she explained. “In a sort of legal framework, it fosters a diverse learning environment. If people are really going to be educated, they have to have exposure to different perspectives, so you need a quorum of underrepresented minorities on campus.” College admissions, she said, is fundamentally an “unfair” process that reflects the realities of inequality in the country, and race-conscious admissions policies are “one small mechanism” to address racial inequality. “It is very hard,” Warikoo added, “to come up with something race-neutral that addresses race.”

The SFFA case is scheduled to go to trial in October. The University, signifying the importance it assigns to the issues, accompanied its June 15 filings with a website summarizing its side of the case and providing supporting materials: https://projects.iq.harvard.edu/diverse-education. For more complete reports, see harvardmag.com/admissionsdocs-18 and harvardmag.com/sffa-filing-18. — BRANDON J. DIXON

Thinking about Space

In a seminar room on the fifth floor of the Graduate School of Design’s Gund Hall, instructor in architecture Lisa Haber-Thomson is looking over a 3-D rendering of a tall and skinny apartment complex comprised of bright red, off-kilter stacked cubes and extremely steep staircases. “Walk us through it,” Haber-Thomson says to her student. “Do a check with yourself to make sure the circulation isn’t awkward. Imagine entering this room, and how you’d move through that space.”

Haber-Thomson’s class is seated around the big table in the middle of the classroom shared by the College’s two architecture studio courses. Every surface is covered with materials: scraps of museum board and cardstock, partially built models, box-cutters and rulers. The room contains four televisions, a projector screen, cables strung this way and that along the ceiling, numerous rolling whiteboards with orange and green markers only, rolling tables and rolling chairs. Everything here rolls.

The two courses—Haber-Thomson’s “Connections,” and “Transformations,” taught by assistant professor of architecture Megan Panzano—aim to give ar-

Illustration by Mark Steele
Attended lectures and built models out of Bauhaus course, “Basic Design.” Students pious, attempting to replicate his famous of the luminary at its center, Walter Gropius. Pedagogically, it gravitated around the ideas of architectural sciences, born in 1939. Humanistic discourse. How design thinking in turn can seep into inform architectural-design practices, and for testing how liberal-arts education can nurture. Their classroom can be a laboratory to cater to the contemporary field of architecture today. The track’s predecessor was the department of architectural sciences, born in 1939. Pedagogically, it gravitated around the ideas of the luminary at its center, Walter Gropius, attempting to replicate his famous Bauhaus course, “Basic Design.” Students attended lectures and built models out of clay and wire. The department had a reputation for rigorous pre-professionalism, built “essentially for men planning to go to some architectural graduate school,” as The Crimson put it in 1951. In 1968, it merged with the fledgling visual-studies program to form the current department of visual and environmental studies (VES); architecture offerings were eventually discontinued.

Today, the re-born program is wedged between the College and the GSD: institutionally affiliated with the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, but housed at the GSD and taught by GSD faculty (see “Architecture as Liberal Art,” January-February 2015, page 22). “Transformations” and “Connections” are the only practice-based offerings directed at undergraduates, and like most studio courses in VES, are oversubscribed: this spring 38 students applied for 12 spots in “Transformations.”

Sean Henry Henson ’19, who took the course this past spring, tells me the studios are difficult because students simply don’t know at first how to make the materials do what they want: there are lots of late nights cutting chipboard all wrong and fumbling one’s way through unfamiliar software. Material technologies are always changing, and with them, the limitations on what can be represented and what can be built. These courses are ambitious, expecting students to master the techniques of manipulating museum board, Plexiglas, and cardstock, wood, and chipboard, but also software for 3-D modeling and fabrication, including AutoCAD, Rhino, and the Adobe Suite. Nonetheless, undergraduates don’t need any prior skills to apply or enroll, and around half the studios’ students concentrate in other fields.

“Connections” and “Transformations” have opposite trajectories. The former begins with an assignment that asks students to consider the urban landscape from the point of view of a non-human agent, like a bird or a brick. The scope of each project shrinks, from a city to a single lot. For the final project, each student selects a site in Harvard Square to transform. A large plywood model covers four or five tables pushed together in the middle of the room. It’s a bird’s-eye view of the Square, stretching from the Charles River north to the top edge of the Yard. Everyone’s lazily resting their laptops on the outsides. One student proposes an architectural intervention for the present site of one of the final clubs. Haber-Thomsen wants her to get a better sense of the site: “Can you get into the Fly, or whatever this is?” she asks, gesturing at what is actually the Fox Club.

In her critique, Haber-Thomsen emphasizes the importance of the material expression of an idea: the materials used should reflect the flavor of what the project is trying to achieve. Her advice and attention, as she reviews projects, migrate back and forth between the idea’s form and its content. “Maybe there’s a way to start drawing your plans so that the void gets treated differently from everything else,” she says to a student working on a residential building, open to the Cambridge public, with a large atrium-like opening in the middle. She then suggests deliberately configuring the house’s communal spaces so they foster interactions between residents and visitors.
Mending the Medical School
Harvard Medical School (HMS) has sold a 99-year leasehold in eight of the 11 floors of its Harvard Institutes of Medicine building. The decision to sell the interest in 190,000-plus square feet of lab space (News Briefs, March-April, page 23) proved rewarding: Intercontinental Real Estate Corporation paid $272.5 million, apparently a record price per square foot for Longwood properties.

The use of the funds has not been specified; the school runs at a deficit, and has been trimming costs, boosting continuing-education revenues, and so on. In a statement, CFO Michael White said, “The proceeds from this sale will be used as an investment in our educational and research missions as well as to reduce the school’s debt”—suggesting an allocation between augmenting its endowment ($4.1 billion as of mid 2017) and retiring obligations associated with projects such as the New Research Building (completed at a cost of $260 million in 2003; “A Scientific Instrument,” November-December 2003, page 56). Given its needs and hopes for further growth, it would not be surprising to see HMS continue vigorous fundraising—beyond the $773 million raised, as of May 31, during the current capital campaign.

Goldman, Getty, Kluge: A Busy Post-Presidency
As she prepared to depart Mass Hall on June 30, President Drew Faust said she looked forward to a relaxing summer and fall on Cape Cod, some time to consider offers for future engagements, and a reimmersion in historical research. Some of her plans gelled quickly. Effective July 2, she accepted appointment as a director of Goldman Sachs Group Inc. Its chairman and CEO, Lloyd C. Blankfein ’75, J.D. ’78, who steps down in September, no doubt knows the new board member well: he was deeply involved in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences’ capital campaign, particularly in raising funds for financial aid. The announcement occasioned some wry reflections. The student humorists at Satire V, who had gone dormant for the summer, posted twice (a headline read, “I Understand People Are Upset, but If It Helps I Will Be Making A Lot of Money,” and, quoting a mock memo from the former president that plays off undergraduates’ continuing interest in finance, “I’ll see you in a year or two when I’m your boss again”). Others pointed to her extended discussion, in her 2008 baccalaureate address and other occasions, about students’ concerns about the flood of their peers into finance and consulting: “I think you are worried because you want your lives not just to be conventionally successful, but to be meaningful, and you are not sure how those two goals fit together. You are not sure if a generous starting salary at a prestigious brand name organization together with the promise of future wealth will feed your soul.” Faust had set a precedent for a sitting Harvard president when she joined the board of Staples Inc. in 2012 (see harvardmag.com/dgf-staples-12).

On July 10, the J. Paul Getty Trust announced that Faust would join its board of trustees—the parent to the eponymous museum, research institute, conservation institute, and foundation. Fellow trustees include James Cuno, president and CEO, who was the director of the then-Harvard University Art Museums from 1991 to 2003; Frances D. Fergusson, president emerita of Vassar and a past president of Harvard’s Board of Overseers; and Neil L. Rudenstine, vice chair and himself president emeritus of the University.

Separately, the Library of Congress announced on June 12 that Faust would receive the John W. Kluge Prize for Achievement in the Study of Humanity on September 12, in recognition of her scholarship on the American South and the Civil War. Past winners include philosopher Jürgen Habermas, LL.D. ’01; His Excellency Fernando Henrique Cardoso, LL.D. ’16, a sociologist and two-term president of Brazil; Peter Brown, LL.D. ’02, a much-honored historian of late antiquity and early Christendom; and one of Faust’s own mentors, John Hope Franklin, Ph.D. ’41, LL.D. ’81, the pioneering historian of race in America. A $1-million honorarium accompanies the prize.

—John S. Rosenberg
or where in the park you could be seen from outside it. Then they intervened in some way to highlight or deemphasize the chosen element, whether by adding a physical structure or manipulating the elevation or making it more kid-friendly, or, in one case, by setting up boundaries between the zones frequented by human and canine visitors. Panzano then assesses how each student’s intervention choreographs an agent’s movement through the space. How does it encourage that agent to perceive the site differently, making its hidden qualities manifest?

Both courses are organized around frequent critiques. At one of Panzano’s, she describes the students’ projects in a hyper-articulate idiom of architectural rhetoric, dense with inscrutable but delicious phrases like “typological models of space,” “element of twoness,” and “memory of the plane.” You can produce “the perception of a curve through the accretion of sharp lines.” She discusses “open systems that can be reoriented.” For one model she recommends “the introduction of material difference.” “You’ve produced hidden space!” she exclaims at one point, and then explains: if you mismatch an agent’s experience and reality, she says, you acquire the capacity to make space disappear.

As an outsider it’s hard for me to wrestle the words into meaning anything at all, but the rest of the class nods along and chimes in. They no longer need the training wheels of constant definitions. Panzano explains some of the terminology: a “datum” is a horizon-like line that tells you where a horizontal plane meets vertical ones. “Node,” meanwhile, is an example of a term that has “a particular definition in the world at large,” but “takes on a new meaning when applied to space.” A node, in architecture, is a point of change, a moment of difference, a “space of centrality,” an organizer, the place and time of change, a moment of difference, a “space of

“where things come together.” One hears the term “attenuation,” a lot as well; it describes the “change from something that is dense to something that is less dense.” “We use a lot of terms to describe change and transition,” Panzano says.

Henson tells me that at first terms like “interdigitization” were incomprehensible, but he and his classmates learned to understand quickly. They also learned how to speak. Certain terms are taboo: they prefer, for example, not to use “building” to describe student projects. It’s too restrictive, implying human scale and habitability. Panzano prefers “intervention” or “assembly,” terms that defamiliarize our relationship to the urban landscape and start to dismantle clichés about architecture.

A “Transformations” model made from opaque board, exploring the concept of “intensities” through repeated, intersecting patterns

“over these past few years, I have felt increasingly that something is terribly wrong—and this year even so much more than last,” said professor of biology George Wald, who shared the 1967 Nobel Prize in physiology or medicine. “But I think I know what’s the matter. I think that this whole generation of students is beset with a profound uneasiness, and I don’t think that they have yet quite defined its source.”

His speech, at an antiauthor teach-in at MIT in March 1969, captured the spirit of a troubled time—an era that culminated in unprecedented upheaval on campus, and is now being recalled in the second of two fiftieth-anniversary exhibitions at Harvard University Archives.

The sources of that uneasiness, of course, were numerous, in a nation and on campuses polarized by the Vietnam War, political violence, riots that decimated American cities, and the radicalizing, televised confrontations between protesters and the Chicago police and National Guardsmen on the streets during the Democratic National Convention in late August 1968. A fiftieth-reunion exhibition at the archives last spring brought back to life the experiences of the class of 1968. As seniors, they voted to host Martin Luther King Jr. as their class day speaker; after his assassination, his widow, Coretta Scott King, agreed to speak in his place—and arrived on campus a few days after the assassination of Robert F. Kennedy ’48. That spring, black students had demanded changes in admissions, the curriculum, and faculty hiring; and hundreds of students indicated that they would not serve if called to military duty. But the campus itself had not yet been torn asunder, as Columbia’s was that spring.

“We got really interested in doing this exhibition when we started doing one on 1968, and we realized that with the events of 1968, the world starts to change, and it continues to change into 1969,” said University archivist Megan Sniffin-Marinoff (Harvard Portrait, January-February, page 16). Equipped with this new vocabulary, the students can pick up on and articulate elements of each other’s projects that an outsider would never notice. In some ways the studios are really language courses: they initiate students into the design community’s lexicon, and they teach them to translate paper into Plexiglas, code into cardboard, thought into matter.

These courses are not about learning to fill up cities with livable or workable infrastructure: rather, they are rigorous training in how to think about space by handling materials, how to think through making. No other courses at Harvard transform your experience of space like these studios, a student tells me. Henson, too, feels he came out of “Transformations” with a new sensitivity to elements of the built environment around him, acutely aware of how designers manipulate the way he moves through the world.

A Time of Trauma

Students at the Graduate School of Design created the lion’s share of posters used by student activists in 1969.
**Athletic Pay Equity**

Following a year-long review of its culture, and in compliance with the new Massachusetts Act to Establish Pay Equity, Harvard Athletics in June announced that it has recalibrated compensation for members of the coaching staff, resulting in increases for both women and men. The changes, to be effected in two stages, are meant to better reflect coaches’ level of responsibility, the size and complexity of their respective programs, and their experience on the job. A detailed report appears at harvardmag.com/coach-pay-18.

**Biomedical Momentum**

Harvard Medical School and the Harvard Program in Therapeutic Science have opened a laboratory for precision medicine. The expanded space houses two new ventures: a Harvard-MIT center for regulatory science, embracing quantitative approaches to drug discovery and evaluation; and the National Cancer Institute center for cancer systems pharmacology. Separately, the new Quantitative Biology Initiative has received $60 million (half each from the National Science Foundation and the Simons Foundation) to support research during the next five years in mathematical and statistical analyses of biological problems. Comparable centers were established at the Georgia Institute of Technology, Northwestern, and the University of California, Irvine. And the Howard Hughes Medical Institute has appointed 19 new investigators; each receives $8 million of support during the next seven years (renewable pending scientific review). Among them are Thomas G. Bernhardt, professor of microbiology and immunobiology; Benjamin L. Ebert, David-Pinedo professor of medicine; Stephen Liberles, professor of cell biology; and Beth Stevens, associate professor of neurology.

**ARTS AND SCIENCES LEADER:** Claudine Gay became dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences (FAS) on August 15, succeeding Michael D. Smith, who had completed 11 years of service. Gay, Cowett professor of government and of African and African American studies, and dean of social science since 2015, assumed her new duties having already been responsible for appointments in and the budget of the largest cohort within FAS (252 professors of 710-plus)—valuable experience among the faculty’s bench of senior leaders. The child of Haitian immigrants, Gay earned her undergraduate degree from Stanford in 1992 (economics), and her Harvard Ph.D. in 1998. After serving on the Cardinal faculty, she returned to Cambridge in 2006. Alongside her social-science brief, she has led the new Inequality in American Initiative. Read about her background, scholarship, and initial aims as FAS dean at harvardmag.com/gay-18.

**MOOC Business Model**

When Harvard and MIT launched edX in May 2012, it had a nonprofit mission to help its parent institutions, and other schools (as they joined) develop and deploy massive open online courses (MOOCs); and a public mission: making its open-source software platform freely available to any interested user. In combination, the members and the 800-plus open-source users have reached online users now numbering in the tens of millions. But maintaining, updating, and offering that platform is not free, and member institutions may be tiring of carrying all the freight. Beyond the capital contributions they make to edX and any fees they pay, it apparently needs more resources to be self-sustaining, and so it announced in May that it is experimenting with a “modest support fee” (Inside Higher Ed reports $9 and up per course). Members can decide whether to impose it or not—so far, HarvardX is declining to collect the fee—but the days of the completely free online edX course may be numbered.

**On Other Campuses**

Preparing for a capital campaign, Yale unveiled a strategy for investment in sciences focusing on integrative data science and mathematical modeling; quantum science and materials; neuroscience; inflammation; and environmental and evolutionary sciences. Those research priorities (and possibly five others) would be supported by funding for graduate students, diversity, centralized instruments, and reorganized and expanded facilities. Separately, Yale attracted Larry Gladney, a physicist and astronomer, from Penn to serve as the new dean for diversity and faculty development within its Faculty of Arts and Sciences; he will also become a professor of physics in New Haven. The UChicago Empower Initiative, announced in June, aims to enroll a more diverse student body (Chicago
lags in enrolling lower-income students). It expands financial aid and campus support for first-generation, rural, and under-represented applicants, and also emphasizes recruiting among veterans and children of police officers and firefighters. One headline decision: it becomes the first elite research university to make the SAT and ACT optional.

Nota Bene
Chief curator, Harvard Art Museums has appointed Soyoung Lee as chief curator, effective in September, filling a vacancy. An expert in Korean art, she has been a curator at the Metropolitan Museum of Art. In her new role (detailed at harvardmag.com/curator-lee-18), Lee will oversee the three curatorial divisions, exhibitions, and collection development.

Doctoring healthcare. Thier professor of surgery Atul A. Gawande has been appointed chief executive of a company formed by Amazon, Berkshire Hathaway, and JP Morgan Chase to find better, more cost-effective ways to deliver healthcare to their million-plus employees. Gawande is also professor of health policy and management, a surgeon at Brigham and Women’s Hospital, and medical writer for The New Yorker (see “The Unlikely Writer,” September-October 2009, page 30), where he has frequently reported on the maladies afflicting the provision of medical services.

After the laurels. The family of the late Thomas C. Schelling, who shared the 2005 Nobel Prize in economic sciences and was Littauer professor of political economy (he mentored graduate student Lawrence S. Bacow), has sold his Nobel medal to benefit the Southern Poverty Law Center, fulfilling his request.

Miscellany. Jake Kaufmann ‘93 has been appointed Griffin director of financial aid, the senior undergraduate aid post; he succeeds Sally Donohue, who retired. Kaufmann had been associate director and senior admissions officer since 2005...Setti Warren, former mayoral mayor of Newton, Massachusetts, and for a brief while a Democratic gubernatorial aspirant, has become executive director of the Shorenstein Center on Media, Politics, and Public Policy...Moncher professor of physics and of astronomy Christopher Stubbs will serve as interim dean of science in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, succeeding Mallinckrodt professor of geophysics Jeremy Bloxham, whose service spanned 12 years...Erin Driver-Linn, who became associate provost for institutional research in 2008 and director of the Harvard Initiative for Learning and Teaching in 2012, has been appointed dean for education at the public-health school....Donald Hall ’51, J.F. ’57—a U.S. poet laureate, National Humanities Medalist, and winner of the National Book Critics Circle Award—died June 23; he was for many years poetry editor of this magazine. See “Off the Shelf,” page 66, for a description of his last book.

RAJ CHERITY RETURNS: Raj Chetty, whose analyses of poverty, economic opportunity, and mobility have attracted wide notice, is returning to Harvard three years after he decamped for Stanford—one of several prominent colleagues then swapping their Crimson for the Cardinal, alarming administrators and the department alike (see “Economists’ Exodus,” November-December 2015, page 26). His return seems to have been associated with an all-out recruiting effort. He becomes the inaugural William A. Ackman professor of economics (named for the hedge-fund manager, class of ’88, M.B.A. ’92). The news rated homepage Harvard Gazette coverage (extraordinary for an individual appointment), with statements from presidents Drew Faust and Lawrence S. Bacow. And David Laibson, then chair, cited them, the provost, and the deans of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences and of social sciences for their help in revitalizing the department. Read more at harvardmag.com/cheritty-18.
Harvey Hacker ’63, M.Arch. ’69, designed an image that became emblematic of the era: a red, clenched fist.

made in the symbols they chose to use in the posters. Some of it may be unique to Harvard, some it may be reflecting what they’re seeing in political organizations outside of Harvard, or around the world, not just in the United States.

Sports, too, will feature in the exhibit, which will recreate the energy from the 1968 Harvard-Yale game, when the teams concluded a nail-biting contest with a 29-29 score. Also highlighted is a lesser known episode in Harvard’s athletic history: the 1968 crew team’s participation in the Summer Olympics. “One of the things we’ll point out in the exhibit is that people often forget that intercollegiate activity was part of the Olympics,” she said. “We’re trying to show how much things have changed, the effect that strife in the world had on the Olympics, and how that bears on the crew team.”

Archieves retains portions of the correspondence between Harvard administrators and members of the U.S. Olympic Committee that detail arguments the parties had about the crew team’s decision to publicly decry racial discrimination in the games.

The archives will also incorporate multimedia into the exhibit, presenting short oral histories that pair alumni who discuss the era—from attempts to complete a merger with Radcliffe, to the daily ways the Vietnam War affected the campus climate. The videos are the product of a collaboration with StoryCorps, a company whose oral histories are archived in the Library of Congress.

“The upheaval had shaken Harvard to its roots, and had set it going in new and different directions,” this magazine wrote of the events of 1968. The exhibit opens in Pusey Library in November.

Brandon J. Dixon

THE UNDERGRADUATE

Take Care of Each Other

by Tawanda Mulalu ’20

My child, you’ve grown, you look so much like your father, do you remember me? I have heard this sentence in so many ways. I have heard it in my childhood with each visit during the school holidays to my home village, a half-morning drive from the capital city in which my sister and I were born. Upon arriving, my aunts and my uncles and my grandparents would look into my face. They would hold my hands and speak to me. My mouth would try their names, fail, and smile back in silence. They still ask if I remember them when I return home to Botswana after the end of a semester, with their faces, roughening like sharp, black sandpaper, staring into mine after so long and so far. I can still hear them when the Cambridge winter is cold and clear enough to make my memories vivid.

At Harvard, many of my undergraduate African friends say similar things about home. We talk about the laughter of our endless cousins, who, when we visited them, suddenly became our brothers and sisters, evidenced by the packed stacking of us onto the few beds in our houses. When we woke up, the sun would shine heavy on our backs as we played games with balls made from plastic shopping bags because our football was deflated by a thorn-tree. And then we’d be tossed into the back of pick-up trucks and jostled through a dusty road to our other home village, this time maybe our mother’s instead of our father’s, to look into the faces of more aunts, uncles, and grandparents. It would sometimes be years.
This fall semester, seniors Isa Flores-Jones and Catherine “Cat” Zhang join this magazine’s editorial staff as the 2018-2019 Berta Greenwald Ledecky Undergraduate Fellows. They will contribute in print and online throughout the academic year, taking turns writing the “Undergraduate” column, beginning with the November-December issue, and reporting on other aspects of student and University life, among other responsibilities.

Flores-Jones, of Sacramento, balances history and literature coursework with cooking and cleaning responsibilities for the College’s Dudley Co-op, on Sacramento Street in Cambridge. She writes short fiction and longer nonfiction for the features board of The Harvard Advocate and the Harvard Arts Blog, is an organizer for Harvard’s Divestment campaign, and has served on the Undergraduate Council. After a spring semester at the University Complutense in Madrid, studying gender politics, sheep, and the Spanish language, she spent the summer on a Weissman Fellowship in Mexico City, working at a nonprofit engaged in bettering environmental and human rights via corporate accountability. Sometimes, she sings.

Zhang, of Plano, Texas, and Adams House, is a social studies concentrator who spent her junior spring in London, where she studied European social and political thought, volunteered at a women’s radio station, and assistant-directed a short film. She is editor-in-chief of Harvard’s satirical news publication, Satire V, and the former head writer of the sketch comedy group On Harvard Time; she also contributes to the Harvard Political Review. This past summer she interned at NPR Music—occupying the desk next to Bob Boilen’s famous Tiny Desk—and conducted research for a senior thesis on cultural Marxism and hip-hop.

The fellowships are supported by Jonathan J. Ledecky ’79, M.B.A. ’83, and named in honor of his mother. For updates on past Ledecky Fellows and links to their work, see http://harvard-magazine.com/donate/special-gifts/ledecky.

At parties, white Americans ask me where I’m from and when I tell them, they say, Oh! that’s so cool my family and I went to Africa two years ago to see the... and I wonder, Which country? I am bored of living in reaction to how others look at me, but I’ve been here for two years and I can certainly feign amusement for two more. So, I laugh and tell them that my home country has a smaller population than New York City and our main exports are diamonds and cattle and we’re about the same land size as Texas or France and that our people are fairly homogeneous and tend to be much nicer there than here.

I imagine what my friends might say. Angela might speak of Rwanda’s astounding economic recovery from the 1994 genocide and she mightrespond with some defensiveness if asked about her president who finessed his way into a third term in power. It will be noticed that she is incredibly funny and resilient and is likely to become the kind of person who ends up running the world in some capacity. Mfundo would probably joke about the differences in social-justice politics between African Americans and black South Africans. Some will walk home from these parties thinking that he is the most charismatic person they’ve ever met and will long remember his intimate knowledge of black power. Tom will announce that he’s the prince of Wakanda and a few people will

New Fellows

At Harvard African Students Association’s Africa Night (from left): Tom Osborn ’20 of Kenya; Joshua Benjamin ’21, of Phoenix, Arizona (whose ancestors are Angolan but were first brought to Charleston, South Carolina, in the late seventeenth century); Tawanda Mulalu ’20 of Botswana; and Mfundo Radebe ’20 of South Africa

Photograph by Christabel Narh

Isa Flores-Jones
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**NEW LISTING**

**CAMBRIDGE**

**44 COTTAGE STREET**

PRICE UPON REQUEST

5 Bedrooms | 4.5 Baths | 3,706 sq.ft.

An exquisitely renovated historic home on large shady lot. Off-street parking plus bonus 1-bedroom rental apartment.

44CottageStreet.com
Susan Condrick | 617.842.4600
Susan.Condrick@SothebysRealty.com

**SEAPORT**

**50 LIBERTY DRIVE UNIT PH1G**

$1,595,000

1 Bedroom | 1.5 Baths | 1,016 sq.ft.

PH1G at 50 Liberty is a perfectly laid out 1-bedroom on the penthouse level with a private balcony & 1 garage parking spot.

Julie Harrison | 617.413.6332
Julie.Harrison@SothebysRealty.com

**NEW LISTING**

**CAMBRIDGE**

**9 CHAUNCY STREET #32**

$769,000

2 Bedrooms | 1 Bath | 995 sq.ft.

995sf unit in professionally managed building. Wood floors, working fireplace, private balcony and off-street parking.

9ChauncyStreet.com
Susan Condrick | 617.842.4600
Susan.Condrick@SothebysRealty.com

**NEW LISTING**

**WESTON**

**22 CHURCH STREET**

$4,150,000

7 Bedrooms | 4.5 Baths | 6,448 sq.ft.

This grand Georgian-style home sits on nearly 7 acres of private land & defines luxurious living all the while maintaining its historical charm.

Julie Harrison | 617.413.6332
Julie.Harrison@SothebysRealty.com

**SOLD**

**CAMBRIDGE**

**69 HARVEY STREET #3**

$679,000

2 Bedrooms | 2 Baths | 2,308 sq.ft.

Schoolhouse Loft with massive windows, great light, an open layout and 11’ ceilings. A very unique home in Cambridge.

Dino Confalone | 617.803.5007
Dino.Confalone@SothebysRealty.com

**NEW LISTING**

**BROOKLINE**

**55 LEICESTER STREET**

$9,995,000

7 Bedrooms | 8.5 Baths | 9,294 sq.ft.

The definition of luxurious living in a premier, private Brookline location with a desirable open floor plan.

55LeicesterStreet.com
Julie Harrison | 617.413.6332
Arianna Brown | 617.549.4207

**SOLD**

**CAMBRIDGE**

**9 CHAUNCY STREET #32**

$769,000

2 Bedrooms | 1 Bath | 995 sq.ft.

995sf unit in professionally managed building. Wood floors, working fireplace, private balcony and off-street parking.

9ChauncyStreet.com
Susan Condrick | 617.842.4600
Susan.Condrick@SothebysRealty.com

**NEW LISTING**

**BROOKLINE**

**55 LEICESTER STREET**

$9,995,000

7 Bedrooms | 8.5 Baths | 9,294 sq.ft.

The definition of luxurious living in a premier, private Brookline location with a desirable open floor plan.

55LeicesterStreet.com
Julie Harrison | 617.413.6332
Arianna Brown | 617.549.4207

**NEW LISTING**

**WILLIAMSPORT**

**50 LIBERTY DRIVE UNIT PH1G**

$1,595,000

1 Bedroom | 1.5 Baths | 1,016 sq.ft.

PH1G at 50 Liberty is a perfectly laid out 1-bedroom on the penthouse level with a private balcony & 1 garage parking spot.

Julie Harrison | 617.413.6332
Julie.Harrison@SothebysRealty.com

**NEW LISTING**

**BELMONT**

**308 BRIGHTON STREET**

$1,485,000

5 Bedrooms | 3.5 Baths | 4,325 sq.ft.

Gracious and well-appointed Colonial-style home built in 2000. Offers over 4,300 sf of living space on three levels.

308BrightonSt.com
Susan Condrick | 617.842.4600
Susan.Condrick@SothebysRealty.com

**SOLD**

**CAMBRIDGE**

**69 HARVEY STREET #3**

$679,000

2 Bedrooms | 2 Baths | 2,308 sq.ft.

Schoolhouse Loft with massive windows, great light, an open layout and 11’ ceilings. A very unique home in Cambridge.

Dino Confalone | 617.803.5007
Dino.Confalone@SothebysRealty.com

**NEW LISTING**

**SOUTH END, BOSTON**

**508 COLUMBUS AVE #3**

$950,000

2 Bedrooms | 1 Bath | 978 sq.ft.

Spacious, classic floor-through with great light & views.

Cathy Marotta | 617.947.1069
Cathy-Marotta.com

**BEACON HILL**

**145 PINCKNEY STREET #102**

$659,000

1 Bedroom | 1 Bath | 610 sq.ft.

Lovely updated one bedroom at the coveted River House, ideally located on the 1st floor of Beacon Hill.

Julie Harrison | 617.413.6332
Arianna Brown | 617.549.4207

277 Dartmouth Street, Boston | 617.375.6900 | GibsonSothebysRealty.com | Each office is independently owned and operated.
For me, the difficult thing about coming to Harvard is that I was raised to be a Motswana man. My culture tells me that the greatest thing you can ever do is to take care of your family. But here, there is the deep, dark thing that happens when you grab a bunch of young, ambitious and nervous people and stuff them into a place like this. People end up not really caring about one another. The fact that it is so cliché to say this implies the embarrassing plainness of its truth: we'll pick a work deadline over a friend; we'll find soft, smart ways of screwing people out of the leadership position that might get us a high-profile job after graduation; we'll pick who we think is worth talking to based on what they do and the people they hang around with. This is the simple story of Harvard. The larger story includes the innumerable things I am happy and grateful for, but the simple story remains at its center.

The simple story of being African is that we were taught to take care of each other. On the night of this year’s Yardfest, one of us had a violent interaction with the police and ended up in the hospital. We heard about it the next morning, hazy, hungover, and hurt. It would not have been so violent if the student had not been black. It would not have been so legally fearful if the student had not been African. The black and African undergraduates were disappointed, but not surprised. This is America—even if filtered through Harvard.

A night later, a group of African sophomores surprise my friend from South Africa with a birthday wine-and-chill in his room, but the night doubles up as a way of trying to make sense of it all, together.

The night is good. It reminds me of home. It reminds me of my family. It reminds me of the need to take care of each other. There is so much noise here at this small birthday party, and it is not the inexplicable Nigerian music, which, for reasons beyond my understanding, will always be played at our large gatherings. The noise is our laughter, so thick and gorgeous that we worry that the proctor of the DeWolfe dorms will come knock on the door to complain. How are we so happy? These voices will stay with us. Years from now, after earning our degrees, we will somehow find each other again, and we will hold each other’s hands and look into each other’s faces and ask if we remember us. And then we will laugh like we are laughing now. This loud, terrible laughter that carries across oceans, whispering, Take care of each other.

Berta Greenwald Ledecky Undergraduate Fellow
Tawanda Mulalu ’20 has grown—and looks like his father.

SPORTS

Happy Returns

Justice Shelton-Mosley needs only the tiniest space to go the distance.

by DICK FRIEDMAN

As the punt hurtles through the sky, freshman Justice Shelton-Mosley ’19 stands at the Harvard 14-yard-line, 40 yards downfield from the line of scrimmage. In many ways, his return began long before the ball was snapped: he has assiduously watched film of Columbia’s punter and read the scouting reports on him. “I look at all punts from previous games and see at what kind of angle they come off the kicker’s foot,” he says. “This punter, particularly, averaged 43 or 44 yards. And he mostly kicked it toward the left hash mark. In this
case he kicked it a little more toward the middle.”

Even as he tracks the ball, Shelton-Mosley takes a glance at the Lions’ gunners—the two opponents, one on either side of the scrimmage line, who are assigned to run full tilt down the field in hopes of arriving at Shelton-Mosley when (or even before) the ball does. “If they get a free release I know I have a lot less time,” he says. “But if our guys hold them up even a little, I know I have a shot.”

**Enter**ing his senior season, Shelton-Mosley, of Leverett House and Sacramento, looks to cement his status as Harvard’s most accomplished return man ever. His career punt-return average of 15.8 yards is more than four yards higher than that of the player in second place, Andrew Fischer ’16. Shelton-Mosley holds the school record for single-season return average: 19.0 yards, set in 2015, during his dazzling freshman season, and nearly matched last year, when his punt returns averaged 18.8 yards. He also has three punt returns for touchdowns, the most in Crimson history, and the longest such scoring play, 91 yards, which came last season in a 41-2 win over Georgetown. Two weeks later he had an 85-yarder in a 38-10 victory over Lafayette. These happy returns have come despite opposing coaches directing their punters to keep the ball out of his hands by kicking it far, far away from him, or putting so much hang time on their boots that he is forced to call for a fair catch. For his efforts in 2017, Shelton-Mosley was named to the All-Ivy first team and the STATS FCS (Football Championship Subdivision) All-America first team as a punt returner.

Harvard coach Tim Murphy has profound appreciation for the way number 17 can flip the field, putting the Crimson offense in a much improved starting place. Murphy has had many crackerjack returners in Cambridge, among them the intrepid Fischer, Colby Skelton ’98, and Brian Edwards ’05. “Justice is as good a returner as we’ve had in my 25 years,” says Murphy (“Murphy Time,” November-December 2015, page 35). “He has outstanding physical skills. And he’s now a bigger, faster, stronger version of his freshman self.” (The 5-foot-10 Shelton-Mosley is now listed at 195 pounds.) “But he also has an incredible sixth sense of where to run the football.”

Shelton-Mosley agrees that his vision is the key. “Once the ball is in my hands, it’s really just what I see, and then I go from there,” he says. “To a large degree, his skill is unteachable. But his high-school coach, Phil Grams, quantified it. Now the offensive coordinator at Lawrence University, Grams saw Shelton-Mosley score 88 touchdowns at Sacramento’s Capital Christian School and be heavily recruited by Football Bowl Subdivision schools such as Northwestern, Cal, and Duke. “I always told him, ‘If you can find that one inch...”

Arguably the Ivy League’s most dangerous offensive weapon, the Crimson’s return man and wideout Justice Shelton-Mosley ’19 is a threat to score every time he touches the ball.
of daylight, you’re gonna come out of it with nobody left to tackle you,” says Grams.

As a Crimson freshman, Shelton-Mosley averaged an eye-popping 33.3 yards on kickoff returns. The following season, hoping to cut down on injuries, the Ivy League moved kickoffs from the 35-yard line to the 40. The notion was to promote more kicks reaching the end zone, resulting in touchdowns, on which no tackles occur and the whistle is blown before there are many collisions. It seems to be working. In 2015, 12.4 percent of kickoffs resulted in touchdowns. In 2016, the number jumped to 44.1 percent, and last year it was 36.1. More significantly, according to the Ivy League office, in years before 2015, conference games averaged six to seven concussions a season. In 2016 there were none during Ivy games, and last year there were two.

When he first heard of the Ivy rules, “I was kind of disappointed,” Shelton-Mosley admits. “On the other hand, it’s a safer game, and that has a ripple effect on other conferences.” (This year the NCAA as a whole has introduced an experimental rule under which a kickoff returner who is inside his 25-yard line can call for a fair catch, after which the ball will be brought to the 25 for the offense to start play.)

Shelton-Mosley is also the Crimson’s most dangerous wide receiver. But as Harvard’s offense has dropped off in the past two seasons, opposing defenses have been able to key on him, causing his production to drop from 48 catches and a 6.0-yard average in 2016 to 36 last year, with a mere 3.6 yards per catch. Says Murphy: “I made an edict to our staff that we have to get him more touches in a game in [2018]. His ability to make plays, to make something out of nothing, is sort of unrivaled in the Ivy League right now and we have to capitalize on that more.”

On this Columbia punt, Harvard’s play is labeled a “boundary return”—designed for Shelton-Mosley to get near the sideline and pick up blockers before turning upfield. He catches the ball, and with a quick cut leaves a would-be tackler in the dust and reaches the area next to the sideline. Then he begins to accelerate upfield. “Run like hell,” he tells himself. “Run away from the defenders and don’t go sideways.”

As Anthony Mosley recalls it, the first time his son returned a punt in organized football was when he was six years old. “He took it to the house” (the football expression for running all the way to the end zone). “I think it was about 45, 50 yards.”


Anthony was a star running back at Fresno State, then went on to have a brief NFL career with the Chicago Bears. Now an athletic trainer, he brings an expert’s eye to his son’s abilities. “He is quicker than he is fast,” says Anthony. “He’s done some amazing things as far as his lateral movement and as far as his ability to plant and pivot off the same foot. I trained with [ Bears Head of Fam- er] Walter Payton and I actually taught Justice one of [Payton’s] moves. In his next game he did it and I couldn’t believe it. He did it without losing any speed. And I’ve seen him do that several times in his college career.”

Anthony is not the only family member to help Justice hone his skills. “When I was seven or eight years old there was a big field in the middle of the apartment complex where we lived,” he says. “My mom [Carla] and stepdad [Donnie Rogers] would take me out to the field and practice punt returns. They’d throw the ball up in the air and they’d run on me and I’d have to juke ‘em. We did that my whole childhood.”

“Now every time I go back to Sacramento, my dad and I go to a field. And sometimes I don’t even have a ball. We’ll take a water bottle, he’ll throw it up in the air. I have to go catch it, make four or five moves, and take off for 60 yards.”

Gathering speed along the sideline, Shelton-Mosley runs into a logjam of humanity—friend and foe. “I just didn’t want to go out of bounds,” he says. “There was a guy actually trying to tackle me from out of bounds. I’m not sure how I escaped that. I did see a hole and I was going to do all I could to get to that opening and then burst out of it. I kind of saw the hole before I got going but I knew that if I kept pushing up, some of the Columbia guys would over-pursue and there would be an even better opening.” The next thing anyone sees is a solitary figure ahead of the pack, running toward the end zone. It is Justice Shelton-Mosley.

There is some disagreement about which of Shelton-Mosley’s returns is his most
amazing. Most think it was that 86-yarder at Columbia when he was a freshman. “How’d he do that?” yelled gobsmacked Lions play-by-play man Jerry Recco when Shelton-Mosley emerged on his way to the end zone.

Shelton-Mosley, however, points to a non-scoring play that to him was even more satisfying. It came in the third quarter of last season’s 25-22 win over Dartmouth, and went for 42 yards. “I shocked myself, honestly,” says Shelton-Mosley, who usually downplays his feats in the retelling, “The play wasn’t even set up to be a return. It was actually supposed to be a punt block. But they kicked it about 40 to 50 yards and there’s a [Dartmouth gunner] breathing down my throat. And I was able to make a move and juke him. And there was another guy right after, and I happened to juke him as well. By no means was I supposed to return that ball. That’s a fair catch every single time.”

“His ability to make plays, to make something out of nothing, is sort of unrivaled in the Ivy League.”

How much longer Shelton-Mosley will be able to do what he loves will depend to some degree on this season. He harbors NFL ambitions, but he is realistic. “There haven’t been many skill guys in the league who have gone to Harvard,” he says. Nevertheless, he is thrilled with his choice. “I was told that Harvard could give me the opportunity to embark on a new world,” he says, and it has. An economics concentrator, he has enjoyed his summer internships in investment banking. Mergers and acquisitions, he says, “is where I could see myself long term.”

That is, when he’s not indulging his other passion: bass fishing, a hobby since childhood. “As I was walking to practice one day along the Charles, I saw a guy fishing,” Shelton-Mosley says. “He pulled up a bass and I was shook. I asked one of my coaches, ‘Hey, can I use one of your rods?’ I’ve been fishing there ever since.”

One way or another, Justice Shelton-Mosley will keep on catching.
The Pragmatist

Lawrence S. Bacow, a seasoned educator, is schooled in making decisions.

by JOHN S. ROSENBERG
A

At Tufts University, Lawrence S. Bacow famously invited members of the community to join him on early-morning runs: a chance to get a word with the president while training for the Boston Marathon. And so this past April 16—a very wet and miserable Marathon Monday morning—enterprising Crimson reporter Luke W. Xu ’20 found himself splashing along Memorial Drive with Harvard’s president-elect. Between breaths, an insatiable Bacow metaphor emerged (“A presidency is marathon, not a sprint”), but also this: “You don’t have to solve every problem in the university on day one, or even in the first year. You need to understand the culture, understand the organization, understand the students, the faculty, the staff, the alumni. Figure out what needs to be done, and then do it.”

In the context, that last bit might seem a riff on Nike’s slogan. But Bacow’s seemingly simple formula assumes broad significance given his lifelong immersion in higher education: from MIT undergraduate (’72, economics) to three Harvard degrees (M.P.P. ’76, J.D. ’78, Ph.D. ’78); 24 years on MIT’s faculty and leadership positions there; the Tufts presidency, and (punctually, it turned out), beginning in 2011, higher-education advising and consulting, and Harvard Corporation service. A scholar of decision- and policymaking in complex settings, Bacow combines deep understanding of how diverse interests are expressed and aligned and more than two decades of experience in applying those insights to set agendas, mobilize support, and effect decisions in the unwieldy, multicentric, hothouse setting of elite universities.

In other words, as he explained in a recent conversation, he brought to his new role as Harvard’s twenty-ninth president, on July 1, a clearly expressed, readily understood theory of action. As abstract as that might seem, the man himself speaks in a comfortably conversational style. Although he uses engineering and social-scientific terms fluidly, and resorts to sports metaphors (from running and sailing, a lifelong passion), his voice is distinctively personal, drawing examples from boyhood experiences; formative teachers and mentors; and deep and apparent religious faith. The effect is clarity about leaderly matters ranging from articulating strategy to defending free speech within the academy.

At work, Bacow is a practiced pragmatist, seasoned and steeped in the values that underlie universities as communities and attuned to their cultures, quirks and all. Most visibly at Tufts, he acted to advance the institutional purpose—attained through “great students, great faculty, and great staff”—for the benefit of individuals and society. Now, at Harvard, which like the rest of higher education faces large internal questions, and perhaps larger ones in a frosty external environment, he seems urgently ready to “Figure out what needs to be done, and then do it.”

From Pontiac to the Red Line

By his own, self-deprecating, account, Larry Bacow grew up in Pontiac, Michigan, as a “nerd”—a ham-radio operator, enthralled by building his gear from Heathkits, entering science fairs, and reading Popular Science, Scientific American, and obscure amateur-radio magazines. As he did on February 11 after being named Harvard’s president, he has spoken about the fundamental fact of being the son of refugees: his father from pogroms in eastern Europe, his mother a survivor of Auschwitz. During his Tufts inaugural address, he named them both: Mitchell Bacow, “who taught me the importance of honesty, integrity, and always speaking one’s mind. Dad, I hope the latter will not get me into too much trouble in my new job. My late mother, Ruth, who recognized that I was born to be a teacher long before I ever did.”

He was certainly born to be a student and a learner. Among others he welcomed to the Tufts inauguration were “Mrs. Chandler” (Shirley Chandler Bitterman), from fourth grade at Webster Elementary School in Pontiac, who “taught me, very gently, how important it was to listen...because other people had really interesting things to say.” He also welcomed Robert Solow, his undergraduate mentor—the first of four Nobel laureates-to-be among his teachers—and dissertation advisers Mark Moore and Richard Zeckhauser, both still professors at the Harvard Kennedy School. Forty years later. (Another mentor, mentioned in a different context, was high-school librarian Pearl Jacobstein, who cleverly guided the young nerd on a broadening course from a biography of Isaac Newton to history and on to literature.)

The best account of the path from Michigan to a higher-education career along the MBTA’s Red Line comes from Bacow’s dedication, in his 1978 public-policy dissertation, to his parents, “Who encouraged my curiosity years ago by answering all those questions that began with ‘Why?’ and then demonstrated extraordinary patience as I tested the sufficiency of their answers with the inevitable follow-up question, ‘But suppose...?’” That foreshadows one of his favorite sayings about his chosen life in the academy: “Faculty members are people who think otherwise.”

As he related in a 2008 MIT sesquicentennial oral-history interview with Karen Arenson, M.P.P. ’72 (who had covered higher education for The New York Times), Bacow headed off to the institute intending to major in math before proceeding to law, his father’s profession. (Arriving amid a campus protest—it was 1969—his father said, “If you get arrested, don’t call home.”)

Instead, he found an absorbing home in economics: “I realized there was a difference between being good at math and being a mathematician. I was good at math.” Graduating in three years, he disappointed Solow’s hope that he would stay for a Ph.D. in economics; Solow then called Thomas Schelling (another of the future Nobelists) at the Kennedy School, and Bacow went upriver for masters’s and doctoral degrees in public policy, a law degree, and a life partnership with Adele Fleet, a Floridian and Wellesley graduate; they were fixed up on a date in 1973 and married in 1975. (She then continued her higher education, enrolling in MIT for a degree in city planning.)

After the intensity of MIT, Bacow described the learning culture in his new environs with some bemusement. In that 2008 interview, he said: “I had an interesting experience as a first-year graduate student at Harvard. I sat through a class, and I remember leaving...and my classmates were just in a tizzy. One of them said, ‘I didn’t understand half of what was going on in there.’ I said, ‘Well, that’s pretty good. You understood half. I just spent three years in college, in which my goal was to stay no more than three blackboards behind the professor.’

“I didn’t expect to understand things at the end of a class. You took your notes and...your book and...your problem sets, and you went back to your room and you sat there with your classmates. And that’s when you really learned the course.”

Withal, much as he adored MIT, he found things to like about his graduate work, too. In his February 11 remarks, Bacow said, “Harvard made me better. It was here I learned that I was a teacher at heart. It was here that I discovered that I wanted to devote my life to scholarship. It was here that I nurtured my passion for higher education. And it was here that I discovered who I really was.”
Few students passing through the Law School en route to a doctorate, all within six years, likely found Harvard a step down in demands, but Bacow seems to have lapped up his increasingly interdisciplinary education and research. His dissertation acknowledges adviser Mark Moore, who “helped me frame the researchable questions, tactfully pointed out my errors of logic, and generally offered much-needed encouragement,” shaping “the way I look at policy problems.” (The tact might be questioned, but not the overall effect: Moore recalls sending his student “a rather stinging critique of a paper he submitted. There was something in there about how painful it was to see him ‘working with rusty saws and bent screwdrivers.’ He told me later that he had kept a copy of that memo to refer to throughout his career when he feared he was getting too full of himself.”)

In the event, Bacow emerged properly equipped. His dissertation, “Regulating Occupational Hazards through Collective Bargaining,” assessed the Occupational Safety and Health Act (OSHA, legislated in 1970) from the perspectives of policy (finding no statistically significant evidence that accidents had been reduced); law (revealing an often adversarial standard-setting process, ill-suited to the distinctions among myriad workplaces and unlikely to yield either a commitment to implement the standards or a search for more practical options); and economics (the inefficiencies and excess costs baked into the system).

He found that although OSHA’s rulemaking “provides a convenient forum for the presentation of alternative viewpoints, it is not well structured to resolve the differences”—a very unlawyerly notion. The parties faced no pressure to reach agreement, nor any cost for failing to do so: a formula for future litigation—but not for improving actual workplaces cost-effectively. He also enumerated the imperfections in a wholly market-based approach to job safety and health, given limited knowledge and other constraints.

More broadly, Bacow observed, “Institutions tend to be organized to perform the tasks they are currently performing. Their capacity to perform new tasks is limited. Moreover, they learn slowly and can only pay attention to a few things at a time.” Those insights, proceeding from knowledge of organizational behavior, rather than from law or economics, point to different modes of action. (They obviously also apply to operating long-established enterprises that meld together research, professional training, and residential undergraduate education—and with tenure for certain employees, to boot.)

Having proposed another way of proceeding, Bacow tested his theories in real-world settings ranging from United Auto Workers’ health and safety stewards in General Motors factories to training for the workers at dozens of diverse construction job sites covered by United Association of Plumbers and Pipefitters’ agreements. He did not claim that bargaining could substitute for regulation; rather, it could usefully boost enforcement of safety standards, training, and other effects that would make work less dangerous—all by actively engaging “the parties most directly affected.”

In this light, his dissertation’s academic, anodyne title—mashing up “regulating” and its command-and-control connotations with the very distinct processes of “collective bargaining”—could also be read as a statement of how to think differently. Aiming toward safer workplaces, it cut through problems of cost, insufficient and unequal expertise, and even the philosophical divides that separate advocates of risk-based, free-market solutions from those who see a rights-based role for government intervention.

Degree in hand, Bacow headed back down the Charles for a two-year faculty appointment in MIT’s department of urban studies and planning—a trajectory that pointed decisively back into academia, in a field where he could draw on those disciplines to engage with interesting policy problems.

The book he completed in 1980, Bargaining for Job Safety and Health, drew heavily on the dissertation. Some of the obligatory academic prose carried over (“The collective-bargaining-based regulatory strategy described...represents an attempt to enhance the capacity of the implementation process to reflect efficiency considerations”). But the subtle changes seem revealing now. The title conveys the essence of the work far more simply and vividly. Bacow emphasizes applying research, even when doing so falls short of perfect theory (negotiation “will not be as efficient as the decentralized intervention strategies urged by many economists, but it will be more efficient than what we have now”). And in a reworked summing-up, he calls out academic navel-gazing, particularly as it might be perceived by policymakers who hope to deploy scholarship productively:

Academics have a general tendency to look for global solutions to interesting policy problems. In fact, much of the academic debate over regulatory reform centers on the choice between standards and economic incentives. Although the participants in this debate have produced much interesting literature, the debate itself has been over the wrong question. Economic incentives can no more be preferred to standards than a wrench can be preferred to a pair of pliers—there is a time and a place for each, and what is important is knowing when to use which. To do a good job, the regulator needs to know how to match regulatory tools to regulatory problems.

The stylistic nod to Mark Moore’s bracing criticism may have been subconscious, but Bacow was finding his true voice. Like any good writer, he saved his best lines for last. Making the case for a pragmatic path forward, he concluded on a most unacademic note: “In general, regulatory policy would be both more efficient and more effective if we identified and exploited modest but significant opportunities to do
better. And in many cases the only way we will succeed in identifying these opportunities is by asking the simple question ‘What works?’

An Education in Leadership

Two years turned into two dozen. “I sort of found myself as a faculty member,” he said in the 2008 interview. “I liked it, and I enjoyed the teaching.” A tenure-track position was created after his term appointment, he entered the search, et voilà. He taught in his department, and in economics and political science, and served on committees when asked. When his chair tapped him to see what MIT ought to do in the field of real estate, Bacow led the creation of a new master’s degree program in development, drawing from his department, economics, civil engineering, architecture, and the Sloan School (MIT’s business school). Doing so, as he put it in the 2008 conversation, was not only an exposure to other parts of the institute but also “how I came to encounter faculty governance”: learning how initiatives are birthed, the curriculum is shaped, and resources are allocated. That done, he returned happily to his faculty role: “One of the wonderful things about being a faculty member is, you can pick and choose what problems you work on...because they are of interest to you. And I loved that. And I really worked pretty hard to avoid academic administration.”

As a scholar-teacher, Bacow embedded himself more deeply in policy thickets even more complex than negotiating workplace safety: resolving environmental disputes (siting, permitting, rulemaking, and enforcement). Here, disparate actors expressed differing values, assessments of risk, and guesstimates of probable outcomes—all in the context of overlapping laws and regulations at multiple layers of government. From an MIT research project, Bacow and Michael Wheeler, then of the New England School of Law and MIT, created a graduate-level casebook, Environmental Dispute Resolution (1984).

Certain general findings again stand out. Environmental conflicts would surely persist, but the costs of conflict “likely can be reduced. Even if perfection will always be out of reach, the quality of decisions in environmental cases surely can be enhanced”—especially relative to protracted litigation. Negotiation “relies on the principals to create the terms of the final outcome,” guided by their “much deeper understanding” of the issues than a judge may have and their superior capacity to “explore different solutions and their consequences”—with which the negotiator/principals “usually will have to live.” In sum, “negotiation is more likely to produce results that accurately reflect the preferences of the parties.”

“He’s intrigued by the moving parts and, like an engineer, is interested in making them work more productively,” Wheeler recalled in a recent conversation about their research. Bacow, he said, is a “systems thinker” with a critical approach honed by his legal training. Reflecting on his academic collaborations during the past three decades, Wheeler (who retired as MBA Class of 1952 professor of management practice at the Business School in 2013), said, “None was as engaging or instructive for me as that one was.”

Their friendship since the early 1980s has led Wheeler to put the conclusions they drew then into broader context. He and Bacow, he said, share the view that conflict “can be very costly in lots of ways, but it can also be generative—can be the basis for more solutions” than those surfaced otherwise. Bacow’s higher-education leadership roles, he continued, have been informed by “the same view of accepting the reality of conflict, of understanding that it must be charged and dealt with, that if it were stifled, we might be the worse for it.” Conflict, in other words, can advance a mission—so long as it evolves and does not devolve. Hence the importance, for leaders, of understanding all the parties to an issue and analyzing their perspectives: the takeaway Bacow summarized for his Crimson running partner in April.

At Harvard, then: the young couple in 1976, when Larry Bacow became a newly minted M.P.P.-J.D.

Concluding their book, Bacow and Wheeler wrote, “Instead of creating the illusion of truth, bargaining embraces the accommodation of competing interests,” which in turn “forces each side to acknowledge the legitimacy of the claims of the opposition.” Transpose that to leading a community like a university—where differences often arise precisely because the principals are, as scholars, single-mindedly committed to discovering “right answers.” As Bacow was to say in a later context, a university president, responsible for the safety and flourishing of human beings, their surrounding physical plant, and the community’s finances, in many ways fills the role of a city mayor—the ultimate pragmatist and negotiator among “competing interests.”

(It helps to lubricate that approach to problem-solving with humor. During a visit to Gloucester, Bacow took command of Wheeler’s sailboat—and promptly ran it onto a sandbar: “He turned to me and said, ‘It could be worse,’” Wheeler recounted. “I asked, ‘How?’ and Larry said, ‘It could be my boat!’”)

For all his affection for the life professorial, it seems retrospectively inevitable that a scholar of negotiation and decisionmaking, whose cast of mind went “deeper than curiosity about how systems work” (Wheeler’s description), would end up with his hand on...
the tiller. During a sabbatical in Amsterdam—one of several stints abroad—Bacow said in the 2008 interview, he received a call asking him to chair the MIT faculty. Given his youth and the peripheral status of his department within the engineering firmament, he said, it was unexpected. But “Candidly, I knew I was going to say yes”: the position was a singular honor and “I thought there were a set of issues that were before the faculty that I thought I might be able to be helpful with.”

In the doing, “I loved being faculty chair. I thought it was a wonderful job.” Faculty members, he realized, “tend to keep our noses down. We know the people who live in our neighborhoods...intellectually and geographically.” But as chair, “you have the world’s biggest hunting license,” addressing everything from the way MIT brought junior faculty members aboard to concerns about student life and learning. Interestingly, MIT had seriatim committees on the latter; this time, Bacow and colleagues “[took] a look at why those other committees had failed” so their new task force could actually get things done.

As chair, for a transition year and then a two-year term, Bacow attended MIT Corporation meetings—and had the idea of inviting members to come a few hours early to meet with groups of professors to learn in depth how they spent their time: an education in academic life for the governing board. He also joined weekly two-hour Academic Council sessions, convened by the president and including deans, the provost, the head of the libraries, and others: a personal education in the institution as a whole, including access to all tenure and promotion cases. The professor of planning was quickly exposed to all the disciplines, to admissions and financial aid, and to federal education policy—at a time when MIT was cutting its costs to adapt to more stringent reimbursement for the overhead on research grants.

From this lapse into administration, Bacow returned to his faculty duties for a year, setting up a center to coordinate MIT’s environmental initiatives. But the hook had been set: in 1998, MIT president Charles Vest appointed a new provost, Robert A. Brown, who had been engineering dean when Bacow was faculty chair. Vest also created a new post, the chancellorship, and appointed Bacow. He and Brown sorted out their respective responsibilities— in Bacow’s telling, over bagels at the S & S Deli in Inman Square. MIT’s deans reported to Brown, who ran the budget; Bacow oversaw everything that cut across the schools, from undergraduate and graduate education to strategic planning, allocation of space, and institute-wide partnerships with other institutions. He also engaged with audiences ranging from alumni to visiting world leaders.

Those formal responsibilities completed the leaderly preparation of two presidents-to-be (Brown now leads Boston University). In Bacow’s case, other lessons accrued, too. In the wake of the 1997 death from alcohol poisoning of MIT freshman Scott Krueger while pledging a fraternity, the chancellor took on the challenge of moving toward on-campus housing for all freshmen, upending a cherished tradition. Effecting that change was not easy (“I was hung in effigy,” he said in the 2008 interview). “It was a very stable system, and one which people cling to”—an example of the organizational culture he had observed at OSHA.

The Krueger death seems to have shaped the way he later talked to Tufts students and parents about drinking. Those cumulative experiences likely entered into his thinking about Harvard’s decision to sanction undergraduate membership in final clubs, fraternities, and sororities: a policy he and fellow Corporation members affirmed in a vote late last year, during the presidential search.

Aligning with his scholarly predilections, Bacow said in 2008, his engagement with MIT as a whole was an immersion in “an engineering-driven culture. I came to really embrace that...Engineers see problems and they say, ‘Great, there’s a problem, let’s go solve it.’...Engineers are not ideological; they are data-driven.”

And then Tufts came calling. “I was 49 years old, and I’d been at MIT as faculty for 24 years,” he said. “One more year and it was going to be half my life, and there are times when you need to take risks and get reported.” So he said yes, “but it was excruciating leaving.”

Presiding from the Heart

In A conversation at Loeb House two weeks before he assumed Harvard’s presidency, Bacow said, “When I’ve advised new university presidents...one of the things I’ve said to every single one of them...is that the biggest challenges they will face probably could not have been anticipated on the day that they were appointed.”

His learning curve entering Tufts was already steep: in a 2006 essay on university leaders, he observed that during that search, his name didn’t surface until the day his appointment was unveiled: secrecy was preserved, but “I could not have the kinds of conversations with faculty and students and staff that one really wants to have to understand the new environment.” He paid attention when an adviser urged him to look for opportunities to tell his new community “what makes you tick, what you care about, what your values are.”

That opportunity came unwanted, 10 days after he became president, via the ultimate unforeseen challenge: the terrorist attack of 9/11. In a message to the community that day, Bacow urged, above all, “This is a time when we must come together to support each other,” while conveying his own sense of vulnerability: “Like you, I am finding it difficult to concentrate on anything other than the suffering of so many innocent people and their families.” Three days later, he wrote again, to the student body, underscoring the importance of coming together even as he acknowledged turbulence: “I wish that every member of our community felt equally embraced, but I fear this is not the case. I have heard reports that some of our Muslim, Arab, and international students have been subject
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to unkind remarks or worse. We cannot tolerate this behavior.” He concluded on a simple, humane note: “I think we are all glad to see this week draw to a close.”

Those spontaneous messages set a tone for Bacow’s presidency: a sympathetic, personal voice; recurrent emphasis on community; and sharp clarity about values—and the reciprocal obligation to uphold them (“We cannot tolerate...”). One aim of his communications, he noted in that 2006 reflection, “was to be as explicit as possible about...some of the challenges and opportunities that we confronted. I tried to say quite clearly to the faculty that any academic institution that had to rely on its president for all its good ideas was a university in trouble. I expected them to be part of this process.”

His beginning-of-year letters shared news of appointments, praise for colleagues who had received honors, and updates on capital improvements and academic programs. Other emails were straightforward about personal matters of institutional import, such as the infection of the heart lining that left him “a guest” of the Tufts-affiliated hospital in the spring of 2004.

Tufts is small—like an urban Dartmouth—with faculties of arts and sciences, and of engineering; dental, medical, nutrition, and veterinary schools (in Boston and Grafton, respectively); and the Fletcher School (international affairs). The compact central campus, in Medford and Somerville, invites that kind of personal outreach—augmented by the president’s morning runs, and such innovations as the Bacows’ dinners at their home for all members of each senior class. The scale also enabled him to talk to people throughout the institution, and to aggregate and process what he heard and saw. In the assessment of Sol Gittleman, the provost for 21 years, who stepped down shortly after Bacow arrived, Tufts in 2001 was a school that had from inception been a superb undergraduate teaching institution, onto which a research culture had begun to be grafted in recent decades.

“The faculty just fell for him,” Gittleman, now retired, said in a recent conversation, embracing their new leader as a fellow scholar and appointing him to their ranks in five separate departments in three separate schools—recognition not bestowed on his two immediate predecessors. By the end of October, Bacow was ready to suggest where Tufts needed to progress, appointing a task force to examine the undergraduate experience, and a university council on graduate education (through which research innovations as the Bacows’ dinners at their home for all members of each senior class. The scale also enabled him to talk to people throughout the institution, and to aggregate and process what he heard and saw. In the assessment of Sol Gittleman, the provost for 21 years, who stepped down shortly after Bacow arrived, Tufts in 2001 was a school that had from inception been a superb undergraduate teaching institution, onto which a research culture had begun to be grafted in recent decades.

“The faculty just fell for him,” Gittleman, now retired, said in a recent conversation, embracing their new leader as a fellow scholar and appointing him to their ranks in five separate departments in three separate schools—recognition not bestowed on his two immediate predecessors. By the end of October, Bacow was ready to suggest where Tufts needed to progress, appointing a task force to examine the undergraduate experience, and a university council on graduate education (through which research priorities and cross-school opportunities would be identified). He also eliminated a vice presidency (for arts, sciences, and engineering) and the associated budget, and applied the savings to faculty salaries: a modest but tangible signal about the research mission. As Gittleman announced his plan to return to teaching, Bacow hailed him as a “wonderful mentor” and “a true mensch”—apt for a professor of Yiddish literature.

• Setting the strategy. Bacow’s inaugural address, in April 2002, timed for the Tufts sesquicentennial, outlined the outcomes of liberal-arts education, aimed at “helping our students become active, engaged, effective citizens” who are

“People comfortable dealing with ambiguity.
“People willing to take a risk to make a difference.
“People more interested in solving problems than in taking credit.
“People who—Mrs. Chandler will be glad to hear—can appreci-
ity of our students... We compete for students with a set of schools that we do not necessarily compete with for faculty.” (Tufts was not need-blind at the time. Its endowment reached about $1.3 billion in its 2010 fiscal year, after the 2008 financial crisis; up about 80 percent from 2002, reflecting strong prior returns and the proceeds from Bacow’s $1.2-billion Beyond Boundaries campaign, launched in 2006.)

Speaking in the wake of the dot.com bust that weakened other schools’ balance sheets, he continued, “Although we are under-endowed as an institution, we have a short-term competitive advantage over endowment-driven” schools. Or more memorably, “Every dog has its day, and this day is ours.” Reverting to running metaphors, “races are won on the uphill,” and this was the time for Tufts to hire faculty members—“to make a move, and gain on our competitors.” He summarized the plan as “great students and great faculty”—an “easy message to communicate to donors.”

The resulting strategy was not sugarcoated. There were appealing goals: the faculty embraced better salaries and hiring packages, and the related investment in laboratories and research facilities. Turning from the teachers to their students, Bacow said Tufts had to commit to need-blind undergraduate admissions—for which it would have to raise nearly four times as much scholarship endowment as it had realized in the campaign that concluded the year before.

But Bacow also emphasized accommodations that had to be made. Given scarce money, space, and faculty slots, their use would be driven strictly by academic priorities, enforced by a budget run from the provost’s office (a departure for Tufts, meant to send “important messages about how we are changing the way we do business”). Even closer to home, “true excellence will test Tufts’ egalitarian culture.” In a tight market for faculty talent, “we are going to have to match employment offers from other very competitive institutions”—hiring a young colleague as a full professor lest she or he spurn an offer at a lower rank, or promoting colleagues more rapidly than usual to retain them. And ahead of the coming campaign, Bacow even settled on “slowing growth in the deferred maintenance budget” to free resources to invest in the people priorities.

His peroration hit the standard notes—“We must raise our sights for the faculty we hire, for the students we recruit, for the donors we solicit, and for ourselves as a board”—but it was built on a distinctive foundation of candor and tough love. Such discussions may have taken place at Harvard in recent decades, but not for public consumption.

In the event, Tufts met his goals. Despite severe headwinds from the financial crisis, the campaign exceeded its $1.2-billion target in the final week of Bacow’s presidency, in June 2011, raising $434 million for financial aid and $386 million for new faculty positions and research support. The rallying to the cause no doubt reflected enthusiasm for his strategy.

- Weathering the storm. It probably also reflected confidence in how he had navigated that crisis. (From 9/11 to 2008, Gittleman said, Bacow was “never lucky” as president.) A series of community memos, beginning October 6, 2008, openly acknowledged conditions “unlike any I have ever witnessed in the financial markets,” but asserted, “Tufts has never been in a stronger financial position,” with a growing endowment, modest debt, and an improved credit rating. From the outset, Bacow stressed, “We have a moral obligation to continue to meet the full need of all undergraduates currently enrolled at Tufts, and we will do so.” He even indulged in humor (“Economists are fond of giving forecasts without time horizons. I can guarantee you that this market will turn, but I cannot tell you when”), reinforcing readers’ sense of their leader’s assurance.

Given that Tufts derived just 8 percent of operating income from endowment distributions—less than one-quarter wealthy Harvard’s exposure—he was able by mid-November to outline a prospective $76-million deficit (about 6 percent of non-research funds) and to reinforce the guarantee of financial aid. While not promising to avoid layoffs, he suggested “some sacrifice for each of us”—a call to community, to be met by those earning more than $50,000 doing without salary increases, “so that we can avoid sending colleagues into an uncertain job market in these difficult times.” And he committed to preserving critical initiatives: “I don’t believe in across-the-board freezes or budget cuts. They are an abdication of management responsibility.”

By the following March, he was able to project balanced budgets for that fiscal year and 2010—and with that, the adjustment to more limited means was crisply completed. He was especially delighted to end that missive by noting that “the students on our Medford campus are organizing a concert...to say thank you to our faculty and staff who...are sacrificing so we can protect our students. All of these actions make me proud to be president of Tufts.”

- Giving voice to values. Support for Bacow as a strategic and fiduciary leader was surely buttressed by his comparable addressing of academic values—and community members’ obligations—on divisive issues such as free speech, norms of appropriate behavior, and, more generally, how to conduct one’s life.

- Speech. When issues of offensive, hateful speech arose on campus, Bacow responded with an unwavering, three-part response: an absolute affirmation of freedom of expression; application of that freedom to condemn what he saw as false or abhorrent speech; and absolute affirmation of freedom of expression; application of that freedom to condemn what he saw as false or abhorrent speech; and an appeal to individual reflection and common values.

Thus, in February 2002, when student publications published personal attacks, a community memo stated the bedrock principle:
“Individuals and the press enjoy extraordinary freedom of expres-

“Bacow did not hold back after his first experience of the similar space in each year’s matriculation address, in front of parents, for adolescent indiscretions, but they aren’t always forthright about standards in other, unusual ways.

He similarly condemned attempts to muzzle publications by steal-
ing copies of the print run, behavior that “runs counter to every-
thing we stand for as a university.”

Finally, turning from community to individual responsibility, he drew a line between “legitimate criticism” of ideas to “personal invective designed to hurt,” and having found the line crossed, declared, “I hope that those who edit some of our student publica-
tions would aspire to higher standards.”

This layered response, applied whenever such conflicts rent campus, looks far easier to accomplish than it is under pressure. (A favorite quip: “I often say that one of the things that makes being a university president tough is that everybody who went to college thinks they can run one.”) Bacow has demonstrated a “remarkable ability to artic-
ulate sensitive, delicate issues with full frankness and no edge,” said Harvard’s Richard P. Chait, professor of education emeritus, whose scholarship and advisory practice have focused on higher-education governance and leadership. (He advised the University during the reforms that remade the Corporation at the end of 2010.) A close ac-
quaintance for a couple of de-
cades who worked with the Tufts board during Bacow’s presidency, Chait said of his friend’s ability to articulate such concerns, “I envy it” He added that Bacow addresses the most sensitive concerns with “a refreshing forthrightness that has no edge to it—it’s not provocative, and it doesn’t instigate hostile reactions.”

-Campus behavior. Bacow has held students accountable to high standards in other, unusual ways.

Deans of students, and their higher-ups, routinely fret about adolescent indiscretions, but they aren’t always forthright about their charges’ misdeeds. Bacow, spared by what can go wrong, made space in each year’s matriculation address, in front of parents, for a passage like this one from 2010:

If you look hard enough, you will find many temptations on a college campus...We admitted you because we thought you had good judgment. Please do not prove us wrong....

Let me give you some blunt advice about drinking. Nothing good ever happened to anyone while they were drunk. You are likely to embarrass yourself or worse, put yourself or others at risk....Please be advised that Tufts is not a con-
sequence-free zone. Your Tufts ID does not entitle you to flout the law.... We expect you to be the type of person you described in your application....[N]one of you claimed to be loud, obnoxious, drunk, or offensive to your neighbors. We don't expect you to behave that way here either.

Neither the Crimson nor anyone else has pinned him down on the Harvard Yard “Primal Scream” preceding exams each semester, but Bacow did not hold back after his first experience of the similar “Naked Quad Run” at Tufts, in December 2002. “I was sorely disappoint-
ied by what I saw and heard,” he wrote. The littered campus was “an embarrassment”—a state of affairs that “cannot continue.” Some students were reportedly groped, amid other disrespectful behaviors. “Tufts is better than this,” and though “not everyone is responsible for what occurred...it reflects on all of us.” Again, “I have higher expectations for you, and candidly, hope that you have higher expectations for yourself.” He concluded with a call for collective action: “Let’s work together to make changes so that what happened last night is not repeated....”

-Knowing when not to speak. Asked during that mid-June conversa-
tion whether Harvard could expect similar community memos, Bacow said his Tufts missives “were prompted by events” (see page 16 on a welcome message on July 2, the first business day of his new presidency). “I was pressed regularly to do more,” he continued, “and my response was if I communicate too frequently to people, there’s a signal-to-noise problem, they tune it out.”

A revealing example of knowing when not to weigh in dates from 2004, when Bacow spoke at the Hebrew College commencement ad-
dress, “a great honor” for someone who “was not the best or most attentive student of Jewish learning as a young adult.” He used the occasion to explore how to “understand or explain what some in our community believe to be a rise in anti-Semitism on college campuses,” despite the ascent of Jewish leaders in higher education. As an example of what he said was the “gross distortion” of characterizing campuses as “hotbeds of anti-Semitism,” he took on the politically charged issue of petitions calling for divestiture from Israel. Beginning from a first principle (“On its face, this petition is outrageous”) in comparing Israel to the South African apartheid regime, he moved to the practical crux of the matter: that the petition, for all the publicity given it, “has gone virtually nowhere,” with fewer than 30 Tufts faculty members, out of 700, signing: “It is literally much ado about nothing.”

How better to proceed? By “trying to find the teachable moment,” teasing out divestment from South Africa (which Tufts supported) from comparable sanctions on Israel. His basic conclusions were that proponents of divestiture are not anti-Semites and that “the conversation comes to an immediate and crushing end if you label them as anti-Semites. This language is not helpful”—foreshadowing reasoned efforts to change opinions.

-Lives well lived. The tendency of elders to bestow wisdom on their young charges is particularly pronounced on ritual college occasions. Doing so originally is a test of oratorical skill, which in turn reveals the emotional intelligence, at least, of the person command-
ing the lectern.

Feeling the weight of parental expectations? Bacow told the se-
niors in 2005, “My dad was not happy when I told him I was going to become an academic instead of returning home to practice law with him. He has since gotten over it.”

An even more personal message appeared later in that baccala-
ureate address. Pivoting from the hoary advice that wealth is not the true measure of success, Bacow said:

There are lots of ways to earn a living. What is truly impor-
tant is to lead a meaningful life, to acquire a good name, or as the Talmud would say, a shem tov.

What is a good name? It is the crown that sits atop all your
other accomplishments. It comes from the love and respect one earns from parents and children, from friends and colleagues. It comes from being honest and trustworthy with yourself and with others. It means making good on your commitments. People who enjoy a good name always strive to do the right thing, not that which is easy or convenient. They think about others before thinking about themselves. They are helpful because it is the right thing to do....People who enjoy a good name do not yield to temptation, but rather, always embrace decency, honesty, integrity, and humility....

We have every confidence that you will make your mark in the world, and that you will create for yourself a shem tov, a good name.

At the conclusion of his presidency—a decade in which he made decisions that necessarily disappointed some people, and routinely called out those who he felt had fallen short of community standards (and their own)—Bacow departed, Sol Gittleman said, as someone who had begun with a “pretty good product and made it much better, in every respect.” He was “clear, transparent, and honest, but he made decisions.” Tufts “needed that presidency,” he continued, and Bacow is remembered as someone who “just had it.” He departed with his shem tov intact.

A Productive Post-Presidency

After Tufts, the Bacows appeared headed for a more relaxed pace—but not retirement. Adele Fleet Bacow continued her planning, cultural and economic development, and urban design prac-
tice as president of Community Partners Consultants, the firm she founded in 1996. Larry Bacow was president-in-residence and then leader-in-residence, respectively, at the Graduate School of Education and the Harvard Kennedy School—and, from its expansion in 2011, a fellow of the Harvard Corporation. The couple spent time with their two sons’ growing families in New York, and acquired a second home on Florida’s Gulf Coast, a better base from which to indulge in sailing during New England winters.

With the gift of less structured time, Bacow pursued several issues in higher education that could become pertinent, in ways then unforeseen, given the decision he made this past winter to move across campus to Mass Hall.

• Learning online. His departure from Tufts coincided with rising interest in online learning: Harvard and MIT announced their edX venture on May 2, 2012—one day after Bacow, William G. Bowen (Princeton president emeritus), and coauthors published a study on the barriers to adopting online learning in U.S. higher education. Lowering them, they hoped, would make it possible to “greatly expand the reach of the nation’s colleges and universities to populations currently not served, while at the same time helping to bend the cost curve” of ever-escalating expenditures and tuition charges. But they worried that the obstacles were at least as much “conceptual, organizational, and administrative” as technical: difficult to overcome because they went to “the heart of the traditional model of higher education and its highly decentralized mode of decision-making.” As for the potential to save costs (the subject of Bowen’s foundational scholarship on the constraints on productivity in higher education), they cautioned, “Absent strong leadership...we fear that any productivity gains from online education will only be used to gild the educational lily.”

In a 2015 academic paper, “Online Higher Education: Beyond the Hype Cycle,” Michael S. McPherson, president of the Spencer Foundation (which funds education research) and past president of Macalester College, and Bacow warned that the adoption of online education could worsen inequalities in higher education. That “dystopian” outcome might result if state legislators used online learning as an excuse to cut appropriations to public institutions, while elite private ones “flipped” more courses and invested even more heavily in smaller, faculty-led classes.

• Bolstering public universities. Bacow served as an adviser to the American Academy of Arts & Sciences’ Lincoln Project: Excellence and Access in Public Higher Education. Its report, published in 2016, observed that following the Great Recession, hard-pressed states cut support for public universities severely. Many institutions were forced to curtail programs and to increase tuition sharply. Because they educate nearly four million students and disproportionately enroll those with the greatest financial needs, their very character as “public” institutions has come under threat, and their expansive research is in jeopardy. The Lincoln Project pragmatically observed that the budget cuts were “not necessarily the result of changes in political philosophy” but rather reflected “long-term structural changes in state finances.” In response, it recommended renewed state support, coupled with internal cost efficiencies and new revenues; public-private partnerships to sustain research and teaching; and further efforts to help students through simplified financial aid and clearer transfer processes. The presence of private representatives (Bacow; former Columbia provost Jonathan R. Cole; and Shirley M. Tilghman, president emerita of Princeton, and from January 2016 a fellow member of the Harvard Corporation) strengthened the case for their public peers.

• Networking in higher education. Bacow is deeply embedded in the higher-education community along Boston’s Red Line subway (from MIT to Harvard to MIT to Tufts to Harvard). At Tufts, he broadened that circle, serving as chair of the council of presidents of the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges and a member of the executive committee of the American Council on Education’s board of directors.

But the online-learning studies and Lincoln Project expanded these ties. The 2012 online-learning research spanned the spectrum from Bryn Mawr, MIT, and the University of Texas to Austin Community College, Fayetteville Technical Community College, and Morgan State University—including schools with negligible resources that are intimately involved in educating students who must overcome huge socioeconomic challenges. Similarly, former Berkeley chancellor Robert J. Birgeneau (whom Bacow knew from MIT) and Mary Sue Coleman, then president of the University of Michigan (now president of the Association of American Universities), led the Lincoln Project. Other advisers came from the across the country, from the University of Arizona to West Virginia University. If he wants to build a higher-education coalition, Bacow can engage with a refreshed contact list extending to every kind of school—and to congressional districts not routinely on the Harvard fundraising circuit.

• Attacking costs. Concern about costs has long figured in Bacow’s message about higher education. Beyond productivity issues, he has
advanced an analysis of organizational behavior—as in his 2006 testimony before the U.S. secretary of education's Commission on the Future of Higher Education:

[C]ompetition...in most other industries has the effect of driving costs down...In higher education, in some instances, competition has the effect of driving costs up. Students and their parents are looking for smaller class sizes, not larger classes. They are looking for more student/faculty contact, not less. They are interested in more hands-on learning, not in rote lessons delivered in a lecture hall...I think these trends produce an educational output that is unique and outstanding, but it is an educational output that is also expensive.

In other words, the negotiation scholar sees that lower costs are feasible—but lack a constituency. And the competitive dynamics suggest that online pedagogy—the first good opportunity to raise teaching productivity in a century—might be deployed in the richest institutions, in McPherson and Bacow's analysis, only when they “can demonstrate that it is actually more expensive than existing methods.” Most bluntly, “selective institutions...actually compete to be among the least cost-effective providers of educational services.” The problem extends to what they call “curricular entropy”: offering endless specialized courses and concentrations “even when demand...dwindles.” The result is a sector of elite colleges that “already spend more than can be justified on educational grounds” (even as public schools' strained finances jeopardize the quality of and access to education at the very places where most American are actually enrolled).

Bacow explained the problem further in a 2016 essay and in April 2017, as Clark Kerr lecturer at Berkeley, where he addressed “The Political Economy of Cost Control on a University Campus.” Drawing on his leadership experiences, he detailed an ecosystem of interests aligned to drive education costs ever higher—at the risk, he fears, of derailing the entire sector. When costs are controlled, that is “almost always due to exogenous constraints on revenue.” He went so far as to say that access is no longer the most pressing issue for higher education—because escalating costs threaten to undercut public support generally, choking off government research and financial-aid funds.

Faculty members value the artisanal, craftlike way their scholarship has developed, and resist administrative efficiencies that might yield benefits in the aggregate, but disrupt “locally optimized” systems of support that have reproduced all over campus. Even trustees, the financial fiduciaries, have countervailing incentives, Bacow said. Much as they care for their institutions, they are loath to see the schools' reputations diminish on their watch. Hence, they are always inclined to favor new revenues—even when fundraising “can actually be quite expensive” if incremental resources do not fully cover an initiative’s costs. The path of least resistance is for tuition to increase.

What, then, is to be done? Bacow nodded to the promise, if not yet the reality, of online technology. He also suggested lessening the competition that fuels rising costs—through shared scientific facilities, libraries, purchasing, graduate-student housing, and even the curriculum (a Lincoln Project recommendation): “We need not replicate” every degree program or research facility on every campus, he argued. Absent mandatory retirement, he even suggested experimenting with capping new tenured appointments at, say, 35 years, with the possibility of term extensions thereafter.

Ultimately, he came back to the roles of leaders and their campus communities. Leaders need to do a better job of finding opportunities to lay out the real choices the institutions face: at some point, crises over costs that exceed the public’s threshold, and the collapse of government support. Again sounding the Tufts theme of collective responsibility for the community’s well-being, his takeaway was that acting to bend the cost curve is in the interest of every constituency within any college or university. At Tufts, he said, once financial aid became the highest undergraduate priority, he could have conversations about other wants: if students sought funds for three new club sports, he could frame that request in terms of the number of students who would have to be deprived of aid.

The academic leader’s work is to frame the institution's challenges and articulate needed change—and then to make those leaderly problems student and faculty problems, too. “We need to be candid, we need to be up front, we can't hide from the very real challenges that we face,” he said. “But in articulating those challenges, we need to give each constituency a stake in the outcome. We have to explain to students and their parents, if we control costs, what we will do for tuition. We need to explain to faculty, if we moderate administrative costs or enhance faculty productivity, how we are going to share those with them.”

In other words, having identified an overarching, intractable, even existential problem for higher education, Bacow concluded with his theory of action.

On Broadway

Bacow arrived at Tufts as a distinguished scholar with recent administrative posts at MIT—but with limited knowledge about his new academic home. He assumed his Harvard presidency, by his own account, a couple of decades removed from professorial practice, but a veteran university leader and immersed in this one’s workings from his perspective on the Corporation.

Even as he looked forward to “being a Harvard student again,” as he described his transition on February 11, Bacow knew that already being prepared (he was an Eagle Scout) would stand him in good stead. As one observer of his career put it, from Off Broadway (near the Tufts campus, on the Somerville-Medford line), he has now moved to Broadway (given the bright light shined so often on Harvard). Harvard’s sheer scale makes it more demanding to conduct the kind of personal presidency that he and Adele Fleet Bacow effected at Tufts.
And the threatening external environment for higher education—a focal point for senior fellow William F. Lee’s remarks on February 11, and Bacow’s, too—suggests exceptional challenges for elite universities.

- **Beyond Harvard.** In an April conversation, Lee fleshed out how the latter concerns helped shape the presidential search. Present circumstances call for leading institutions like Harvard to reaffirm fact-based inquiry, evidence-based discussion, and the free exchange of ideas, he said. Despite some surveys that report broad disaffection from higher education, he noted, other research shows overwhelming support for having one’s children attend college (even as parents worry about the costs). A new president should, as Drew Faust did, articulate the values and benefits of higher education and help bridge the gap dividing communities—addressing other educators, legislators and policymakers, and the public at large. Interestingly, Lee said the Corporation has been discussing such matters regularly—for example, being briefed on Thomas professor of government and sociology Theda Skocpol’s field research. (Her work shows that keeping campuses open to diverse viewpoints, making factual arguments about the value of education and the institutions that provide it, and partnering with public colleges and universities are winning strategies with the electorate at large—no matter the partisan combat among political elites.)

Corporation member Shirley Tilghman said in a May conversation that it is “very important, to the greatest extent possible, to talk to individuals on all sides of the political system,” especially as the “perception of universities as bastions of liberal political correctness” has spread. (Bacow’s absolute commitment to free speech, and the clarity of his remarks on speech controversies, seem valuable assets here.) She was at pains to say, further, that the president must “speak in the broadest general terms about the value of education, period,” and “in the case of Harvard and Princeton, the value of a liberal-arts education.”

Discussing his presidency two weeks before it began, Bacow championed that role, perhaps the feature of his nascent administration most interesting to outside observers: “I’m anticipating that I’m going to spend a fair amount of my time engaging with legislators and policymakers in Washington about issues that bear on higher education,” he said. But he broadened the mission, saying, “Typically, when policymakers think of institutions like this, they tend to look at them almost exclusively through the lens of undergraduate education. They fail to...appreciate the degree to which graduate and undergraduate education are joint products....So part of my job is to be a teacher, and to try to educate people on how institutions like this actually work, on how we are in competition for faculty talent and student talent globally.”

It will be interesting to watch how Bacow allocates his energies between Washington, where Harvard has direct interests in the federal budget and regulation, and places the University touches only slightly now: metaphorically (and perhaps literally), Pontiac. “[A] lot of what I’ll do is engage with people who actually need to understand us better,” Bacow said. “In one of my early books, I wrote that one of the mistakes people make in public disputes, sitting disputes, is they spend too much time talking to their friends and not enough talking to their enemies. I’m not trying to characterize people who disagree with us as our enemies. But...if you want to make progress, you do so not by talking only to those who think like you. You need to engage with those who think differently, and that’s going to be a big part of my job.”

The aim, he said most expansively, is “being a voice for all of higher education, not just Harvard—for what I’ve started calling the enduring values of the nation’s colleges and universities as the enablers of the American dream.” (Bacow’s own family history is a story of how higher education enabled a refugees’ son to experience that dream.)

- **At Harvard.** There is plenty to do on campus and along the Red Line, too—internally, and in support of the public agenda. Most of the other priorities Lee and Tilghman highlighted appeared in Bacow’s lean February 11 remarks, which merit rereading in light of his record and past communications. He stressed then:

  - **Connecting teaching and research to the wider world:** “This is the place [where anyone] can have the greatest chance not only to succeed personally, but, even more importantly, to make a difference in the lives of others.”

  - **Maintaining truth, high standards, and access:** “The Harvard I have known has always stood for at least three things: the pursuit of truth, or as we say, Veritas; an unwavering commitment to excellence; but also to opportunity....[W]e need to be vigilant to ensure that our campuses are always open to new ideas—that they are places where all our members feel free to express themselves, and also where every member of this community feels that he or she belongs.”

  - **Developing the frontier:** “I am particularly excited by the extension of our campus that’s taking shape in Allston” (see page 5).

  - **Pursuing interdisciplinary work:** “Our breadth has long been our great strength. And our great opportunity now is the chance to combine our strengths in new ways that help address some of the world’s most pressing problems.”

Then, and in the June conversation at Loeb House, he was clear about some of the ways he would address his agenda. Asked whether his message about costs pertains to Harvard (with, as the public knows, the world’s largest endowment), Bacow quickly said, “It applies,” and pointed to the Kerr lecture. “I think that if people in positions like I’m about to be in don’t push back against the natural inclination of the various constituencies to always demand more, there’s going to be ever-present, ever-rising pressure on costs.... While it may appear in the short run that they would be better off if we did more, in fact longer term, we are all paying the price in potentially diminished public support for the enterprise.”

Did he envision academic partnerships involving Boston’s flagship university (another subject he alluded to in February)? “Absolutely. Last week, [MIT president] Rafael Reif invited me to speak to the MIT Corporation—a bit like going home.” Already, Bacow said, he and Reif have chartered their provosts with examining “existing collaborations, and there are many” (like edX, the Broad Institute for genomics research, an HIV/AIDS institute, and the graduate-level Harvard-MIT program in Health Sciences and Technology) to determine how they are working and how they could be improved, and “then to look in a systematic way at opportunities for us to collaborate in various scholarly initiatives.” Similarly with former MIT colleague Robert Brown, now presiding at BU: the two have
talking about ways in which we could collaborate, especially in Allston, which is closer to his campus than it is to ours.” And so on.

- How to proceed. After a decade of expansionary University hopes reined in by financial crisis, little if any growth in the professoriate, governance reform, and the extensive Harvard Campaign to repair the balance sheet, Bacow arrives, as he did at Tufts, championing the faculty and the mission.

He said in mid June, “I start from the proposition that the function of an administration is to enable the faculty to do their best work—their best teaching, their best scholarship—and that all of us who work in a university, we all are in service of the academic mission.”

He stressed the latter point, underscoring his vision of a community enterprise: “It’s important for everybody in the institution to feel that. It’s not just the job of the faculty. It’s the job of literally everybody who works in a place like this—to understand that...what we are all doing, is trying to produce great teaching and great scholarship.”

Universities’ work takes place, he noted, in “fundamentally collegial organizations,” where “there are strong expectations that people will be engaged in discussion, debate about the future of the institution, that the passion that people have for the institution, whether they are faculty or staff or students or alumni, can sometimes make this a noisy process. But you need to recognize and understand that what motivates it is in fact passion, and that that’s good.”

Passionate scholars will be further encouraged by the advice Bacow said he always gives new presidents and deans, to the effect that “in a university, any time you have to assert your authority to get something done, you’ve lost. You lead by the power of your argument, by being able to reason from first principles...”

All this will be manna to professors. But, as at Tufts, Bacow made clear that community and institutional interests are paramount, and collegiality is not a formula for endless debate. The outcome of that argument and persuasion, he continued, is “your willingness to engage and explain to people why you are doing what you are doing, and why that’s in the best interest of the institution as a whole.”

The leader’s challenge is channeling the community’s passion, figuring out “how does one do so productively that allows you to move forward on important decisions and in addressing difficult issues?”

Richard Chait said of leading in an academic context that “shared governance is consulting and explaining.” Of his friend, he said, “Larry doesn’t hide. He listens and explains his decision.” The ultimate emphasis is on reaching decisions and moving forward. As Bacow put it in mid June:

There’s a frequent conversation one winds up having in jobs like this: it was true when I was chancellor of MIT, it was true when I was president of Tufts, and I am certain it will be true when I assume this office two weeks from today. That is, somebody will come in—it could be a dean, it could be a faculty member, it could be a vice president—and they will be unhappy with a decision I have made or they will be asking me to do something that I cannot do. And what I have found very effective...is to listen and listen carefully...

But often, people, because of their passion, are representing what are reasonably parochial points of view. So I’ve found myself saying at times to people...“You’ve made a really good argument. We know if I were sitting where you are sitting, I don’t think I could make a better one—but I’m not. So let me explain to you why I did what I did, or why I can’t do what you want me to do, and if you can look me in the eye and tell me that if you’re sitting where I’m sitting you would do something different, we have something to talk about.” But if all you’re saying is, “Do this because it locally optimizes my preferences,” I’m sorry, I can’t do that right now...

My job is to make you a better dean, a better faculty member, to enhance your capacity to do your work, but in this case I can’t do what you’re asking me, because my responsibility is to the institution writ large. In my experience, when you explain things to people who truly care about the institution in those terms, they understand.

How he defines those responsibilities will become clearer soon: Bacow’s installation is October 5. People keeping score should be able to tick off a clear focus on common purposes—and higher purposes—from February 11: “I can think of no more exciting time than [now for] doing all I can and indeed I would say—all we can—to help Harvard achieve [its] potential, not just for the good of our students, but for the good of the world that we aim to serve”). At least with their inner ear, they should detect a leader with a vigorous appetite for action, honed by scholarship and practice for nearly five decades.

At Harvard, now: at work in Loeb House on July 2, the first business day of his presidency—Harvard’s twenty-ninth insertion. As he put it in June, “I’m constantly looking for ways to frame issues so that it broadens people’s perspective,” to hear their questions, and to explain a course of action—but not to fret about satisfying every interest. “I think it’s important to recognize you’re never going to make everybody happy—but you don’t have to. I was a student of Tom Schelling when I was...here. I learned about the importance of ‘unblocked coalitions’ from Tom. In order to move forward, that’s what you need, an unblocked coalition—you don’t need everybody on board.”

In the past half-century, Harvard has seen leaders with a spiritual bent or steeped in professional disciplines and in the humanities, periods of full-sails expansion and of sails reeled to reboot the University’s operating system. Now, amid challenges to Veritas and a polarized polity, it welcomes its twenty-ninth president, Lawrence S. Bacow, whose scholarship and leaderly seasoning have made him higher education’s preeminent pragmatic visionary. Harvard is about to find out, at this moment, what he thinks “needs to be done”—and “What works?”

John S. Rosenberg is editor of Harvard Magazine.
Naught looks the same for long...
Waters rush on, make valleys where once stood plains;
hills wash away to the sea.
Marshland dries to sand, while dry land
becomes stagnant, marshy pool.
From Nature, springs erupt or are sealed;
from earthquakes, streams burst forth or vanish.

IN Metamorphoses, the Roman poet Ovid, echoing Pythagoras, alludes to geomorphology: the study of the forms taken by the earth's surface, and what causes them. Almost 19 centuries later, William Morris Davis, S.B. 1869, devised a clear, concise, descriptive, and idealized model of landscape evolution that revolutionized and in many ways created this field of study.

Born into a prominent Philadelphia Quaker family, Davis studied geology and geography at Harvard's Lawrence Scientific School and then joined a Harvard-sponsored geographic-exploration party to the Colorado Territory, led by the inaugural Sturgis-Hooper professor of geology, Josiah Dwight Whitney. Wild stories had circulated since soon after the Louisiana Purchase about Rocky Mountain peaks 18,000 feet or higher. The Harvard expedition set out to investigate, and found none, but they did find “14ers” (14,000-plus feet). Among these, the expedition members surveyed, named, and made two first-recorded summits in the “Collegiate Peaks,” designating the tallest in the group Mount Harvard (honoring their sponsor), and the second tallest Mount Yale (honoring Whitney's alma mater).

Once back in Cambridge, Davis earned a master’s in mining engineering from the University's short-lived Hooper School of Mining and Practical Geology in 1870. Three years at an Argentinian observatory, and a bookkeeping stint in Philadelphia, followed—until geologist Nathaniel Southgate Shaler hired him to teach at Harvard in 1876.

He had a slow start in academe, with few accolades for either his early teaching or his early research. (In 1882, President Charles William Eliot even advised him to seek employment elsewhere.) But Davis was tenacious, as well as a keen observer of nature, a master of logical deduction, and a brilliant synthesizer of disparate observations and ideas. From his own field observations and studies made by the original nineteenth-century surveyors of the western United States, he devised the theory for which he is best known: the “Erosional Cycle.” Inspired by the work of Erasmus and Charles Darwin and Jean-Baptiste Lamarck, it had a strong evolutionary flavor.

Alongside tectonic uplift, Davis identified rivers and their tributaries as the primary agents for altering the appearance of landscapes, and distinguished three anthropomorphically named stages of landscape evolution, all initiated by uplift. In “Youth,” narrow, incised river valleys locally decrease the growing elevation differences between “uplands” and “base-level” caused by uplift. In “Maturity,” these elevation differences and the number of branching streams reach their maxima, while valleys cut downward and broaden. In “Old Age,” the ever-broadening valleys hold meandering channels that create rolling lowlands (“peneplains”). In a complete cycle, the stages transition gradually unless interrupted and reset by subsequent uplift (“Rejuvenation”). This theory, published between 1886 and 1911, moved geomorphology, despite some opposition, from purely local descriptions to global explanations—and in the history of his discipline, time is often demarcated as “before” or “after” Davis.

By the time he became a full professor in 1890, Davis had published more than 100 works on everything from astronomy to zoology and was renowned for inspirational lecturing and the complex but lucid blackboard illustrations he executed ambidextrously. Having lamented once that his field was “as much a sealed book to the person of ordinary intelligence and education as...a great cathedral would be to a backwoodsman...It makes one grieve to think of the opportunity for mental enjoyment that is lost because of the failure of education in this respect,” he worked to rectify the situation; his pedagogical
ideas would affect the content and teaching of physical geography in primary and secondary schools worldwide for nearly a century.

In 1899, Davis himself became the Sturgis-Hooper professor, like his mentor, Whitney. He received numerous awards from professional societies and honorary doctorates on three continents; he even became a knight of the Legion of Honor. Retirement from Harvard in 1912 did not end his influence. Although deeply shaken by World War I and the deaths of his first, and then his second, wife, he rallied by the mid 1920s: marrying a third time, lecturing widely, and relocating first to the University of Arizona and subsequently to Caltech. He produced key works on the origins of coral reefs and on erosion in deserts, along coasts, and in limestone caverns, and created more print pages and drawings as an octogenarian than most do in an entire career.

His cyclical model fell under attack—including by some in his former department at Harvard: faulted for ignoring the erosional roles of climate, underlying geology, physical processes, and the marine environment as well as changes in global sea-level. In his deductive determinism, he often appears to conflate model with observation. Dogmatic? Perhaps he was. Yet Davis was the first to give qualitative coherence to a field awash in decades of disconnected descriptions. His model does not answer all geomorphological questions, but in its elegant simplicity, it still holds pedagogical value.

Philip S. “Flip” Koch ’78, a faculty member at the Colorado School of Mines professing in earth science and finance, has ascended Mount Harvard multiple times.
“When I’m away from Cambridge, Harvard Magazine brings the University to me as nothing else can. The magazine takes readers everywhere—from inside scientists’ laboratories to around the globe with exciting scholars, students, and alumni, all of whom are making a difference in our world.”
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**YOUR GIFTS MAKE A BIG DIFFERENCE.**
The most political case of the indelibly political Supreme Court term that ended in June was about the travel ban President Donald J. Trump imposed last September. It banned almost all travel to the United States from seven countries where more than 135 million people were covered by the ban. More than 90 percent of the citizens in five of the countries were Muslim. As the state of Hawaii said in its brief about the case called Trump v. Hawaii, this element of the ban violated the Constitution’s “bedrock command that the Government may not take actions for the purpose of excluding members of a particular faith.”

The Trump administration claimed the ban was “religion-neutral,” with restrictions “expressly based on the President’s national-security and foreign-policy judgments.” A prime point of contention was the stream of statements Trump had made stressing his aim of barring Muslims from the United States. When the Court heard oral argument in the case, Chief Justice John G. Roberts Jr. ’76, J.D. ’79, assumed Trump had made the statements with that purpose. Roberts asked Hawaii’s lawyer: “If tomorrow he issues a proclamation saying he’s disavowing all those statements, then the next day he can re-enter this proclamation and ‘your discrimination argument would not be applicable?’” The lawyer said, “Absolutely.”

Solicitor General Noel J. Francisco, representing the administration, asserted in rebuttal that there was nothing to disavow: “Well,
the President has made crystal clear on September 25th that he had no intention of imposing the Muslim ban. The following day in *Slate*, Joshua A. Geltzer, a visiting professor of law at Georgetown University, explained why that assertion was inaccurate. “Here’s the problem. No such thing seems to have happened on September 25th.” He went on, “Time and again, Trump and the White House have said the opposite of what Francisco represented to the court on Wednesday.”

A few days later, Francisco sent a letter to the Court saying that, when he referred to a statement by the president on September 25, he meant January 25, when Trump said a previous version of the travel ban addressed “countries that have tremendous terror,” but was “not a Muslim ban.” The next day in *Slate*, Geltzer called Francisco on that claim, too. The president’s full statement on January 25 made plain that, to Trump, his administration’s ban was a Muslim ban, but narrower than the absolute one he promised — “the Muslim ban,” Francisco called it, with “the” implying absoluteness. And to Trump, the narrowing was regrettable. Francisco’s argument to the justices, Geltzer wrote, was “dangerously misleading.”

To close observers of the Court, Geltzer was making a weighty point about the solicitor general: the S.G., as the lawyer in the post is known, had put the interests of the Trump administration ahead of those of the Court and the justices should be wary of his assertions in this matter. By fudging facts — about the travel ban itself, as well as about the president’s purpose in imposing it — to fit the view of the law he was trying to persuade the justices to take, Francisco had violated the scrupulous standard of candor about the facts and the law that S.G.s, in Republican and Democratic administrations alike, have repeatedly said they must honor.

In June, when the Court upheld the ban by 5-4, there was no apparent penalty for this duplicity. For the conservative majority, Roberts wrote that the law in question “grants the President broad discretion to suspend the entry of aliens into the United States” and President Trump “lawfully exercised that discretion.” In reviewing the president’s anti-Muslim statements, the Court had to consider “not only the statements of a particular President, but also the authority of the Presidency itself.” He stressed, quoting an old opinion, “For more than a century, this Court has recognized that the admission and exclusion of foreign nationals is a ‘fundamental sovereign attribute exercised by the Government’s political departments largely immune from judicial control.’”

Justice Sonia Sotomayor wrote a piercing dissent. She said the ban is “motivated by hostility and animus toward the Muslim faith,” that it’s “inexplicable by anything but animus,” and that it “now masquerades behind a façade of national security concerns.” She closed, “Our Constitution demands, and our country deserves, a judiciary willing to hold the coordinate branches to account when they defy our most sacred legal commitments.”

It was the president who needed to be held to account. Martha Minow, Harvard’s 300th Anniversary University Professor, and Robert Post ’69, Ph.D. ’80, a Yale Law School professor, wrote that Trump has come “perilously close to characterizing the law as simply one more enemy to be smashed into submission.” The S.G.’s fudging drew attention because it raised the disturbing prospect of the S.G. sacrificing the integrity of the office as part of that smashing.

But the Court’s seeming indifference to the S.G.’s misrepresentation reflects another change in practices, under way for two generations and a contributor to major shifts in the S.G.’s role. With the Court divided ideologically along partisan lines for the first time in history, between conservatives nominated by Republicans and liberals by Democrats (a division deepened by the retirement of the sometimes-libertarian Justice Anthony M. Kennedy, LL.B. ’61, since Brett Kavanaugh, the Trump nominee to replace him, is likely to be more conservative), the S.G. — no matter the administration — has become more political. How did this esteemed post, which the Court long regarded as the keel keeping the government balanced when it threatened to heel too far to the left or right, come to contribute to forceful tactics one way or the other, to the Court’s seeming indifference?

A comparison of the divergent approaches of Harvard Law School’s late Archibald Cox ’34, LL.B. ’37, LL.D. ’75, as S.G. in the 1960s and Charles Fried in the post in the 1980s (he is the Beneficial professor of law) illuminates these important changes. (Eight of the nation’s 48 S.G.s went to HLS, have taught there, or both, including Justice Elena Kagan, J.D. ’86, the only female S.G.) The changes matter because the solicitor general remains, by a wide margin, the
most frequent and influential advocate before the Supreme Court. The changes reflect the changed nature of the Court, which is at the center of American life.

**Law and Policy Fused**

The S.G. is traditionally called the “tenth justice,” though it’s obvious the Court has only nine justices. The moniker is a shorthand for what’s been inspiring about the position: Thurgood Marshall, then an actual justice and a former S.G., called it “the best job I’ve ever had, bar none!” The S.G. is the only national public official, including the Supreme Court justices, required by statute to be “learned in the law.” The job is to represent the executive branch at the Court and to decide which cases it appeals to the Court and to the federal appeals courts, yet the S.G. has an office at the Supreme Court as well as at the Justice Department.

Those offices in different branches of government represent what Justice Lewis F. Powell Jr., LLM. ’72, called the S.G.’s “dual responsibility”—as an advocate for the president yet also as a counselor to the Court, expected to help the justices reach the right result in the law. S.G.s have long engaged in practices that confound the ideal of zealous advocacy at the heart of the adversary system. They have confessed error in cases they thought the government won unjustly and recommended that the Supreme Court overturn the decision. They have refused to argue the merits of cases in which they thought a victory for the government would be a miscarriage of justice, or even to sign the government’s briefs—or they have signed the briefs, but signaled their disapproval in a footnote, known as tying a tin can: that tiny notation noisily clangs, signaling that the brief presented is not the S.G.’s.

The 1978 *Bakke* case about affirmative action in university admissions was one of the most contested of the past half-century. When a white engineer sued a University of California medical school for reserving 16 of the 100 places in its entering class for minorities, claiming that deprived him of equal protection of the law, President Jimmy Carter, pressured by cabinet officers, directed his S.G. to advocate strongly for affirmative action. The Court’s resolution of the case—in favor of affirmative action but against reserving those places at Davis—was equivocal. The Justice Department’s response to the controversy was clear-cut.

Its Office of Legal Counsel, in 1977, laid out the argument for the independence of the S.G.’s office. “The short of the matter is that under our law,” a memorandum said, “the Attorney General has the power and the right to ‘conduct and argue’ the Government’s case in any court of the United States” and the S.G. worked for the A.G. But “the tradition of the ‘independent’ Solicitor General is a wise tradition,” the memo went on, because the A.G.’s political duties might “cloud a clear vision of what the law requires.” Legal judgments, the S.G. should make. Policy judgments, the A.G. should. “But the Attorney General and the President should trust the judgment of the Solicitor General not only in determining questions of law but also in distinguishing between questions of law and questions of policy.”

The memo’s premise was that, in most instances, law and policy—politics—could be distinguished. Since 1977, however, that distinction has been all but obliterated in the most important cases before the Supreme Court. In them, the Court is a political institution, as many scholars have documented and most Americans believe. In 2015, the Pew Research Center found that 70 percent, spanning partisan and demographic groups, “say that in deciding cases, the justices of the Supreme Court ‘are often influenced by their own political views.’”

The justices are products of politics. That’s unmistakable in the selection processes of presidents and the confirmation clashes of the Senate. Justices’ rulings are often also products of their ideologies—about how the Court should allocate power, opportunity, and other elements of society. Under the traditional ideal, judges reached results by applying legal rules independent of political pressures. A classic example is the many federal-trial-court orders calling for desegregation of public schools in the South after *Brown v. Board of Education* held that separate-but-equal education violated the Constitution, despite furious opposition to racial integration. The contemporary reality in the most important cases is that the justices apply rules in ways that are products of politics.

Since 1969, three conservative chief justices, appointed by Republican presidents, have led an increasingly conservative Court. It’s about to enter its fiftieth year as what the legal scholar Lee Epstein called the Republican Court, because of the link between the domin-

S.G.s have confessed error in cases they thought the government won unjustly, and have refused to argue the merits of cases when they thought a victory would be a miscarriage of justice.

**Pamphleteer General**

The conflicting approaches of Archibald Cox and Charles Fried as S.G. showcase the difference between ideal and reality. Cox, a cut patrician, was S.G. for four years in the Kennedy administration. Two decades later, Cox, an urbane cosmopolitan, filled the post for four years in the Reagan administration. As HLS professors on leave to serve as S.G. who prided themselves on their pedagogy—Cox was on the faculty from 1945 until 1978, with stints away for public service; Fried has been on the faculty since 1961, also with stints of service—each was emphatic about why he took his approach.

Cox’s grew out of his adherence as a liberal to judicial restraint—the philosophy of judicial deference to the executive and legislative, or political, branches—which was embraced by his mentors Felix Frankfurter, LL.B. 1906, LL.D. ’36 (an HLS professor who became a justice), and Learned Hand, A.B. 1893, A.M. ’94, LL.B. ’96, LL.D. ’39 (the renowned federal-appellate-court judge whom Cox clerked for in Manhattan), as liberals whose views were formed in a conservative Court era. Fried’s approach was reinforced by his training as a legal philosopher focused on the values underlying laws and on how laws empower or encumber those values, and as a liberty-
emerging, autonomy-promoting conservative whose views were formed in a liberal Court era.

Their views were distilled in contrasting stances—Cox’s cautious, Fried’s aggressive—about when the S.G.’s office should file friend-of-the-court, or amicus-curiae, briefs at the Court. (These are filed on behalf of organizations or people not in a case as a party—initially as plaintiffs or defendants, later either petitioning the justices to hear it on appeal or responding on the other side—who have information or insight that they think the Court could benefit from, since specific cases raise general questions and the parties don’t always address them.) The growth in such filings is a proxy for the transformation of the Court since World War II: from a relatively weak institution and guardian of federalism into a relatively strong branch of government and champion of nationalism, in the sense of developing national law so all individuals would be treated equally.

Until Cox became S.G., the government rarely filed amicus briefs: it was unusual for anyone to file them in Supreme Court cases. In the 1960s, however, in what Cox called “a new period in our constitutional development” under the Warren Court, the S.G.’s office began to appear regularly as an amicus at the Court as such filings in general soared. Between 1961 and 1966, about 20 percent of the government’s appearances at the Court were as amicus. (The remaining 80 percent continued to be as a party in a lawsuit, either as the petitioner who brought the case or as the respondent.) Samuel Krislov wrote in the Yale Law Journal, in 1963, that “the amicus is no longer a neutral amorphous embodiment of justice, but an active participant in the interest group struggle” and “has moved from neutrality to partisanship, from friendship to advocacy.” The amicus brief became a tool of political lobbying, for pursuing social and legal change as the Court increasingly sought to resolve in law major disputes in society.

In this period of expansion for the Court, Cox’s caution about filing amicus briefs stood out. In 1985, when I interviewed him for my 1987 book, The Tenth Justice: The Solicitor General and the Rule of Law, he said, “We had the feeling when we filed an amicus brief that we had an even stricter responsibility to the guardians of the law than we normally did. We couldn’t just take a strong position on behalf of a state, for example. We had to be especially careful about what we said the law was or should be.”

In deciding whether to file an amicus brief, Cox was punctilious in meeting standards he chose: Was the question important to constitutional law? Would the answer affect a lot of people? Could a government brief really help the Court? Was the government’s interest “direct”—would it be directly affected by the case’s outcome?

In 1962, by 6-2 in Baker v. Carr, the Court ruled that it had the authority to decide cases about reapportionment of legislative districts. (Earl Warren called it the Court’s most important ruling while he was chief justice.) Cox’s predecessor as S.G. had decided to enter the case as an amicus on behalf of fairer apportionment, but Cox was not sure he should make an oral argument. As recently as 1946, the Court had ruled that reapportionment was “a political question” for the legislature to decide. When Cox did make the oral argument, Ames professor of law emeritus Philip B. Heymann (an assistant to Cox at the time) told me: “Archie stood up and said, ‘It is respectable and nothing terrible will happen if you take on reapportionment.’...He wrestled with Baker v. Carr a long time, and it’s one of those cases where the lawyer made all the difference.”

Between 1959 and 1986, the legal scholar Rebecca Mae Salokar found, the party the S.G. supported as an amicus won 72 percent of the time—and, in the past three decades, that rate remained the same. The score for Cox was 89.4 percent.

To Fried, the explosion of law under the Warren Court led to enormous costs for the United States, in the growth of litigation, violent crime, and what he saw as perversion of the American system: in a speech in 1985, he said that “educational opportunities, housing,judgeships—all the good things were being handed out, not on merit, but by a racial and ethnic and religious and gender spoils system.” At a seminar that year, he explained why this view led him to reject key Warren precedents: “Judicial restraint”—including adherence to precedent—“may require judges to be faithful to a lot of things which, in the abstract, don’t deserve fidelity.” Fried defined the government interest broadly so he could enter any case where the Reagan administration, viewing amicus briefs as tools of change, wanted to put itself on record.

In Fried’s first year as S.G., the share of the government’s cases in which he filed an amicus brief climbed to 41 percent. Throughout the Reagan years, the S.G.’s office took part in 62 percent of the cases that the Court decided on the merits—on the basis of the law and the facts—rather than on technical or procedural grounds. It was involved as a party in 61 percent, in 39 percent as an amicus, almost twice the rate as under Cox.

For Fried, the equivalent of Baker was the Thornburgh abortion case. In 1973, Roe v. Wade had established, 7-2, the constitutional right to abortion. In 1983, the Court had affirmed that right, 6-3, saying “the doctrine of stare decisis”—following precedent—“demands respect in a society governed by the rule of law.” In 1986 in Thornburgh, by 5-4, the Court reaffirmed the right, with the majority correcting a key assertion in the government’s brief, which said that lower federal courts had showed “unabashed hostility” to state attempts to regulate abortion; the majority opinion said it was the states that showed hostility to the right to abortion.

Where Cox had hesitated about Baker, Fried was decisive in Thornburgh. Cox felt constrained by what courts said the law was. Fried didn’t. Stirring immense controversy, his brief called for striking down the right to abortion only three years after the Court affirmed it, because “the textual, doctrinal, and historical basis for Roe v. Wade is so far flawed” and it “is a source of such instability in the law that this Court should reconsider that decision and on reconsideration abandon it.”

In 2009, in The Journal of Politics, the political scientist Patrick C. Wohlfarth wrote that Fried’s aggressive approach had ill effects. “Generally speaking,” he said, “a solicitor general who politicizes the office acts as a forceful advocate for executive policy at the expense of assisting the Court.” The price Fried paid, Wohlfarth showed in a
statistical analysis, was a decline of 15 percentage points in his success rate compared to his Republican predecessor. Importantly, the analysis showed that other S.G.s paid a similar price: “the Court’s perceptions of the S.G.’s political bias” exerted “a systematic, negative impact on the office’s credibility.”

Yet seen in longer perspective, the contrast between Fried’s record and Cox’s is less significant than this: Cox started a trend that Fried accelerated. Most S.G.s since have continued to increase it. In the Obama administration, the S.G.’s office took part in 82 percent of the merits cases the Court decided. Among them, it took part in 43 percent as a party and 57 percent as an amicus—almost three times Cox’s rate as an amicus and almost 50 percent higher than Fried’s.

Wohlfarth’s article was based on an analysis of “all voluntary amici curiae filed by the solicitor general’s office during Supreme Court terms 1961–2003”—under every S.G. from Cox through Theodore B. Olson for President George W. Bush. He omitted amicus briefs the S.G. filed at the request of the Court, so the data reflect only cases where the S.G. chose to file and was especially likely to present a view favored by his administration—to make a political statement. When the level of “S.G. politicization” climbed from the low end to the high, Wohlfarth found that the Court’s support for the S.G.’s position fell from 87 percent to 60 percent.

He shared the data from the ’61 through ’03 terms and brought it current through the 2014 term, near the end of Obama S.G. Donald B. Verrilli Jr.’s five-year tenure. In the past half-century, the share of voluntary amicus briefs has increased almost fivefold.

When Fried returned to Harvard, he published an instructive book in 1991 called Order and Law about his time as S.G. that put his service in a more scholarly perspective. He shared what he called Reagan’s “gut-level dislike for the pretensions of government in general.” The “Reagan Revolution” challenged those pretensions. They included, among others, “an exaggerated faith in bureaucracy and government expertise,” especially the federal courts as “major bureaucratic actors, enthusiastically, self-consciously enlisting in the movement to substitute the judgments and values of the nonproductive sector of society—lawyers, judges, bureaucrats, politicians—for the self-determination of the entrepreneurs and workers who create wealth.”

To Fried, the 20 or so career lawyers in the S.G.’s office carried on the Cox approach:

In an important sense government is law. This is an ideal that entails a kind of regularity, objectivity, and professional technique apart from—maybe even above—politics. These brilliant and hardworking lawyers had signed up in the service of that ideal. They had not enlisted in the Reagan Revolution. What they consistently failed to see was the extent to which the traditions and precedents of the office had become clogged with commitments and assumptions that were in fact political. I was constantly being told that I should not intervene in cases where all I had to add was a philosophical statement about how the law should come out. I was supposed to represent the interest of “government” in general—that is, the ability of government to go about its work, whatever it may be, as freely as possible. The political bias of this attitude was obscured because since the 1930s the prerogatives of the federal government had been overwhelmingly involved in the prevention of a liberal, regulatory agenda.

Fried wrote, “In a real sense the Solicitor General is responsible for the government’s legal theories, its legal philosophy.” He told me recently, referring to those passages, “What those statements leave out is the continuing validity of the view of law as ‘regularity, objectivity, and professional technique apart from—maybe even above—politics.’ I certainly believe that now and I hope I believed it then.” In other words, it was important to challenge the political commitments and assumptions embedded in the traditions and precedents of the office, but to do so as respectfully as career lawyers articulated them.

Order and Law laid out what has more or less become the norm for S.G.s in every administration since, and why Rebecca Mae Salokar, in her S.G. study, concluded, “The Solicitor General of the United States is an important political actor.”

The first Reagan S.G., Rex E. Lee, whom Fried replaced, was a conservative worn down by pressure from other political appointees to take aggressively conservative positions in social-agenda cases—to call for striking down the right to abortion after the Court signaled it wouldn’t, restrict affirmative action more than the Court said it was ready to, and allow spoken religious prayer in public schools after the Court compromised at allowing only silent prayer, for example. He took conservative positions in the cases, but said he felt constrained by the law’s “careful modulations.”

When Lee left office after four years, in 1985, he told me in an interview, “There has been this notion that my job is to press the administration’s policies at every turn and announce true conservative principles through the pages of my briefs. It is not. I’m the solicitor general, not the pamphleteer general.” Lee’s phrase conveyed the essence of the difference between the traditional ideal that Cox championed and the political reality that Fried explained.
and that now prevails. By his time, in key cases, the S.G. had become the pamphleteer general—the chief articulator of the administration's legal philosophy.

The Counselor’s Role Reduced

After his s.g. service, Lee helped the Washington, D.C., office of a national law firm develop a Supreme Court practice. That was the start of a modern Supreme Court bar outside the S.G.’s office. By the 1980s, the emergence of the global economy and the increase in the size of business deals transformed the market for corporate legal services. As firms mushroomed to provide the gamut of them, a Supreme Court practice embellished their offerings, especially with the prestige of a former S.G. leading it. Of Lee’s 10 successors (excluding the current S.G.), only one hasn’t formally led or joined a private practice or contributed to one: Justice Kagan. Aibel, professor of law Richard Lazarus worked as a young lawyer in the S.G.’s office under Fried. A decade ago, in an article titled “Advocacy Matters Before and Within the Supreme Court,” he wrote that “what has gone wholly unrecognized by all, including legal scholars,” was how this emergence of a Supreme Court bar of elite attorneys was “quietly transforming the Court and the nation’s laws.”

The new Supreme Court bar quickly became successful, influencing the Court’s docket and winning for its clients. In the Court’s 1980 term, expert counsel outside the S.G.’s office filed only six successful Court petitions, a 5.7 percent success rate. By the 2006 term, when Lazarus was writing, the tally was 28 petitions and 44 percent. The new bar, he spotlighted, was shifting the Court’s docket “to topics more responsive to the concerns of private business” by changing the justices’ priorities and interests. The bar has successfully persuaded the Court to take many business cases and helped make the Roberts Court strongly pro-business.

Lazarus didn’t pay a lot of attention to how the rise of this group affected the S.G.’s office, beyond the new opportunity for lawyers to move to prestigious, high-paying jobs while continuing to practice before the Court. But the bar’s docket-shaping contributed to the evolution in the S.G.’s role, too. The S.G.’s office continued to decide which government cases it wanted to take to the Court or to keep from getting there, but its overall influence on the Court’s docket shrank considerably. It has also appeared much less often as a petitioner (the party that lost in a lower court and is asking the Court to reverse that ruling) than as a respondent (the party that won and now must defend that victory). The respondent is much more likely to lose. These shifts were intensified by a steep drop in the docket’s size, from an average of more than 150 merits cases a year in the early 1980s to 74 in the past five years.

The S.G.’s role is strikingly different than when Cox filled it two generations ago. As the balance between the S.G.’s advocacy as a party in a case and as an amicus has shifted to the latter, the balance between his character as a counselor to the Court and as an advocate for the executive branch has shifted, too. The S.G. retains a counseling function. The focus of career lawyers in the S.G.’s office on the long-term interests of the law, a former S.G. said, is “a very strong force within the office” and “you’d be risking a calamitous tenure as S.G. if you didn’t pay significant heed to that perspective.” But the S.G.’s role is measurably more political. Except in rare circumstances, the S.G. doesn’t hesitate to enter any case with a significant impact on public policy. With rare exceptions, the Supreme Court seems to expect the S.G.’s office to weigh in.

This former S.G. said, “The change in expectations has been so great that the action that would raise eyebrows and create the risk of negative inferences that might be unwarranted is when the United States doesn’t participate.” He went on, “This expectation on the part of the Court that this is a difficult, sensitive matter and we want to hear what the United States has to say about it means that S.G. must participate.” He went on, “This expectation on the part of the Court is that they are going to be in the middle of something that’s highly politicized.”

The challenge to what’s left of the S.G.’s role as counselor to the Court now rarely arises from threats to its “independence” by other political appointees. S.G.s are superb lawyers, but they are carefully vetted. The legal philosophy each one brings to the office is well known.

In their 2012 volume The Solicitor General and the United States Supreme Court, the political scientists Ryan C. Black and Ryan J. Owens used data from the 1946 through the 2010 Court terms, and a statistical technique called matching, to compare the S.G.’s influence on the Court in general—in setting its docket, in how it comes out in cases, in the opinions justices write, and even in how they treat precedent—and how these elements differ when the S.G. isn’t involved. They found that the S.G.’s office “influences every major aspect of the Court’s decision-
making process,” because of “its objectivity and professionalism.”

Their analysis is not historical and doesn’t concentrate on the changes in influence in the past generation, as Jacqueline Bell and Cristina Violante did last October in Law360. They found a startling decline in the S.G.’s win rate in the past generation: “The S.G.’s office fell short of its 30-year average win rate in 8 of the past 10 terms.”

One factor was the success of the Supreme Court bar. The S.G. now has excellent competition. Another was politics. Some of the decline, they wrote, was “the natural result of a liberal solicitor general representing a liberal administration tangling with a court that, by some measures, is one of the most conservative in decades.”

The overall decline also masked big exceptions to that pattern, like the 2014 term when the Court decided same-sex marriage is a fundamental right. The term ended so well for Donald Verrilli that former acting S.G. Walter Dellinger gushed in Slate, “This may be the greatest Supreme Court term any solicitor general has ever had.”

Black’s and Owen’s analysis doesn’t take account of the increase in voluntary amicus filings since the end of the 2003 term when Patrick Wohlforth’s analysis ended. The increased politicization of the S.G.’s filings and the continued high win rate of parties the S.G. supported as an amicus bolsters the view that, while the S.G. has become more political, the political Court has come to discount that.

Course Reversed
When the Senate approved Noel Francisco as S.G. last September, the headline of the Courthouse News Service was “Senate OKs Federalist Society Nominee for US Solicitor General.” The society is the organization of conservative lawyers started in the Reagan era that grooms and screens conservative candidates for judgeships and executive-branch positions—the “single outside group,” Linda Greenhouse ’68 wrote in The New York Times, from which Trump accepted “a predigested, preapproved list of potential nominees” from which to make his recent Court pick. Francisco’s ideological profile made it unsurprising that his Senate confirmation vote was close—50 to 47—and completely along party lines.

Last summer, Adam Liptak wrote in the Times about the Trump administration’s reversals of Obama administration positions in major cases about rights of workers and about rules for cleaning up voter rolls: “The decisions to change course cannot have been made lightly, as lawyers in the solicitor general’s office, the elite unit of the Justice Department that represents the federal government in the Supreme Court, know that switching sides comes at a cost to the office’s prized reputation for continuity, credibility and independence.” The Trump administration ended up reversing positions of the Obama administration in four major Court cases.

In 1992, Rebecca Mae Salokar said she had found only one example of this kind of shift between 1959 and 1989. Griffin Bell, attorney general in the Carter administration when that happened, wrote in his memoir that it was almost an axiom that a reversal in a case would be seen as the result of a new “administration imposing its policy views on the Justice Department despite the department’s contrary judgment of the law.”

Near the start of Francisco’s argument at the Court in the voter-rolls case, Justice Sotomayor interrupted to address that reversal. She said, “General, could you tell me, there’s a 24-year history of solicitor generals of both political parties under presidents of both political parties who have taken a position contrary to yours.” She went on, “How did the solicitor general’s office change its mind?”

To carry out the law’s prohibition against removing anyone from the rolls because he has not voted, Francisco replied, those predecessors had read into the National Voter Registration Act a requirement that a state can start removing someone from its voter rolls only if it has reliable evidence that he moved away and is no longer a resident. The Trump S.G.’s office abandoned that reading because the requirement is “found nowhere in the text” of the law.

He advocated upholding an Ohio law that let the state do what the federal law banned, by beginning the purging of people from the rolls only because they had not voted. The heart of that pro-

Today, the S.G. doesn’t hesitate to enter any case with a significant impact on public policy. With rare exceptions, the Supreme Court seems to expect the S.G.’s office to weigh in.
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Dick Friedman ’73—proud alumnus of both Fair Harvard and Sports Illustrated, where he toiled for many years—covers contemporary Crimson football for this magazine each fall, in lively, nuanced accounts resonant with the sport’s history (see page 28). Now he has dived deep into the glory days, a century and more ago, when big-time college football meant Harvard vs. Yale. In this excerpt from chapter eight of his new book, The Coach Who Strangled the Bulldog: How Harvard’s Percy Haughton Beat Yale and Reinvented Football, Friedman recalls the now unlikely-seeming origins of the industrial-strength “amateur” contests currently featured on campuses across the land (and national television broadcasts) each autumn and early winter.

Spanning the Charles River from Boylston [now Kennedy] Street to the entrance of Soldiers Field, the Larz Anderson Bridge opened in time for the 1913 season. Supplanting a narrow, rickety, wooden drawbridge that had been a choked, dust-kicking trial on game days, the sturdy, paved structure made the march from Harvard Square to the stadium more tolerable, especially for the multitudes who trekked across and back for the big games and championship games. Its very solidity and permanence also symbolized that the relationship—perhaps unholy—between colleges and sports was now set in stone.

Beginning as early as the 1880s, Harvard, Princeton, and Yale had decided that it was part of their mission, educational or not, to provide sporting entertainment for the masses. In the 1890s, Harvard president Charles W. Eliot decreed that his school would no longer play major football games at neutral sites, but on campus only. Within 20 years the Big Three all would have colossal stadiums, and game day had become a ritual, complete with spectacle, song, and spirit. For good or for ill, these institutions set the pattern that has been followed and refined by universities to this day.

There were many carpers, at Harvard and elsewhere. Muckraker Henry Beach Needham, in his 1905 McClure’s exposé, had put his finger on the win-at-all-costs mentality and the creeping realization that the cart was pulling the horse: “The physical development of the student body is neglected, that eleven men of the university may perform for the benefit of the public.” The disdain for the immersion into the muck of so-called big-time college sport drips...
from the comments of the eminent historian Samuel Eliot Morison, A.B. 1908, Ph.D. ’12, Litt.D. ’36, in Three Centuries of Harvard, his official history published for the University’s tricentennial in 1936. These included a swipe at another son of Harvard, Percy Duncan Haughton, A.B. 1899. “Haughton was the first of the modern ‘big-time coaches,’ and he certainly ‘delivered the goods,’” sniffs Morison, “but it may be questioned whether his talent for picturesque profanity made the game more enjoyable, or whether his strategical and tactical developments turned football in the right direction.” Give the man his “H”—for Harrumph!

Morison did concede a positive aspect: “The growth of athletics tended to integrate college life in the [Charles W.] Eliot era; participation in them, both as players and as managers, brought together men of the widest social origins, and victory over Yale in the four ‘major’ sports of football, baseball, rowing and track was something that the entire College prayed for.”

Those who deplored what football had wrought were bowled over like a would-be tackler in the way of Haughton’s gang of interferers. The athletic horse had left the athletic barn; though it would be reined in some after World War II, the rest of America took notice, especially of the financial windfalls a mighty team could generate. The school had become dependent on ever-burgeoning football receipts to fund its entire athletic program. In 1917, receipts for all of the school’s athletic events would be $155,608.72, with football delivering all but $12,461.53 of that total. (Football netted $166,688.34 that year, the athletic program as a whole only $38,302.64.) Thus football was funneling more than six figures in profit to the athletic association, keeping the rest of the department afloat.

Even amid unparalleled success on the field and at the gate, Harvard’s leaders—including those who championed the Crimson teams—acknowledged unease. Foremost was President A. Lawrence Lowell, Eliot’s successor, who accurately identified the emerging self-aggrandizing sports apparatuses. (Today the self-perpetuating athletic department expansion is labeled “the gold-plating of college sports.”) “The vast scale of the public games has brought its problems,” declared Lowell in his annual report for 1912. “They have long ceased to be an undergraduate diversion, managed entirely by the students, and maintained by their subscriptions. They have become great spectacles supported by the sale of tickets to thousands of people....Money comes easily and is easily spent under the spur of intense public interest in the result of the major contests, and a little laxity quickly leads to grave abuse.... Graduates, who form public opinion on these matters, must realize that intercollegiate victories are not the most important objects of college education. Nor must they forget the need of physical training for the mass of students by neglecting to encourage the efforts recently made to cultivate healthful sports among men who have no prospect of playing on the college teams.”

Many within the Harvard community complained that academically many of the star athletes were unworthy. These were not the functional illiterates who festoon too many college rosters today. The Crimson players had passed the entrance exam....most had, anyway. Many were admitted “with conditions.” But would they have been doing through classes in Sever Hall if not for their ability to punt or carry a football?

The schizophrenia was illustrated by the Harvard Alumni Bulletin.* At the same time that it was breathlessly printing play-by-play of the football games (complete with photos and diagrams), the publication also moralized. “Are our colleges and universities being injured or aided by the recruiting of boys who are brought to them because they are athletes...?” it editorialized in 1913. “We believe that this type of undergraduate...may be in every way a sound and wholesome person, and on the way to become a useful, and perhaps a leading, citizen; but if the college attracts him chiefly as an athletic club and a place to earn a sweater decorated with a precious letter, his path to...
usefulness should not lie through the college....The fact is that, driven
on by the enterprise of our sporting editors, we are as a people losing
our balance in the matter of athletics.”

Then as now, some were indig
nant about the “almost scandalous”
amounts spent to equip footballers.
Proclaimed the Bulletin in 1911—right
after the Crimson had been declared
national champion, and shortly after
Dean LeBaron R. Briggs had issued a
report criticizing the athletic depart-
ment’s management—“Some months
ago the Bulletin asked why it cost
$1000 per man to put a football squad
through a seven-weeks season when
that amount is more than it takes to
carry the average student through
an entire year....Why
should not the ac-
counts of the athletic
organizations be made
public in detail?!...We
daesay there would no longer be large
items of expenditure for ‘taxicabs as
the sole means of getting about, and for
costly dinners with wines and cigars.”

Others were aghast at the coarsening
of spirit engendered by the desperation
to beat Yale. The keening and barking
of the stadium crowds was perhaps
fine for the working classes watch-
ing the Red Sox at Fenway Park but it
was unworthy of Harvard men. After
Harvard superstar Charlie Brickley ’15
dropkicked the Elis into submission in 1913, one correspondent,
calling himself “Sporticus Antiquus,” was concerned about...the
tone. “Whenever Harvard had the ball on the Yale side of the field
during the recent game in the Stadium, the Yale crowd set up a great noise,
in order to drown, if possible, the sig-
als given to the Harvard men. So also,
whenever Brickley prepared to make
a drop or place kick, the Yale ‘rooters'
burst forth in shouts and cat-calls in
their effort to ‘rattle’ him.... Not only
Harvard men, but neutrals who belong
to neither university, and a saving rem-
nant of Yale men themselves, deprecate
a practise which mars the pleasure of
witnessing athletic contests.”

Well, then. Did this concern engen-
der widespread guilt? If
so, it was drowned out
by the shouts of vic-
tory. Fred Moore, the
Harvard Athletic Asso-
ciation graduate treasurer, summed up
the prevailing sentiment. In his report
for the fiscal year ending on July 31, 1915
(and thus encompassing the 1914 Yale
game), Moore wrote: “When the score
is 36 to 0, and the receipts from the game
are $138,000.00, it is rather difficult for the
manager to refuse the team and coaches
anything in reason they may desire.”

The football-industrial complex
had a multiplier effect. In 1916-17, ex-
penses for training table were $2,424.30, for doctors $2,791.66, for “rubbing” (masseurs—we hope) $1,318.25, for travel $6,477.66. The coaching staff got $9,630.00. Expense of games came to $16,603.93, a figure swelled by “expense of large games” (some of which was shared by the visitors). Eight undergraduates were required to look after the business part of the enterprise—a manager (a post that could be lucrative through the sale of program ads and hence was much coveted), a first assistant manager, and six assistant managers.

The Boston Globe in 1911 noted, “There are little sidelights to a big football game that are interesting. There were 276 student ushers at the Carlisle game, and there will be 300 or more at the Dartmouth and Yale games. There are also required 100 or more policemen. Lunch is served for these 400 men at 12 o’clock in the baseball cage. The details of management of a big football game are certainly considerable.”

Most spectators traveled to the stadium on foot or by streetcar, but with such a well-heeled (and well-wheeled) clientele, parking on Soldiers Field also became a thriving enterprise. In 1913, for the early-season games, a parking (or “checking”) space cost 25 cents; for Brown and Yale, a half-dollar. And the economic effect extended well beyond the stadium. For those shut out of the arena, Boston music halls offered scoreboards, running play-by-play, and even live entertainment. For the weekends of major games, hotels were booked months in advance, and the music halls featured big-name stars.

The spectators were just as glittering. As The New York Times reported the day after the 1910 Game at Yale, “Special trains, private cars and automobiles began rolling into New Haven by 9 o’clock this morning, and the entry of fashionable folk from New York and Boston kept up a steady procession.... There were thirty-five specials in all.... From Boston came Mayor John F. (Honey Fitz) Fitzgerald, among whose party was daughter Rose, who four autumns later would wed Joseph P. Kennedy, A.B. 1912.

Like other sports with mass appeal, such as baseball, horse racing, and boxing, football was producing its mandarin class of scribes. For the “championship” games, upwards of 150 reporters crammed the press box. They included the big names of the day: Grantland Rice, Damon Runyon, Ring Lardner, Heywood Broun (A.B. 1910), Herbert Reed (known as “Right Wing”) of The New York Tribune, Harry Cross of the Times, George Trevor of The [New York] Sun, plus correspondents from the major magazines such as Collier’s (which published the prestigious All-America team selected by Yale’s Walter Camp, “the Father of Football”) and Harper’s Weekly. In the week before the (please turn to page 82)
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The football industrial complex (continued from page 57)

Yale game, column inch after column inch was devoted to analyses, predictions, lineups, statistics, and features. The game itself got Page One treatment. The Boston Globe “Sportsman” declared in 1911 that “180 football writers and 50 operators will work in the press stand at the Harvard-Yale game Saturday....The only event in sport exceeding the Harvard-Yale game in its demand for wire service is the World’s [sic] Series in baseball, and that is in a class by itself.”

Already a few writers were going beyond play-by-play and glib commentary and, like Haughton, beginning to break the game down. In 1913 Herbert Reed published Football for Public and Player. Like a few of his press-box brethren, Reed had played the game—in his case, at Cornell under Pop Warner. In the era before players and modes of attack and defense could readily be identified, and at a time when the game was in flux, he explicated the action and what lay underneath in sensible language, with illustrative photos and x’s-and-o’s diagrams. It was Reed who, invoking the dictum of General William Tecumseh Sherman about an army, propagated the notion that a team needed a “soul” to be successful. “There was a ‘soul’—call it a personality if you prefer—in the Harvard eleven of 1912, and Captain [Percy] Wendell [A.B. 1913] made the most of it,” Reed declared. Like most of his colleagues, Reed was an unapologetic proselytizer of the sport. “If football is a game...and not so serious a business as many of its opponents believe,” he wrote in the opening chapter of his book, “it is, nevertheless, the most important game we have, the sport that makes the heaviest demand upon every fine quality of the best possible athlete. It is the crucible in which character is moulded at an age when character is in the process of formation—it is, to change the simile, the white light that beats upon a young man’s actions and ideals.”

In contrast to the nationally known names who descended on Cambridge for the big games were the journeymen reporters for the Boston dailies, of which there were a half-dozen in 1913. Since Haughton was so press-averse, they had to rely on other sources and their own powers of observation. George Carens of the Brahmin-oriented Boston Transcript had an in: It was his analysis and his paper’s photos that Haughton had his team scrutinize during Monday practice.

But the true fixture was The Boston Globe’s Melville E. Webb Jr., who eventually (he lived until 1961) would attend 50 Harvard-Yale games. Soon after the stadium opened, with his fellow writers grousing about their substandard accommodations, Webb helped Fred Moore design the press box at the rim of the amphitheatre. Webb made sure to give his colleagues special work areas and writing tables. His efforts were so successful that when Yale and Princeton opened their stadiums in 1914, they consulted with him on the construction of their press accommodations, which in turn influenced later press-box design.

Webb was not a colorful or vivid writer in the mold of Rice or Lardner. But for the daily and Sunday Globe reader in those pre-radio and TV days, he performed two bread-and-butter functions. First, he gave a detailed account of the game that unsparingly noted strengths and weaknesses (including those of the Crimson). He also deployed statistics about as well as one could during those imprecise days. Second, during the week and in postseason summaries, he was most alert to trends. Webb saw through the big crowds to posit that the sport would lose popularity if it did not make it easier to score points. As the rules changed, he noted that bulk and mass, formerly the most important attributes of a powerful team, would need to be supplemented if not supplanted by athletic ability, speed, and versatility. Somewhat in the manner that no one can envision his parents having sex, the modern reader is constantly surprised by the sophistication of Webb and his fellow scribes.

Once inside the amphitheatre, the spectators were treated not only to a football game, but also to grand theatre. First came the riot of hues. “It was a gold mine for the hawkers,” reported the Times of the scene in New Haven in 1910. “Get your colors.’ they yelled until the were hoarse. The flower vendors, with just the kind of flower every girl should wear...Souvenirs of every kind were on tap—little yellow leather footballs pinned on blue and crimson ribbons and large colored letters which could be pinned on the lapel of your coat....” Programs cost 50 cents and were in shape of a football, the contents were loaded with ads for cruises, stylish men’s and women’s “furnishings,” and luxury

Spirited sheet music from 1902 (top), and the varsity footballers attacking the tackling dummy near the Stadium, September 26, 1912
Marching bands would not arrive until after World War I; Harvard’s would be formed in 1919. Instead, the undergraduate sections offered organized cheers and sang school songs. In 1910, when singing “The Marseillaise” (not the French national anthem, but a beloved fight song), the Harvard section, in a precursor of the latter-day “card sections,” caused a sensation by forming, at a signal, a white H.

The programs printed the more popular songs, some passed down through the years, others the product of recent competitions. The 1912 edition contains a few that still are sung: Harvard’s “Our Director” (“Three cheers for Harvard! And down with Yale! RAH! RAH! RAH!”), and Yale’s “Boola,” “Bright College Years” (“For God, For Country and For Yale”), and “Undertaker Song” (“Ooh! More work for the undertaker/Another job for the casket maker; In the local cemetery they are very, very busy on a brand-new grave. No hope for Harvard.”). But in the Great Sing-off of 1912, Yale had the composing equivalent of Charlie Brickley in its head cheerleader: one C.A. Porter ’13. Cole Porter composed the new ditty, “Bingo Eli Yale”:

Bingo, Bingo, Bingo, that’s the Lingo!
Eli is bound to win.
There’s to be a victory,
So watch the team begin.
Bingo, Bingo, Harvard’s team can aught avail;
Fight! Fight! Fight with all your might!
For Bingo, Bingo, Eli Yale!

In 1914, the Crimson riposted with the rousing “Ten Thousand Men of Harvard,” written by Alfred Putnam ’18. If not exactly accurate concerning undergraduate manpower—at any given moment, there might be 3,000 in the College, and today there are about 6,000, half of them women—it became the signature fight song, with its foregone conclusion:

Ten thousand men of Harvard
Want vict’ry today,
For they know that o’er old Eli
Fair Harvard holds sway.
So then we’ll conquer old Eli’s men,
And when the game ends, we’ll sing again:
Ten thousand men of Harvard
Gained vict’ry today!

There were many, on campus and off, who debated whether all the energy the young men at these citadels of learning were devoting to sweat, to songs, to cheers, to sophomoric scribbling was properly directed. They occasionally sermonized. “If Jesus Had Gone to the Yale-Harvard Football Game” was the subject which Rev. Albert R. Williams, pastor of the Maverick Congregational Church, East Boston, spoke on last night,” reported the Globe in 1911. Quoth the Reverend Williams: “If Jesus had gone to the Yale-Harvard game I think He would have much admired the Spartan courage of these men. He would have been glad to find that the players were not all tutti frutti, chocolat eclair, champagne Charlie boys. He would have been glad to find that they were not the up-all-night-and-in-all-day kind....

“If Jesus had gone to the game he would have enjoyed the enthusiastic cheering which came crashing down across the arena, but He would have asked, ‘Is there as much enthusiasm for My work?’”
In 2006, Nell Irvin Painter, recognized by seemingly every venerable institution—Harvard doctorate, Princeton professor emerita, Guggenheim fellowship, to name just a few—boxed up her accolades as a historian and went back to school to become an artist. Now, 76 years old and 12 years deep into her second lifetime, her decision has been well documented and much discussed, not least by Painter herself, for whom a whirlwind press tour has followed the publication of her bracingly honest memoir, *Old in Art School*, this spring.

But in her studio in a red-brick, nineteenth-century former toy factory in Newark, New Jersey, Painter, Ph.D. ’74, turns unforthcoming. Asked why she might bring together this drawn figure with that digital backdrop, such-and-such block of text with so-and-so loud field of color, she answers simply: Because she can. Because she likes the way it looks. Because to do so brings her pleasure. Yet pleasure is not enough: Painter insistently separates herself from the ranks of Sunday watercolor painters. More than a fish-out-of-water tale, Painter’s memoir testifies to her unusual ambition.

The gatekeepers at the Rhode Island School of Design were not encouraging. Their reactions to Painter’s work, and even her presence, ranged from passive disinterest to racist, sexist, or ageist dismissal. Painter herself was dismayed to find her painting hand—dormant since college—rusty, her “twentieth-century eyes” unsophisticated. She set herself to tireless, iterative image-making, but even that drew criticism. Calling her “dogged,” one RISD...
In 1982, Sharmila Sen’s family arrived in Cambridge from Calcutta with six bags and $60, dressed in their best clothes. In India, they were upper-caste Hindu Bengalis, Anglophone-educated and downwardly mobile, their privilege precarious. They would soon learn that the United States had its own hierarchy. Not Quite Not White: Losing and Finding Race in America (Penguin Books, $16) retraces that journey, its comic scenes from childhood—studying Hawaii Five-O, whipping up no-bake Jell-O desserts every day—cut with wry observation.

America gave Sen ’92 new manners (“The Proper Use of Salt and Pepper”; “The Blessed Sneeze”; “The Indoor Voice”); more deeply, over time, she also “got race”: “I got race the way people get chicken pox. I also got race as one gets a pair of shoes or a cell phone. It was something new, something to be tried on for size, something to be used to communicate with others. In another register, I finally got race, in the idiomatic American sense of fully comprehending something. You get what I’m saying? Yeah, I get you.”

In this passage, Sen, now executive editor-at-large at Harvard University Press, recalls the flush of humiliation she felt as a 12-year-old when people asked why her family had immigrated:

We weren’t chic expats or political dissidents with lofty ideologies. We were three people moving from a country with fewer resources to one with greater resources. I doubt we added glamour or value to our surroundings.

“Why did your parents come to America?”

“For better jobs.”

To this day this small exchange—repeated endlessly throughout my years in the United States—determines the social hierarchy between my interlocutor and me. I wish I could say my parents possessed some extraordinary professional skill for which an American institution wooed them. We did not hold noble political or religious convictions that were at odds with the government of India. There was no war raging in my city and we were not being resettled. Homo economicus has a duller, more prosaic story to tell.

“Why did your parents come to America?”

“For better jobs.”

The native-borns nod and feel pleased that they are citizens of a country that offers better everything—jobs, homes, food, schools, music. I would feel the same if I was in their shoes. It must feel good to be born in a country that has more wealth than other places, to have the hardest currency in your wallet. It must feel good to be generous and invite others—after intense vetting and preselection—to share in this plenty. Even though I had no say at all in my family’s decision to emigrate, I felt my shoulders weighed down with the multitude of the host country. This plenitude of which I was to be the grateful recipient was evidence that white people were superior to people like me. How else could one nation be so wealthy and another be so poor; one country have so much to give and another stand in a queue to receive? The inequality of nations was surely a sign that some races were morally, physically, and intellectually superior to others. The inequality of nations surely had nothing to do with man, but was shaped by Providence.

“I’m standing up for my right to be myself,” Painter says. “And that can seem odd.”

criticisms were attempts to keep her within bounds: let the black historian write black history. Her ambition was a “problem” for the most academic historians only dream of, some critics called it “grandiose,” “superficial,” and “too ambitious.” To Painter, these
excerpts from Harriet Jacobs’s *Incidents in the Life of a Slave Girl* have been transformed into imagery though digital projection and hand-painted lettering. A playwright friend commissioned images of Ella Fitzgerald and Hilton Als to illustrate an edition of her work; stage flats commissioned by an opera company feature Booker T. Washington and W.E.B. Du Bois. Everywhere in her work, towering figures of the historical black pantheon make glancing eye contact with the viewer, before slipping out of sight.

Painter understands better than most the roots of the demand that black artists and public figures make themselves legible and unthreatening to a white audience. Much of her career as a historian focused on how figures like Sojourner Truth evaded and manipulated society’s gaze. When she began her memoir, the same conviction that brought her to the top of the ivory tower (and the *New York Times* bestseller list) assured her that she had a story worth telling; writing the book was, in a way, “claiming a privilege” that readers would find interesting, Painter admits. But telling her story isn’t the same thing as explaining herself, or making her life digestible or even political. Instead: “I’m standing up for my right to be myself,” she says. “And that can seem odd.”

At the far end of the basement studio, one white wall has been cleared of framed images, photocopies, and sketches; a bright light shines over it. 2018 has been the year of the book, but soon there will be time for new projects, Painter hopes. She wants to make an artist’s book—something between a folio of paintings and a text-driven work like the memoir—about Emmett Till. Last year, the art world was seized by controversy around the exhibition of Dana Schutz’s painting *Open Casket* in the Whitney Biennial. Critics questioned whether Schutz, a white artist who is an acquaintance of Painter’s, had the right to make, distribute, or profit from an image based on an iconic photograph from Till’s funeral. Painter wants to make her own version of the painting to consider critically what she calls the history, the forgetting, and the rediscovery of Till. “I do this not to better the world or necessarily to make art history,” Painter says. “It’s not art history. It’s mine.”

---

“Little Shards of Dissonance”

*An oratorio adapted from Langston Hughes*

by sophia nguyen

At some point, while preparing for the Rockport Chamber Music Festival, Davóne Tines ’09 and Michael Shachter ’09 were freshly struck by their circumstances. Their piece *Were You There*, a musical meditation on racial violence, starts with Handel and ends with Tines inviting the audience to join him in singing “We Shall Overcome.” The friends were rehearsing in the Massachusetts town’s soaring concert hall, its entire back wall made of glass. Out that window they could see people partying on Cape Ann, enjoying the water, celebrating the Fourth of July. “Davone and I had a moment when we looked at each other,” Schachter recalls. “We’re singing about police brutality, and we’re amidst a lot of wealth and people who could go through years of their lives without confronting—not only any racialized violence, but literally any other race. We felt like, it’s bizarre—we have to be messengers or evangelists for something that people might otherwise have no real need to confront.”

This is a contrast they’ve grown familiar with, as creators of classical music: presenting art about injustice in gracious venues. It’s one they’ll likely face again with their next collaboration: *The Black Clown*, with music by Schachter and its title role sung by Tines, adapts text by Langston Hughes for the stage, and will open the American Repertory Theater’s (A.R.T.) new season.

The poem is obscure, its structure strange. Introducing it as “a dramatic monologue to be spoken by a pure-blooded Negro...
in the white suit and hat of a clown, to the music of a piano, or an orchestra,” Hughes lays out the text in two columns. “The Poem” contains the Clown’s lines, and “The Mood”—itself a kind of lyric verse—provides cues like, “A gay and low-down blues,” or “Flinching under the whip.” Mourning his position as “the fool of the whole world,” the narrator recounts the history of slavery and “the long struggle for life” in its wake.

Schachter and Tines, who met in the Harvard-Radcliffe Collegium Musicum, began the project at a tumultuous time for both. In 2010, Tines was working various gigs, including singing in the choir of the National Shrine in Washington, D.C.; during a lull in rehearsals, he emailed Schachter to propose collaborating on something new. Schachter, who’d landed at the University of Michigan’s master’s program in composition after a year studying music in India, had recently read Hughes’s poem. They decided to set it to music. By 2012, Schachter had sketched out some ideas while writing for the Michigan orchestra. Tines, meanwhile, had enrolled at and grown frustrated with Juilliard, where the faculty kept changing their assessments of his vocal range—a bass-baritone with an equally strong falsetto—and what repertoire he should train in. For a spell after his 2013 graduation, he thought he might go into artist management instead.

Eventually the friends developed a 20-minute song cycle from the Hughes poem, thinking they might record an album or perform it in concert (“with Davóne in a tux, and his hand on the piano,” says Schachter). Things accelerated when, in 2015, Tines joined the A.R.T.’s production of the Civil War opera Crossing, in a role written for him by his friend Matt Aucoin ’12. Schachter and Tines performed the cycle for the A.R.T.’s producers, who said they were interested in it—but as an evening-length work.

Now, some eight years since that first email exchange, Schachter is working on various choral and orchestral commissions and a monograph on musical aesthetics; Tines has a densely booked performance schedule, including roles in new operas by John Adams ’69, A.M. ’72, D.Mus. ’12, and Kaija Saariaho. And The Black Clown, running about 80 minutes, will premiere with a cast of 13 and an orchestra of 10, using dance-band era techniques like growling and sliding.

Even as the production expanded, they hewed to the original text, says Schachter: “We treated it in a way that is more typical of a Handel oratorio.” The Messiah, for example, tells a single, simple narrative, but “You create power through repetition and cyclical musical behavior, within a pocket of the story.” They call theirs a “vaudeville oratorio.” It jumps through different genres—from blues narratives, which use a 12-bar form and nested repetition to drive at a musical idea, to South Indian music, where the text repeats, rising in pitch and complexity—to sound out the idea of inheriting oppression across generations.

The only other lyrics come from spirituals specified by Hughes in “The Mood”: “Sometimes I Feel Like a Motherless Child” and “Nobody Knows the Trouble I’ve Seen.” The influence of religious music is also on full display in the oratorio’s climax, which builds on gospel idioms. The Clown’s declaration—“Rise from the bottom! Out of the slime!/Look at the stars yonder! Calling through time!”—is set to a standard chord progression (a two chord, a four, then a five, resolving on a one). It then repeats at double speed, then triple, then sextuple, overlaid with new harmonic layers. “The last time, you hear these supervening chords, which are quite dissonant, underneath the structure. Davóne and I nicknamed them ‘space chords,’” Schachter explains. “It’s this otherworldly, not quite human glint of light that’s cascading on the whole thing.”

“We get to have fun with plumbing the depths of that cadence,” adds Tines. “Really stretching it out, to further illuminate what Hughes is trying to say: We are subjects of an entire lineage of oppression, but we can look to the stars out yonder. We are calling from all of time, for all that we’ve been through, and all that we hope might come.”

Schachter says, “Getting to that point took us literally years,” much of it spent deciding how to interpret the poem’s ending lines: “I was once a black clown/But now—I’m a man!” “Is his journey a success? Is it something that’s a personal success amidst a larger futility?” asks Tines.

The creators don’t want to give away the oratorio’s ending—but what they say about the score offers hints. Even the biggest and most up-tempo chords, swelling with emotional catharsis, are embedded with what the composer calls “little shards of dissonance.” “I wanted to get this feeling that though we’re in a certain present, we can’t escape the past,” Schachter says. “That we’re in these histories that brought us to where we are now.”
Slightly Supernatural

In Laura van den Berg’s fiction, the deeply strange is ordinary.

by LYDIALYLE GIBSON

It wasn’t until after she moved into the haunted house that Laura van den Berg’s latest novel really started coming together. The Third Hotel follows Clare, a young widow who takes a trip to Havana in the wake of her husband’s sudden death and then begins to see him everywhere. Van den Berg had been batting around a few ideas for a while, loose and abstract but promisingly fertile: the strange pull of solitary travel, the power of tourism to reshape cultures and economies, and the ways people talk about new places. An Orlando native who’d done two book tours in close succession, van den Berg, who is now a Briggs-Copeland lecturer in English, had also started tracking the American tourist boom in Cuba after the United States lifted its travel ban. “So I had all these hazy ideas,” she says, “but I didn’t really understand how they all fit together.”

Then in 2015 she won the Bard Fiction Prize, which came with a writing fellowship—and a house on the college’s vast, pastoral campus, a two-story duplex at the bottom of a small hill with a screened-in porch. Van den Berg is mostly joking when she calls it haunted, but she’s also sort of serious. There were corners where her dog, normally quiet, would sit and bark obsessively, “like he was seeing something that I couldn’t see.” And the attic stairs kept unfolding themselves into the hallway in the middle of the night. “I would wake up in the morning, after doing my best to make sure the attic was securely closed, and I would find the stairs unfolded there, like some terrible invitation.”

Later that year, a family member suffered a medical emergency, and after receiving the news, van den Berg drove her rental car into a ditch. She wasn’t hurt—the ditch
Laura van den Berg

was shallow—but she remembers feeling she had been “dwelling in a slightly supernatual space,” she says. “And also, this lightning strike of grief and a rash action that followed it—that kind of gave way to the world of the book.”

The Third Hotel is van den Berg’s fourth book. In 2015, she published Find Me, a dystopian novel whose narrator is a young woman abandoned at birth, searching for her mother amid a deadly plague that begins with sudden memory loss. The New York Times called Find Me “pleasingly strange” and “impressively original,” and a Salon reviewer declared van den Berg “the best young writer in America.” Preceding the novel came two short-story collections: What the World Will Look Like When All the Water Leaves Us and The Isle of Youth (listed by a dozen outlets as one of 2013’s best books of fiction). Now 35, van den Berg did not begin writing—or even, she says, reading much literature—until her second year at Rollins College, a liberal-arts school just outside Orlando. She signed up for a creative-writing workshop, looking for a straightforward course and finding instead a calling. Among the readings was Amy Hempel’s “In the Cemetery Where Al Jolson Is Buried,” and it set van den Berg on fire. She switched majors from psychology to English and after graduation began an M.F.A. at Emerson College in Boston. “So, a hard turn,” she says, “toward this amazing, brutal love.” She arrived at Harvard in 2016, along with her husband, fellow fiction writer and Briggs-Copeland lecturer Paul Yoon.

In the novel, Clare first catches sight of her dead husband outside the Museum of the Revolution, wearing a white linen suit she’s never seen before and looking up at the sky. The trip to Havana had been meant for the two of them; her husband, Richard, was a horror-film scholar, and they’d planned to attend a festival showing a Cuban zombie movie called Revolución Zombi. She begins following him through the city, watching him buying mangoes from a fruit market, eating alone in a spare apartment, reading the newspaper at a café, drinking at a bar.

Dreamlike and mysterious and almost hypnotically absorbing, The Third Hotel is a moving exploration of grief and marriage. Experimenting with horror-film tropes and dynamics, van den Berg also mines sharp, subtle insights on gender and misogyny, art, loneliness, the afterlife.

A casual horror fan since childhood (“I’m one of those weird people who finds terrifying myself in a really scary movie to be cathartic and relaxing”), she became a bit of a horror-film scholar herself while researching the novel. “Good horror gets to the heart of some really difficult human stuff,” she says. “Death and the afterlife, and what, if anything, awaits us on the other side. And also: the way that what you’re blind to—willfully blind to—can unravel your life. That your secrets, your betrayals, your crimes—there comes a time when you have to reckon with the consequences.” Horror also explores how human crime can manifest in a large-scale social way. “Zombie films have been a really powerful medium for exploring social questions, questions of social violence, historical violence, historical trauma. All this is narrowly deep in horror.”

The Third Hotel also owes its surreal aesthetic to van den Berg’s childhood in Florida (Clare has roots there, too), where “the pedestrian and the deeply strange are always afoot,” she says. She remembers on one hand the bottomless teenage boredom of wandering suburban malls and driving around endlessly. And yet “on the other hand, the uncanny is always there. Florida is a place of extremes: the weather is very extreme—the heat, the storms—and nature is very extreme.” Any body of water larger than a puddle is likely inhabited by alligators, and the animals were forever lumbering into her family’s yard and climbing trees. “It took me a really long time before I could embrace swimming in a lake in New England without worrying about getting eaten by something,” she admits. Meanwhile, her parents, both raised rural, kept a running zoo in the house: cats, dogs, snakes, ferrets, hamsters, chickens, and for one year a wolf named Natasha, with piercing blue eyes, which they adopted as a pup on a family trip to Utah. “I like making work where the uncanny and the ordinary are intertwined,” she says. “That doesn’t feel alien to me; it feels real.”

True Lies

Jill Lepore excavates the history of America, down to its bedrock values.
by CASEY N. CEP

Only the ampersand is still visible; Benjamin Franklin’s thick blackslashes hide the words themselves. It was two weeks before the United States would declare its independence from Great Britain, and Thomas Jefferson, having finished tinkering with his draft of the declaration, asked Franklin to review it. The elder statesman’s changes were few, but critical: where Jefferson had written “these truths” were “sacred & undeniable,” Franklin crossed out the adjectives, and suggested instead that they were “self-evident.”

According to Kemper professor of American history Jill Lepore, it was the edit that changed the nation. Her astounding new ac-

These Truths: A History of the United States, by Jill Lepore (Norton, $39.95)
count of the American experiment—from when Columbus first stumbled on its shores to when President Donald Trump promised to put walls around them—is titled These Truths because of that substitution of evidence for reverence. Lepore argues that the revision meant rights were no longer “the stuff of religion” but “the stuff of science.” The founders grounded their principles in reason, not because it necessarily conflicts with faith, but because anything self-evident could be observed, queried, and debated.

These Truths does just that, surveying American history to see when the country reflected its founding commitments and when it belied them. Historians are often cheerleaders or critics, but Lepore is less like Herodotus or Howard Zinn, and more like Hercule Poirot: sorting out what happened, but also why and how. “Between reverence and worship, on the one side, and irreverence and contempt, on the other,” Lepore writes of her single-volume endeavor, “lies an uneasy path away from false pieties and petty triumphs over people who lived and died and committed both their acts of courage and their sins and errors long before we committed ours.”

To walk such a path all the way through American history is an unlikely task for one of the country’s leading microhistorians, who previously focused her considerable intellect on obscure figures from Benjamin Franklin’s sister Jane to the peculiar psychologist who created “Wonder Woman,” using their lives to tell the story of broader cultural trends and historical movements.

Delightfully, though, Lepore conjures a cast in These Truths every bit as unruly as those in her earlier histories: Quaker preacher Benjamin Lay, who made his pokeberry-juice trick-bible bleed; activist Phyllis Schlafly, A.M. ’45, who torched the feminist tent of the GOP one newsletter at a time; black entrepreneur and intellectual David Walker, who stitched his revolutionary pamphlets into the lining of clothes; Samuel Morse, who sped up communication only by accident, while trying to create a code Catholics could not decipher; “Amazing Grace” Hopper, who programmed some of the earliest computers for the Navy; and the Christian conservative Rod Dreher, whose blog decries the end of Christendom and conservatism with every post.

In These Truths there are no heroes or vil-
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elping for liberty while denying it to oth-
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us the founders were not just hypocrites, but
copyscats: “A revolutionary tradition was
ed not by the English in America, but by
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bellions.” Though the founders might have
been reading John Locke and David Hume,
none needed a treatise to know that tyrann-
y could be resisted. They had heard about
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“Much of the time we spend in gatherings
with other people disappoints us,” warns
professional facilitator Priya Parker, M.P.P.
12. After this deflating introduction, The
Art of Gathering: How We Meet and
Why It Matters (Riverhead, $28) offers
a breezy guide to running get-togethers of
all shapes and sizes. Pointers include “the
kindness of exclusion” (when it’s done
well), a chart laying out the proper square-
foot-per-guest allotment for dance parties,
and an admonition: “Don’t be a chill host.”

“Are you a people sorter?” is the new “What’s your sign?”
Meanwhile, on the dating scene, “What’s
your type?” is the new “What’s your sign?”
But singles aren’t the only ones clamoring
for a “people-sorting device.” As Merve
Emre ‘07 points out in The Personality
Brokers (Doubleday, $27.95), schools,
employers, and even hospitals and church-
es use the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator to
scry human behavior. Emre offers a sweep-
ing account of the personality testing phe-
nomenon, from its creation by Katherine
Myers, an ardent devotee of Carl Jung, and
her daughter Isabel Briggs, a housewife and
murder-mystery writer; to its deployment
in the Cold War; to its current status as a
$2-billion-dollar industry.

In 2015, authorities jailed the “Feminist
Five,” a group who’d planned to hand out
stickers against sexual harassment on Bei-
ing’s public transit. Their detention became
an international cause célèbre and, writes
Leta Hong Fincher ‘90, a turning point for
women’s rights in China. Betraying Big
Brother: The Feminist Awakening in
China (Verso, $26.95) shows how the
movement has risen on social media and
taken root abroad and in cities like Guang-
zhou. Hong Fincher argues that the Chi-
inese Communist Party relies on patriarchal
crackdowns for its post-Soviet survival—
and, further, that “anyone concerned about
rising authoritarianism globally needs to pay
attention to what is happening in China.”

In the last year alone, renowned gay
historian Martin Duberman, Ph.D.
‘57, has published a memoir, a po-
lemic about gay activism, and a “novel/
history” about the inner circle of Kaiser
Wilhelm. He adopts the third genre for
Luminous Traitor: The Just and Daring
Life of Roger Casement, A Biographi-
cal Novel (University of California Press,
$32.95): cleaving to the historical record and
using “informed speculation” to fill in the
gaps. Casement, who exposed colonial
abuses in the Congo and Peru, and was ex-
ecuted for his role in the Easter Rising, cut a
colorful figure. Duberman argues that until
recently, biographies have tended to under-
play, censure, or disparage his homosexuality
and promiscuity—“thereby skirt[ing] cer-
tain essential ingredients in Casement’s
startling contemporary relevance.”

Meanwhile, on the dating scene, “What’s
your type?” is the new “What’s your sign?”
But singles aren’t the only ones clamoring
for a “people-sorting device.” As Merve
Emre ‘07 points out in The Personality
Brokers (Doubleday, $27.95), schools,
employers, and even hospitals and church-
es use the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator to
scry human behavior. Emre offers a sweep-
ing account of the personality testing phe-
and revolutions had been attempted all around them. George Washington’s slave Harry escaped Mount Vernon to fight for the British alongside a man named Ralph who had once been the property of Patrick Henry, while James Madison had to take a break from the Constitutional Convention to track down a 17-year-old named Anthony who escaped from Montpelier. Keeping the word “slave” out of the Constitution did not mean slavery was absent from the document; in fact, Lepore calls slavery America’s Achilles heel, narrating the tortured series of amendments, bargains, and compromises that only delayed the confrontation between the country’s commitment to natural rights and its failure to extend them to African Americans.

Yet even after more than 750,000 men had died in the struggle over emancipation, the moment demands. “Everybody pretty jaded here? Fantastic,” he writes, describing a polar bear. “I couldn’t feel my spine, she was so beautiful.”

A Carnival of Losses: Notes Nearing Ninety (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, $25), the last book by the late Donald Hall ’51, JF ’57, has the air of a rambly chat after a long meal. As the former U.S. poet laureate puts it: “Why should the nonagenarian hold anything back?” Much of the collection sweeps up stray anecdotes from a life in letters; other essays face mortality, relaying what it’s like to lose his hearing (gradually) and his teeth (several times daily). The centerpiece is a remembrance of his wife, the poet Jane Kenyon, observing that “Poetry begins with elegy, in extremity, as Gilgamesh laments the death of his companion Enkidu, watching worms crawl out of Enkidu’s neck.” And just as verse miraculously does, this book finds grace.

Hollywood Math and Aftermath (Bloomsbury Academic, $116.99) is a wonkish tour of the recent history of showbiz. “Money is Hollywood’s great theme—but money laundered into something else, something more,” argues J.D. Connor ’92, an associate professor in the division of cinema and media studies at the University of Southern California. Close-reading the films and the industries that created them, he shows how the financial crisis shocked moviemaking in the Obama era, and why it’s central to understanding work as various as The Incredible Hulk and Upstream Color.

Most know W.E.B. Du Bois, A.B. 1890, Ph.D. ’95, through his writing; now comes a chance to page through his eye-popping infographics. For an exhibition in Paris in 1900, Du Bois and his students at Atlanta University hand-drew charts that inventively displayed migration patterns, property ownership, and other facets of African-American life. W.E.B. Du Bois’s Data Portraits: Visualizing Black America (Princeton Architectural Press, $29.95), edited by Whitney Battle-Baptiste and Britt Rusert, collects them in full color.

For some light back-to-school reading, two thrillers dripping Crimson. Paul Collins’s Blood and Ivy (WW. Norton, $26.95) is true crime told like a novel, about an 1849 murder at Harvard Medical School. The Ancient Nine (St. Martin’s Press, $27.99), is a novel prefaced, coyly, by author Ian Smith ’91: “Based on real events.” It follows an undergraduate from Chicago’s South Side through the harrowing pledge process for the Delphic Club.
In these times, many will read These Truths like a dying man reading a first-aid manual, but history is not self-help.

Television had always fostered partisan divisions: printing presses arrived not long after the colonists did, and after that it was cheaper paper that divided opinion, then the telegraph and the radio. But Lepore argues that “Hiroshima marked the beginning of a new and differently unstable political era, in which technological change wildly outpaced the human capacity for moral reckoning.” The computers that broke German ciphers and calculated the trajectories of Japanese bombs were soon taking inventory, managing payroll, and sorting voters. It had taken a lot of shoe leather, postage stamps, and newspaper ink for the first consulting firm—Campaigns, Inc.—to torpedo President Harry Truman’s plan for universal health insurance. Now public opinion could be manipulated via mass marketing.

In these times, many will read These Truths like a dying man reading a first-aid manual, but history is not self-help.

Television went into almost every parlor, and smartphones, in time, into almost every pocket. In between, conservative intellectual Richard M. Weaver argued in his 1948 book, Ideas Have Consequences, that a commitment to deep truths had been replaced by a shallow concern for facts, and Cold War diplomat George Kennan worried that the paranoid distortions of McCarthyism were not a fluke but a feature of modern politics. Although politicians have always used history in selective and self-serving ways, both Democrats and Republicans began to see it as a palliative discipline: the party of the past peddling a fairy-tale version of a homogenous, prosperous nation that never was; the party of progress insisting on a narrative of advancement that has only occasionally been true, and never for everyone.

Both parties were selling these stories as network television and daily newspapers declined and the balanced-coverage regulations that once governed the airwaves were repealed. Collective truths and collaborative discernment were even more imperiled by Facebook, YouTube, and Twitter, where partisans could post without meaningful rebuttal or rebuke. Tea Party types can put on Patrick Henry costumes without ever reckoning with Gabriel’s Rebellion, the slave uprising that took place just down the street from the site of his most famous speech in Richmond, and Democratic Socialists can hum Hamilton lyrics without ever walking from Trinity Church to the African Burial Ground in Manhattan. More insidiously, whole swaths of the country can like, favor, and scroll until their thumbs fall off without ever knowing basic facts about their democracy, including election days.
Perhaps instead of the next U2 album, Apple could make a copy of *These Truths* appear on every iPhone—not only because it offers the basic civics education that every American needs, but because it is a welcome corrective to the corrosive histories peddled by partisans. In these times, many will read *These Truths* like a dying man reading a first-aid manual, but history is not self-help. Jill Lepore is at her best when she is describing what has happened, not prescribing what should; the book’s weakest pages are the final ones, where she lapses into prediction, and gets lost in a strained metaphor about the ship of state righting itself.

But the first step in self-help is to know thyself, and Lepore can certainly help with that. She has assembled evidence of an America that was better than some thought, worse than almost anyone imagined, and weirder than most serious history books ever convey. Armed with the facts of what happened before, we are better able to approach our collective task of figuring out what should happen now.


**Rebel Lawyer**

**Gerald López’s radical theory—and practice**

by **LYDIALYLE GIBSON**

*With the sun finally fading on a blazing spring afternoon in Los Angeles, Gerald López, J.D. ’74, was sitting down to a simple dinner—salad, bread, Prosecco—at a restaurant a few blocks from the UCLA campus, where he teaches law. He has spent most of his life in this city, first as the child of Mexican immigrants, and later as a “wild-ass radical lawyer” for the poor and marginalized—and an equally wild and radical professor. Now he was trying to explain why he’d chosen public-interest law in the first place. Actually, the question didn’t make sense to him. What else would he have done? “I always thought the idea was, you go back to some neighborhood with a bunch of poor people and fight like shit,” he says. “Otherwise, why be a lawyer?”*

That was the bedrock. On top of it, López built a legal philosophy that has powerfully influenced the practice of civil-rights and poverty law. In 1992, he published a controversial book that altered the way a generation of lawyers conceptualized their work: *Rebellious Lawyering: One Chicano’s Vision of Progressive Law Practice*. Countless spin-off publications have appeared in legal journals over the years, applying López’s lessons to the specifics of immigration law, racial discrimination, mass incarceration, environmental justice, education reform. The student-run Rebellious Lawyering Conference, launched in 1994 at Yale Law School, held its twenty-fifth annual gathering this past February, drawing more than 1,000 participants. The book “stands among the transformative canons of clinical theory and practice,” wrote University of Miami legal scholar Anthony Alfieri in a 2016 issue of *Clinical Law Review* dedicated to *Rebellious Lawyering*. “Groundbreaking” and “radicalizing,” was how another author described it.

For all its influence and notoriety, *Rebellious Lawyering* has been out of print since 1995, when its small publisher was acquired by a larger company. For years, López fought to win back the publishing rights, as copies*
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paradigm shift he envisioned remains incomplete. And that shift is most important, López has come to believe, in legal education. He began teaching law full time in 1978, at UCLA, and followed that with stints at Harvard, Stanford, and New York University, before he returned to UCLA 10 years ago. Law schools have steadily added clinical programs and lawyers have edged “in fits and starts” toward work that he would call “rebellious,” but the real transformation, he says, hasn’t yet happened. So he keeps pushing.

López grew up a few miles from UCLA’s Westwood campus, the son and grandson of immigrants who’d arrived, sometimes without papers, to work in mining towns in the Southwest. He worked too, from an early age, first as a shoe-shine boy and then, after his father died when López was 14, as a gardener, a janitor, and a warehouse laborer, helping to put food on the family’s table. The neighborhood was almost entirely Mexican, with a smattering of Chinese, Japanese, Russians, and Irish, and he learned to pay attention to the meaning of ethnicity.

He also came to know the criminal-justice system early, when his older brother, beloved and idolized, became a heroin addict in his mid-teens. For years he cycled in and out of prison. There was very little help for him or the rest of the family, beyond a tiny cluster of friends, and a feeling of lostness and dislocation lodged deep in López and stayed with him. After high school, he enrolled at the University of Southern California and then, because it was a dream of his late father’s—and because he wanted to fight—he headed to Harvard Law School. “I was feral,” he says—arriving in Cambridge unsophisticated, but smart and hungry. The curriculum, with its casebook orthodoxy and Socratic method, left him cold. By his second year, he’d mostly stopped going to class. And yet for the first time in his life, he says, he began to read seriously: fiction, poetry, psychology, science, sociology, religion—anything but law-school textbooks. “It must have been chemical or something—I was finally ready to sit still,” he says. The reading taught him something important: “that you could draw wildly powerful insights for your own work from seemingly really dissimilar sources.” A kind of rebelliousness.

He did dive eagerly into one facet of law school, a legal clinic, supervised by Gary Bellow, who founded Harvard’s clinical law programs and became a role model for López (see “Nothing rankles more than the feeling of injustice,” November-December 2017, page 66). Assigned to the Massachusetts public defender’s office, he worked in Dorchester, where he began making house calls on juvenile defendants who missed pre-trial meetings. “The kids would be arrested for some misdemeanor, and then they’d get a note from the public defender that said, ‘Show up at the office.’ And mainly they didn’t.” Some missed court dates, too. “I thought, ‘This is crazy,’” López says. So he and another student decided to go knock on doors. “We were these two long-haired guys, him blond and me Mexican, calling on these Irish and Italian families. The racial dynamics were such that we were told we should not be doing this, that these were rough neighborhoods.” But every family

Eight alumni received Hiram S. Hunn Memorial Schools and Scholarships Awards from the College’s Office of Admissions and Financial Aid in September for their volunteer efforts to recruit and interview prospective undergraduates.

Kenneth S. Allison ’67, of Phoenix, began interviewing candidates through the Harvard Club of Phoenix in the mid 1970s, and served for two decades as its schools and scholarships committee co-chair before retiring from that post in May.

Carol M. Barker ’68, of New York City, has been an alumni interviewer since 1982 and for several years also co-chaired one of the supervisory alumni groups in the metropolitan area.

Richard F. Black ’77, M.P.H.-D.M.D. ’84, of Wellsboro, Pennsylvania, is a veteran member of the central Pennsylvania schools and scholarships committee, and has served as its chair for the last three years.

Adrienne E. Dominguez ’90, of Dallas, became a member of the Harvard Club of Dallas’s schools and scholarships committee in 2004. In 2007, she became a co-chair, and has held that role since, save for her 2011-13 service as club president.

Frank K. Friedman ’80, of Roanoke, Virginia, has been interviewing applicants for 25 years through the southwestern Virginia schools and scholarship committee, which he also chaired from 2002 to 2016.

Barry W. Furze ’68, of Sturgis, South Dakota, joined the local schools and scholarships committee, of which he is also the longtime chair, in 1996.

Charles E. Gilbert III ’71, of Bangor, has led the schools and scholarships committee that covers eastern and northern Maine since 1994.

John F. Kotouc ’68, of Omaha, began interviewing candidates in 1990, and in 2009 became chair for his region.

Hiram S. Hunn Awards for Alumni
welcomed him: "They could see we were going out of our way for their kids."

López finished a year behind his classmates, having spent what would have been his third year of law school in Europe, living on the streets and sleeping out in fields, deliberating about whether to return to school. In the end, the work drew him back, even if the coursework didn’t.

After graduation, he returned to California, and, along with three former public defenders, opened up what he calls “our little radical law practice” inside a San Diego storefront. Their clients were immigrants, farm workers, housekeepers, the poor and disenfranchised. "We did a potpourri of things we found politically acceptable to bring money in the door—family law, personal injury, immigration—and then we did huge amounts of unpaid work with communities and community organizations,” he says. Even though the practice lasted only three years, the work left an enduring mark on him, especially the civil-rights litigation that paid only when they won. “And we took the cases that were the least likely of all to win. We took on righteous fights that, as a legal matter, were real long shots because those were fights worth fighting.”

To him, they still are. A clinical professor for the past three decades, he still takes lost causes on the side, clients who can’t pay, and likely can’t win, but still want to fight. “It could be about anything,” he says: civil rights, small-time claims, legal complaints that don’t fall into easy categories. “Maybe you’re getting screwed over by a health provider, and there’s no lawsuit, per se, but I’ll still say, ‘OK, let’s go fight....If it means something to you to fight, then I’ll throw down.’” That alone can change lives. “You might never get a judgment, but making the other person take you seriously, that might well catapult you into a whole different life from then on. I’ve seen it. I believe it. I enjoy that kind of lawyering as much as I enjoy any lawyering.”

Still, the “real revolution” López maintains, “is with the teachers, the universities, the bar.” He was still working in the San Diego law practice when he started teaching adjunct classes at a local law school. He loved it immediately. “I began a clinic right away down there. And I’d been assigned these doctrinal courses that I tried converting into lawyering, problem-solving courses.” Before long, UCLA called with a tenure-track offer, and a few years after that, he came to Harvard on a visiting professorship in 1983 to teach a course in civil-rights litigation. Afterward, he joined the faculty at Stanford, where he helped found the Center for Community Problem Solving. It attempted to put into practice his philosophy of deep community engagement. One centerpiece was a massive survey of residents from six local neighborhoods, intended to gather, analyze, and distribute “neglected street-level community knowledge” about problems that affected the poor and people of color—not just legal problems, but also social and economic ones. The work yielded a 2005 “re-entry guide” for the formerly incarcerated returning to the city—how to navigate the world they were re-entering, find work and housing and education, manage the obstacles they’d face as ex-convicts. That guide and the research behind it became the basis for a clinic López launched and taught in for many years after he returned to UCLA in 2008, helping clients not only fight discrimination in hiring, but also secure financing and licenses to start their own businesses, which a criminal record also makes difficult. “What we learned listening to the community,” López says, “shaped our work.”

On the eve of its republication, Rebellious Lawyering and its ideas, remain urgent and they send López to work every day. In 2017 he published a two-part essay in Clinical Law Review titled “Transform—Don’t Just Tinker With—"
WHY I JOINED THE HARVARD CLUB OF BOSTON

There are many different reasons to join the Harvard Club of Boston. Amy Norton is a graduate of the Divinity School at Harvard, and here’s why she joined.

“For Exceptional Service…”

Six alumni were recognized with HAA Awards (during the Harvard Alumni Association board of directors’ fall meeting), for their outstanding service to the University. Danguole Spakevicius Altman ’81 of Houston, a member of her class’s thirty-fifth-reunion planning committee, has also served the Harvard Club of Houston for more than two decades, including as an alumni interviewer and twice as president. As an HAA board member, she chaired the Alumni Leadership Conference and the former clubs and shared interest groups (SIGs) committee, and has been a regional director for Texas and a member-at-large on HAA’s executive committee. As an initiative leader for alumni volunteer “ambassadorship,” she was integral to developing board “town hall” meetings to discuss topical issues and University challenges.

Joseph F.X. Donovan Jr. ’72, formerly of Cambridge, devoted more than 40 years to Harvard as a student, fundraiser, and volunteer, retiring from the University Development Office principal-gifts team. In 1977, he joined the Harvard College Fund and became a driving force in fundraising for House renewal, financial aid, professorships, and athletics (he’d been an undergraduate manager of Harvard football). In addition, he volunteered for many years on the boards of the Harvard Club of Boston and the HAA, and was a member of HAA Awards and Happy Legal Education,” calling for law schools to turn their basic curriculum inside out.

Law school, he says, “should provide us mind-boggling experiences at every turn... That’s what practicing in the world should be like, and that’s what law school should be like.” He knows that sounds idealistic. It doesn’t bother him. “If it is utopian, it’s a practicable utopia. I think we can do it. I just think we don’t have the will.” Like living and lawyering, that’s simply a problem to be solved.

“I joined the Harvard Club as a graduate student to meet new people and network. While I was job-searching after graduation, I was on a tight budget, yet I maintained my membership because the Club had become a place where I felt like I belonged. I met people at the Club who would become my closest friends, and who helped sustain me through that challenging year. I’m giving back by serving on the Member Engagement Committee, and co-chairing the Young Member Committee.

The Harvard Club has become my community.

— Amy Norton ’16

For more information regarding membership, please call 617-450-4444 or visit harvardclub.com.

Back Bay Clubhouse | 374 Commonwealth Ave, Boston, MA
Downtown Clubhouse | One Federal Street, Boston, MA

Self Teaching Fellowship

www.andyo.org

Sponsored by: WETANKNSTORE.COM
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### Changing the World

**Employing the mantra “It’s Not Too Late to Change the World,” some members of the class of 1973 have formed a nonprofit organization to address important local, national, and international issues while simultaneously building relationships among classmates. ClassACT HR73 (“Achieving Change Together”) aims to leverage “classmates’ expertise, skills, time, and goodwill,” according to co-chair Jonathan Sprague, to form effective collaborations that support existing projects or develop new opportunities.**

ClassACT’s largest project has been the establishment of the Benazir Bhutto Leadership Program (BBLP), which honors the prime minister of Pakistan assassinated in 2007, who was also their classmate. The program helps support “leadership development in predominantly Muslim countries,” says another co-chair, Marion Dry, and includes two fellowships at Harvard’s Kennedy School, in conjunction with the Edward S. Mason Program for mid-career graduate students. The BBLP is designed to advance peace and human rights in connection with principles espoused by Bhutto, Sprague notes, namely: “democracy, equality for women, reconciliation of religious and cultural differences, and education for all without gender or religious bias.”

To date, about 125 classmates have participated in developing this project and more than $540,000 has been raised for the program. Inaugural fellows Natasha Jehangir Khan and Roohi Abdullah, both of Pakistan, matriculated in June.

The nonprofit is also spearheading more than a dozen “Bridge Projects.” These smaller endeavors match needs of socially responsible organizations founded or supported by classmates with classmate volunteers. So far, those versed in grant-writing and the arts have aided a Kenyan organization called Osiligi Hope, which provides educational and health services to Maasai communities. The classmate-founded JusticeAID, which holds concerts around the country to raise money for local justice organizations, has benefited from ClassACT help in promoting concerts and related events. Those included discussions on “Justice, Mental Health, and Incarceration,” moderated by Pulitzer Prize-winning *New York Times* journalist Michael Winerip ’74, and on “The Criminalization of Poverty: 21st Century Debtors Prison,” hosted by former U.S. Solicitor General Seth Waxman ’73. The latter featured Harvard alumni Alec Karakatsanis, J.D. ’08, of the Civil Rights Corps (profiled in “Criminal Injustice,” September-October 2017, page 44), and Gina Clayton, J.D. ’10, of the Essie Justice Group. ClassACT is also working on a national project to support STEM education through the creation of sports analytics clubs for high-school and middle-school students interested in learning data-management and -analysis skills.

ClassACT HR73 has engaged about 250 classmates in these efforts, according to Dry, who adds, “We believe we are the first class [at Harvard] to ever organize ourselves to such an extent.” In coordinating the nonprofit and regional events, the group works cooperatively with the Harvard Alumni Association (HAA), which supports its aims, Sprague says. “One of the long-range goals is to share what we have learned with the HAA and to encourage them to adapt or adopt what we have done and potentially create a ClassACT-type structure, and ultimately connect inter-class endeavors.”

—NELL PORTER BROWN
Harvard Sanctions Hurt Students and Diminish Harvard

Given the stated mission of Harvard University "to educate the citizens and citizen-leaders for our society" Harvard has a duty to uphold and model the freedoms that define our society, including freedom of association as embodied in the First Amendment of the United States Constitution and applicable law.

Harvard should not discipline, penalize, or otherwise sanction students for their personal decisions to join, or affiliate with, any lawful organization, political party, or social group.

Therefore, the Harvard Corporation and President Bacow should rescind a policy of threats, intimidation, and coercion antithetical to the education of future citizens and citizen-leaders of a free society.

What are the “Harvard Sanctions”?

In December, the Harvard Corporation voted to adopt a policy of penalizing undergraduates—but not graduate students, staff, faculty members, administrators, or members of the Harvard Corporation—who join certain independent, off-campus, social organizations, including those that are single-gender.

This same vote strips student-athletes and members of recognized student organizations of the right to elect leaders of their choosing, as well as faculty members of the right to recommend the most qualified students for post-graduate fellowships and scholarships influenced or controlled by Harvard.

Finally, the Corporation has stripped Harvard undergraduates of the ability to exercise without threat of punishment their freedom of association off-campus, on their own time, in ways that do not violate any laws.

Under the new policy, administrators will now deny members of unrecognized social organizations, including single-gender, the opportunities they have earned in the classroom and on the playing field, although Harvard will continue to benefit from their efforts and abilities.

This statement paid for by members of the Cambridge Coalition on behalf of concerned students, faculty, alumnae and alumni throughout the Harvard Community, and is endorsed by Alpha Phi, Delta Kappa Epsilon, Delta Gamma, Fly Club, Kappa Alpha Theta, Kappa Kappa Gamma, Pleiades Club, Porcellian Club, Sigma Alpha Epsilon, and Sigma Chi.

Contact us by email at info@CambridgeCoalition.org
Sweet Farewell

Your wooden arm you hold outstretched
to shake with passers-by.

Spider man. Parents pass their names along to children. Donors often have theirs applied to buildings. But scientists have their own devices for enshrining their identities. The faculty’s memorial minute for the late Agassiz professor of zoology Herbert W. Levi (who was “fascinated by spiders” as a young man, and for whom “respect among the arachnological community was immense”) reveals his superpower: describing an astounding 1,254 new spider species. (With suitably scientific precision, it notes that 1,204 are “still considered valid,” but reveals no more about the other 50.) The signal legacy of that meticulous scholarship is “the more than 40 species, and two genera, named after him.”

Tying one off. Penelope Laurans, Ph.D. ’75, last seen here in the last issue, forwards another gem—from the liberation front, sartorial division: a “limerick war” with the formidable classicist John Finley, master (the then title) of Eliot House, who weighed in thus on the Faculty Club’s coat-and-tie rule:

Though drawn by Lyssipus and Myron
And often displayed by Lord Byron
The masculine throat
Is small object of note
It looks brighter with tighter attire on.

Countering, she scribbled this response in the Club’s book:
True, Byron was shockingly bred
Still at Harvard, have I been misled?
I’ve been brought up to note
That what’s outside the throat
Matters less than what’s inside the head. Looking back to that exchange now, it was no contest. Laurans’s victory seems complete, to the delight and comfort of thousands of men, Byronic or otherwise.

“Fair Harvard” encore. Before the recent decision to do in “the stock of the Puritans” (see The College Pump, July-August, page 76, and prior dispatches)—long before, in fact—alumni had raised the issue. An eagle-eyed colleague found in the July-August 1974 edition of this department a letter from New York City’s James G. King ’20 (soon we will have to note 1920), who observed: “One need scarcely point out that there are many other stocks of which our modern Harvard is composed, and that all of them are equally important, and have been made up of pioneers, no less than were our earliest founders.” He suggested a “slight emendation of this otherwise excellent stanza”:

Let not moss-cover’d error moor thee at its side
As the world on truth’s current glides past,
Be the herald of light and the bearer of love,
For as long as our country shall last.
King generously hoped there would be other suggestions for emending this long-valued stanza for effective use today.”

Given Harvard’s augmented international composition and reach, it is perhaps best that he was so broad-minded. The larger question, perhaps, is how long the current version of that troublesome last line (“Till the stars in the firmament die”) itself endures.

Melting moments. “Celebrate 28,” a by-invitation gala Drew Faust-fest thrown by the Corporation on the afternoon of June 28, lauded the concluding presidency with a concert/mock “report card”/graduation in Sanders Theatre (John Lithgow ’67, Ar.D. ’05, emceeing; trumpeter Wynton Marsalis, Ar.D. ’09, tooting his golden horn). It ended with Faust boogieing across the stage as Joshua Brian Campbell ’16, reprising his 2016 and 2018 Commencement performances (as shown), crooned “Ain’t Too Proud to Beg,” a twofer: an emotional opening for the fans in attendance (“I know you wanna leave me, But I refuse to let you go”); and a perhaps subliminal statement about a leader who did her utmost in asking (but not so much begging) to ensure the success of the $9-billion-plus Harvard Campaign. An evening of dancing in Memorial Hall ensued.

The public exit reprised Faust’s first official day in office, July 2, 2007, when she held an ice-cream social in Harvard Yard. This one, on the steamy afternoon of June 29, took place at the Science Center Plaza, a tangible legacy of Faust’s community-building “Common Spaces” initiative. Sweet.
Shifting Sands
Family snapshots of living off the land

Six days inching through heavy sand, a truck falling into an aardvark hole, blazing days and frozen nights: the Marshalls weren’t on a typical family vacation when they set out into the Kalahari Desert, in present-day Namibia, in June 1951. Laurence Marshall was freshly retired from Raytheon; his wife, Lorna, taught English at Mount Holyoke. Also along were their teenagers, Elizabeth and John, plus some scholars, interpreters, guides, mechanics, cooks, and other helpers. Backed by Harvard’s Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, they were searching for the semi-nomadic indigenous people they called “Bushmen” (and later, more precisely, the Ju’hoansi and /Gwi).

In six more trips over the ensuing decade, the Marshalls documented the daily lives of the hunter-gatherers in 40,000 photographs. Some will be displayed, alongside past and present images of the people of the Nyae Nyae, in “Kalahari Perspectives: Anthropology, Photography, and the Marshall Family,” at the Peabody Museum from September 29 through March 31, 2019.

The Marshalls had no formal training in anthropology or photography, but their fieldwork methods were unusually holistic for the time, says curator of visual anthropology Ilisa Barbash. They lived with Kalahari families for up to 13 months at a stretch. John learned to hunt giraffes and pigs with the other young men; one woman named her daughter after Lorna. The Marshalls’ strikingly naturalistic images (as at left, of a toddler, ≠Toma, showing Elizabeth Marshall a caterpillar) always identified their subjects by name.

Westerners have depicted “Bushmen” to suit their own ends: whether as scientific specimens to be classified, to speed up colonization, or as elusive exotics, to burnish their own renown as adventurers. In her book, Where the Roads All End, Barbash argues that the Marshalls projected an image of gentle people who deserved special consideration from the state. But the sheer size of their collection has given subsequent scholars latitude for their own interpretations.

Some of the Marshall images became so popular that outdated romantic notions about the region persisted long after its inhabitants’ lives had changed. Pushed into fixed settlements by the government during the 1960s, they built huts from mud and straw and adopted Western clothing, as shown above in the two portraits of Ntai, a young Ju’hoansi girl, from 1955 and 1961.

John Marshall later regretted that these photographs elided how much, and how rapidly, the groups’ lives were changing—a record he tried to correct later in life in his advocacy and groundbreaking documentaries. When Barbash first began work with the archive, he told her, “Make sure you don’t leave these people in the past.”

~Sophia Nguyen
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