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Correction: In the Alumni Books section of the Spring 2007 issue of Colloquy, there were two errors in the note on Postmodern Gandhi and Other Essays: Gandhi in the World and at Home by alumnus Lloyd I. Rudolph and alumna Susanne Hoeber Rudolph. The text should have read that “Gandhi was neither a traditionalist nor a ‘back number’” and that he sought to “revive certain traditions” in India. We regret the errors.
Better Support for PhDs in the Sciences and Engineering

Harvard University is embarked on bold expansion and innovation in the natural sciences and engineering, to support established and new programs in Cambridge, Longwood, and Allston. As a vital part of these efforts, we must continue to admit and educate superb doctoral students. Yet at the very time when Harvard needs to expand graduate education in the sciences, traditional sources of external and internal funding are insufficient, both in amount and flexibility, and we must look for new ideas.

Graduate students are central to all aspects of the University’s mission: They push forward the frontiers of knowledge, enable cutting-edge faculty research, and serve as teachers and mentors to undergraduates in the College. Currently, doctoral candidates in science and engineering constitute almost half of the University’s PhD students and are enrolled in 20 out of 55 degree-granting programs. Their ranks must grow, and new programs and tracks are sure to appear in a fast-changing intellectual landscape.

Unlike the situation enjoyed by some of our peer universities, PhD education at Harvard is not endowed, except in a few departments. Year by year, the support packages promised to entering science PhD students are pieced together from external fellowships, faculty research grants, fragmentary endowments, teaching fellowships, and resources deployed through the Graduate School. External fellowships and training grants won by our students and faculty play a large role in the funding system—but when such opportunities constrict, Harvard programs without dedicated endowments cannot easily expand.

The current system is also overly rigid. Students often must be assigned at the time of admission to particular training programs without dedicated endowments, and in areas where internal funding are insufficient, both in amount and flexibility, and we must look for new ideas.

In short, even though our faculty and students outpace nearly all competitors in winning grants and fellowships, available external sources of funding are simply not ample or reliable enough to support ongoing research—and the new initiatives we are undertaking. Clearly, we must enhance Harvard’s own contributions to PhD education in the sciences.

Establishing a bold new program of “Harvard Science Fellowships” can be part of the solution to the challenges we face. These would support all first-year PhD students are pieced together from external fellowships, faculty research grants, external sources of funding are insufficient, both in amount and flexibility, and we must look for new ideas.

In short, even though our faculty and students outpace nearly all competitors in winning grants and fellowships, available external sources of funding are simply not ample or reliable enough to support ongoing research—and the new initiatives we are undertaking. Clearly, we must enhance Harvard’s own contributions to PhD education in the sciences.

Establishing a bold new program of “Harvard Science Fellowships” can be part of the solution to the challenges we face. These would support all first-year PhD students are pieced together from external fellowships, faculty research grants, fragmentary endowments, teaching fellowships, and resources deployed through the Graduate School. External fellowships and training grants won by our students and faculty play a large role in the funding system—but when such opportunities constrict, Harvard programs without dedicated endowments cannot easily expand.

The current system is also overly rigid. Students often must be assigned at the time of admission to particular training grants or research areas. This makes it hard for them to explore new intellectual areas in their first crucial years for faculty to assign the most appropriate students to training grants—potentially hindering the competitive renewal of those grants. International students, moreover, cannot be supported through federally funded training grants.

In recent years, training grant slots and fellowships from sources such as the Hertz Foundation and the National Science Foundation (NSF) have remained relatively constant in raw numbers. But the percentage of Harvard science PhD students supported by these sources has declined sharply—dropping from 27 percent in 2000 to 18 percent in 2007. The life sciences are most affected, because Howard Hughes Medical Institute fellowships were discontinued a few years ago, and training grants from the National Institutes of Health are now more difficult to obtain and renew. Yet this has happened at the very moment when Harvard aims to expand rapidly in the life sciences!

In short, even though our faculty and students outpace nearly all competitors in winning grants and fellowships, available external sources of funding are simply not ample or reliable enough to support ongoing research—and the new initiatives we are undertaking. Clearly, we must enhance Harvard’s own contributions to PhD education in the sciences.

Establishing a bold new program of “Harvard Science Fellowships” can be part of the solution to the challenges we face. These would support all first-year PhD students except those who win outside fellowships. Such support could also be available to second-year students in start-up areas, in departments without historic endowments, and in areas where international students and younger faculty are most numerous. (Younger faculty are often just launching research programs and need help to support students until they can apply for outside research grants.)
PERFECTION COMPLEX

Genetic Technologies Could Compromise What it Means to Be Human, Warns Political Philosopher Michael Sandel

BY SUSAN LUMENELLO

Should those of us who can afford it take advantage of emerging genetic technologies to perfect our minds, bodies, and children? In his newest book, The Case Against Perfection: Ethics in the Age of Genetic Engineering (Harvard), Michael Sandel argues that sex-selection, human and animal cloning, designer eggs, free-market eugenics, and other forms of biotechnological enhancement threaten our humanity.

Breakthroughs in genetics “present us with a promise and a predicament,” writes Sandel, the Anne T. and Robert M. Bass professor of government.

The promise is well-documented: The cloning of embryonic stem cells may lead to treatments for multiple sclerosis, diabetes, and other illnesses; gene therapies show hope for treating and even preventing still other diseases; and bioengineering may reduce the bone fragility and memory lapses of aging.

But Sandel also sees a predicament that arises when these technologies become available for nonmedical uses—in a quest for perfection that he finds deeply worrisome. He spoke recently with Colloquy about these concerns and why we need new arguments to engage in a debate about this uncharted medical—and moral—territory.

I understand from the acknowledgments in the book that the provocative title was suggested by your editor at The Atlantic magazine, where the book began as an essay in 2005. But what does the title mean to you? Who would be against perfection?

Michael Sandel: It’s less the goal of perfection that gives rise to moral disquiet than the attitudes and habits, even the hubris, that attend the drive for perfection. That seems to me the heart of it. For example, there’s nothing wrong with parents seeking the best for their children: the best education, the best health care, and so on. At the same time, there is a tendency toward hyperparenting.

What do you mean by “hyperparenting”?

MS: Even before we get to questions of genetic engineering, I mean the anxious excess of parental managing and molding and directing of children. The danger of using genetic technologies to get “designer children” is that it will reinforce the tendency of hyperparents to see their children as instruments of their own ambition ... That’s the tendency that I worry about. It’s that aspect of the drive for perfection that worries me... The risk is that we will turn children into objects of manufacture, into commodities...pick[ing] and choos[ing] the genetic traits we want in our children, rather than [viewing them] as independent persons. And there’s the risk, too, of undermining the unconditional love parents have for children if we begin to specify hair color, eye color, height, sex. If we pick and choose the traits of our children, there is the risk of turning parenting into an extension of the consumer society. And that could erode the norms of unconditional love of parents for children.

You’re a parent. Have you ever had to restrain yourself from engaging in hyperparenting?

MS: I think anyone who’s spent any time on the sidelines of youth soccer fields or Little League baseball diamonds has not only witnessed [hyperparenting] but experienced the temptation to hyperparent. Of course it’s always those other parents who display it at its extreme! But honesty requires, I think, noticing those same tendencies in oneself. I think it does take an exercise of restraint on the part of parents, especially these days. When I was in high school, nobody I knew took an SAT prep course. Today, parents look around,
especially in affluent suburban public high schools and also in private schools... and feel that there's a kind of arms-race mentality. Since everyone else is burnishing their college credentials and taking SAT prep courses, not to do so seems to be depriving one's own child of a competitive advantage.

The real danger [of hyperparenting] will come when parents feel pressured to resort to genetic engineering for the sake of giving their children a competitive edge, or even keeping up with what other people are doing. We see this already in a limited way with the use of human growth hormone, which can modestly increase the height of children. It was introduced to help children with a hormonal deficiency, but it also works with genetically short but otherwise healthy children. So the question is: Are we going to have a hormonal arms race for height?

In part, you seem worried about these great scientific temptations because you fear that people with the means to pay for them will embrace them. How worried are you, and what exactly worries you?

MS: What worries me are not the genetic technologies by themselves but the availability of new genetic technologies together with social and cultural attitudes in an increasingly competitive society. It's the combination, not just the technology. I should emphasize that I consider breakthroughs in genetics a great blessing for medicine and for health and for the relief of suffering. My sole concern is with the nonmedical use of genetic technologies, and I want to emphasize that. So I would not in any way want to restrain research and breakthroughs in genetics. To the contrary, they are crucially important for health. My concern is when technologies that were designed for the sake of promoting health are used for nonmedical purposes [and] are turned into instruments of competition in a consumer-driven society.

The moral concerns go back to the history of eugenics. In the first half of the 20th century, eugenics were associated with state control and coercion—forced sterilization laws, for example...and, ultimately, Hitler's Nuremberg Laws and genocide.

Today, eugenics is making a comeback, without state coercion. It's making a comeback in the form of privatized or free-market eugenics. I think that privatized or free-market eugenics is morally troubling even without the state coercion... because now the eugenic ambition is wedded to consumerism in an increasingly competitive society. So, parents will feel increasing pressures to resort to genetic engineering in order to give their children an edge in a competitive society. It's that combination that worries me.

continued on page 10
In a sense, the Blaschkas, father and son, were the Eileen Ford or John Casablancas of the glass models industry. Like fashion agency moguls, the Blaschkas devoted their careers to finding ideal specimens and shaping beauty. Their super models, however, were the impeccably rendered glass flowers that have graced Harvard’s Museum of Natural History since 1886, when it was the Botanical Museum.

A new book, *Drawing upon Nature: Studies for the Blaschkas’ Glass Models* (Corning Museum of Glass), shows the original illustrations used in designing the flower models as well as the Blaschkas’ models of invertebrate creatures. The models, write authors Susan M. Rossi-Wilcox and David Whitehouse, “provide a running commentary on the development of the biological sciences in the late 19th and early 20th centuries.”

The story of the glass flowers at Harvard began in the mid-19th century, in the small town of Böhmisch Aicha, now Cesky Dub in the Czech Republic, where Leopold Blaschka joined the family glass manufacturing business, mostly producing costume jewelry. A personal love of plants and marine animals inspired Leopold to begin making models of items from starfish to orchids. His work came to the attention of Prince Camille de Rohan, who had established a notable garden at one of his estates. The prince offered Leopold several commissions, which led to the models being shown in a local natural history museum.

From there, Leopold began receiving commissions from other natural history museums, which were sprouting up throughout Europe and the United States. By the 1870s, Leopold had been joined in making models by his son, Rudolf. Both Blaschkas were supplying models to museums, libraries, and individuals all over the world. The Museum of Comparative Zoology (MCZ) at Harvard, under the direction of Louis Agassiz, also bought about 350 invertebrate models during this period. Less known than the flowers, many of these models are still on view at the MCZ.

In 1886, Harvard Professor George Lincoln Goodale, director of the University’s Botanic Garden, visited the Blaschkas, who now lived in Germany. He asked Leopold to focus his model-making on flowers and plants, and to focus even more sharply on making them for Harvard’s teaching collection. Botanical specimens in glass—at least of the artistic quality and scientific veracity of the Blaschkas’ work—were essential for study. Real specimens rotted, preserved ones were limited, and New England’s weather prohibited the cultivation of a wider range of plant life.

The Blaschkas agreed and ultimately signed a long-term contract with Harvard. In 1892, Rudolf sailed to America and stayed with Professor Goodale, with whom he oversaw the installation of the glass flowers in the Botanical Museum. Rudolf wrote to his father about the models in their new setting, “With delight and emotion, I saw all the old friends united here…”

Super Models of the Blaschkas

HOW A FATHER-AND-SON TEAM PROVIDED THE FOUNDATION FOR BOTANICAL STUDY AT HARVARD

BY SUSAN LUMENELLO
Colloquy Fall 2007

Alumni Notes

Applied Sciences

In July 2007, Lawrence A. Mysak, PhD '67, was elected president of the International Association for the Physical Sciences of the Oceans for the 2007–11 term. IAPSO is one of eight sister associations of the International Union of Geodesy and Geophysics, a nongovernmental organization under the International Science Council. Mysak is the Canada Steamship Lines professor of atmospheric and oceanic sciences at McGill University.

Economics

Gordon R. Munro, PhD '63, was honored this year with the publication of Advances in Fisheries Economics (Blackwell), a festschrift in recognition not only of his contributions to the advancement of the economics of fisheries management worldwide but also his work as a policy advisor to the United Nations' Food and Agriculture Organization and the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. Munro is professor of economics emeritus at the University of British Columbia; he was appointed visiting professor at the Centre for the Economics and Management of Aquatic Resources at the University of Portsmouth (England) in August 2007.

Glenn Withers, PhD '75, was appointed foundation Chief Executive of Universities Australia, the new umbrella group for all of Australia's universities, beginning in October 2007. Withers also chairs the Menzies Harvard Scholarship Committee. He was awarded the Order of Australia for his contributions to applied economics and policy, including the design of the Australian Immigration Selection System (the “points system”). Most recently he has been advising the Himalayan Kingdom of Bhutan on their transition to democracy.

Fine Arts

Desmond FitzGerald, AM '83, reports that his most recent book, Irish Furniture (with James Peill) was published earlier this year with Yale University Press. FitzGerald, who is the 29th Knight of Glin, is the president of the Irish Georgian Society, which does historic preservation. He is also the author of books on landscape, gardens, and fine and applied art, including Ireland's Painters (also with Peill). He previously served as a curator at the Victoria and Albert Museum, London. FitzGerald also owns dairy farms at Glin Castle, which he and his family have restored as a historic house.

Accompanied by a Harvard botany instructor, Rudolf took advantage of his new setting to spend parts of the next few years touring the United States and Jamaica, where he collected plant specimens and made reference drawings for future models.

In 1895, Rudolf returned to Germany, where his father had suffered a fatal stroke. There, Rudolf continued to fulfill the Harvard contract, finishing the models his father had started. The contract with Harvard continued through 1923; by that time, Rudolf was working with Oakes Ames, the Botanical Museum’s next director.

The last shipment to Harvard was made in 1936; some of these later models concentrated on “grasses, insect pollination, and the progression of fruit blight.” Rudolf died in 1939, leaving behind unfinished models of rotting fruits and fungi. In all, the Blaschkas left Harvard approximately 3,000 plant models, featuring more than 800 species and varieties. The Museum of Natural History recently acquired some of the Blaschkas’ personal items, including tools and a bench, now on exhibition.

Mary Lee Ware, whose parents were the benefactors of the Harvard collection, visited Rudolf in 1928. After observing the model-maker in his studio, Ware reported back to Ames: “It all leaves you breathless that anyone can and will do such work.”

Drawing upon Nature contains essays by Rossi-Wilcox, administrator of the Ware Collection of Blaschka Glass Models of Plants at Harvard and curatorial associate of the Botanical Museum and Herbaria; and Whitehouse, executive director of The Corning (New York) Museum of Glass, which also houses a collection of Blaschka models, on view through November 2007. For more information about the Harvard collection, see www.hmnh.harvard.edu.

Indian Paintbrush Scrophulariaceae, Model 500 (1894). By L. and R. Blaschka. Colored pencil on paper. Rudolf observed examples of this flower in San Diego.
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“Engineering Consent”  
By Allan M. Brandt  
Brandt is the Amalie Moses Kass professor of the history of medicine and professor of the history of science.


BY THE END OF THE 1920S, the cigarette had accrued a remarkably elastic set of meanings. Though nearly ubiquitous and overwhelmingly sold in just three brands, it was often regarded as a marker of independence and autonomy. Smoking was associated with sexual attractiveness, physical beauty, and leisure. For men, it could connote virility, strength, and mental acuity. When used by women, the same product—even the same brand—could be deployed to invoke feminine beauty as well as social and political equality. Amid the social rigidities of urban industrial culture, the cigarette was favorably associated with pleasure and satisfaction. When surveyed, smokers overwhelmingly cited “sociability” as an essential attraction of the cigarette.

The cigarette had assumed meanings previously associated with alcohol, fostering social encounters. A majority also noted the pleasing fragrance (a reminder that responses to smell are historically contingent). Only five percent cited taste as one of the cigarette’s pleasures.

Unlike most other consumer goods, the cigarette also caused a radical change in social behavior. American society had to learn how to smoke. Cigarette smoking became integrated into the social and cultural mores of both work and leisure until it had crossed traditional boundaries of tobacco use. Whereas smoking of cigars and pipes had been a largely private activity, the cigarette came to be brandished publicly, first by men and then by women. Restaurants, theaters, railways, and other public institutions all had to accommodate this new product and behavior.

The cigarette also fit the “modern” culture emerging in the first decades of the 20th century. It was frequently cited as respite and solace in an increasingly bureaucratized and industrialized world. Certainly this quality was noted during World War I, when soldiers employed cigarettes to relieve the anxiety and boredom of war. But they were seen no less as an antidote to the frenetic pace of urban-industrial society. As early as 1889, the New York Times—an early critic of the cigarette—explained:

Whatever its merits and demerits, one thing is certain—namely, that there is an ever increasing subjection to the influence of this narcotic, whose soothing powers are requisitioned to counteract the evil effects of the worry, overpressure, and exhaustion which characterize the age in which we live. ☞

COTTON ON THE NEW GROUND was a finicky consumer of labor, with a special appetite for the fit and the fertile: people capable of both carving plantations from forest and bringing up a next generation of bound workers. Because of a decided tilt toward those with the highest capacity to reproduce, the antebellum migration selected for slaves between the ages of 15 and 30, a preference that repeatedly shredded black people’s bonds of blood and affection. Upper South slave communities, the headwaters of that antebellum river of slave migrants, were particularly hard hit. As many as one half of all antebellum slave sales in the Chesapeake area separated parents from children; one-quarter tore husbands from wives. Workers, as Samuel Wright of Baker County understood when he advertised a slave woman as a fine field hand, “first rate Cook, Washer, and Ironer,” were what sold well to the planters of southwest Georgia, just as they did to those hoping to till fortunes out of the ground in Mississippi, Alabama, and even
the panhandle of Florida. Carefully categorizing their human wares—some of whom came from as far away as Kentucky, Maryland, North Carolina, and Virginia—by height, weight, age, sex, and capacity to produce (and reproduce, if the slave was female), itinerant peddlers of slaves disposed of a “good many” as they tacked their way across the countryside. Others set up shop in the corners of local dry-goods emporiums, displaying their stock of slaves alongside stacks of rope, harness, boots, hoes, hats, shoes, and bacon. So confident was Gabriel Sibley that he could turn a profit on the slaves he imported to Albany in the late 1840s, that he opened his own office out of which he shouted an intent to “sell and buy negroes.”

“Thoughts About Moving and Changing”
By Steven Pinker

Pinker, PhD ’79, psychology and social relations, is the Johnstone Family professor of psychology.

From The Stuff of Thought: Language as a Window into Human Nature. Copyright © Steven Pinker, 2007. Published by Viking, New York.

THE FLEXIBILITY OF THE HUMAN MIND—its ability to flip frames, shift gestalts, or reconstrue events—is a wondrous talent. But it makes it difficult to predict how a person will think and talk about a given situation. When I hit a wall with a stick, am I affecting the stick by moving it to the wall, or affecting the wall using the stick as an instrument? When Harold likes Hildy, is he causing himself to think well of her, or is she causing him to approve of her? If Bill does an impression of John Travolta in Saturday Night Fever, is he causing Debbie to laugh in the same way that he causes a balloon to pop by pricking it, or does Debbie have enough free will that “causation” is not an appropriate way to think about it? When Becky shouts across a noisy room to Liz, what is she doing: affecting Liz, creating a message, making noise, sending a message across the room, or just moving her muscles in a certain way? Even the most palpable cognitive distinction—who did something and who had something done to him—can be mentally flip-flopped, as when a hockey player shouts, “Kiss my elbow!” or when Woody Allen in Play It Again, Sam gets roughed up by some bikers and tells his friends, “I snapped my chin down on some guy’s fist and hit another one on the knee with my nose.”

Cognitive flexibility is in many ways a blessing, but in figuring out how language works, it is something of a curse. Language is supposed to give us a way to communi cate who did what to whom. But how can it ever do that if two people can look at the same event and make different assignments of the who, the what, and the whom in the first place? This isn’t just a hypothetical worry; it saps the explanatory power from the gestalt-shift theory of how children learn verbs. To regain it, we are forced to drill deeper into the psychology of motion and change.
MAKING THINGS INTERESTING: SECONDARY FIELDS ENHANCE PHD PROGRAMS

Toby Lee is in the fourth year of her PhD in social anthropology, but she has long had an interest in using film theory and production as ways to approach her field—both conceptually and as a documentary tool. “Within anthropology, there’s always been a history of ethnographic film, going back to the turn of the [20th] century,” Lee says. Using media tools “might shape [anthropological] discussion and help us understand things in a different way.”

Thanks to the new secondary fields initiative in the Department of Visual and Environmental Studies (VES), Lee was able to craft her program so it more closely reflected her scholarly interests—while enhancing her professional qualifications for when she hits the job market.

In the class “Sensory Ethnography,” Lee completed a short film on how residents of the 70-person town of Royal, Nebraska, interact in a small space with many transients. Her film relates directly to her dissertation about the long-running international film festival in Thessaloniki, Greece, and how residents and visitors interact at the festival and in the city.

VES was the first Harvard department to offer PhD students the opportunity of adding a secondary field to their program. “I was ecstatic [the department] decided to offer a secondary field,” Lee recalls, and she was hardly alone. In the first year of this initiative, VES welcomed a total of 26 PhD students—from anthropology, Romance languages and literatures, comparative literature, East Asian languages and civilizations, and other areas—all interested in enhancing their scholarship with a secondary field in film theory, history, and production.

Moreover, the idea of secondary fields has been taken up by four additional departments or committees. In fall 2007, Romance languages and literatures, African and African American studies, medieval studies, and the classics joined VES in offering PhD students this option. To qualify for a secondary field, graduate students must take four courses in the subject area, ideally in the first few years of their program. Students may also teach in the department or committee of their secondary field.

David Rodowick, professor of VES as well as director of graduate studies for the department, regards the secondary field option, in part, as a steppingstone to a proposed film studies PhD program. A proposal for such a program is currently under consideration by the University administration.

The high interest in film studies at the graduate level hasn’t surprised Rodowick. “In the humanities,” he says, “film and visual/cultural studies is a growth area. There are a lot of jobs in film, but the curious thing is that they’re not in free-standing film departments,” he says. “They’re in a variety of different situations that are always cross-disciplinary. There’ll be a German department that does film, or an English department that also does film.”

But to get these jobs, students need training, training that has until now been unavailable at Harvard or its peer institutions (no more than a handful offer graduate work in film studies). For that reason, says Rodowick, the secondary field in VES will be “a magnet” for new students looking to add this film component to their Harvard doctoral work. Publishing, teaching, and even curating can be included in this graduate “minor.”

If and when a full-fledged PhD program is introduced, Rodowick expects to admit only two or three students per year, at least initially. For that reason as well, he says, offering a secondary field in VES to students from across the arts and sciences will be an important way to help meet a growing demand.

—Susan Lumenello

For more information on secondary fields in VES, visit www.ves.fas.harvard.edu/secondary.html.
New Awards for Teaching Fellows
Honor GSAS Students, and a Longstanding Friendship

At the first annual ceremony honoring winners of the Bok Award, held in University Hall, are, from left, Dr. and Mrs. David Nathan, former University President Derek Bok, GSAS Dean Theda Skocpol, Jennifer Ferriss, Rachel Garoff Eaton, Paul Edlefsen, Bok Center Director James Wilkinson, and Brandon Tilley. Missing: Kelly Heffner.

Last spring, the Derek Bok Center for Teaching and Learning at Harvard, along with GSAS, honored five outstanding teaching fellows with the first Derek Bok Awards for Excellence in Graduate Student Teaching of Undergraduates at a ceremony at University Hall. Each award came with a $1,000 prize and a certificate. More importantly, it highlighted the crucial role that graduate students play in educating undergraduates.

The prize is named for Derek Bok, University president from 1971 to 1991 and, most recently, interim president for the 2006–07 academic year. The prize was endowed by David G. Nathan, AB ’51, MD ’55, and his wife Jean Louise Friedman Nathan, as a way to honor Bok and his commitment to teaching.

Bok and Nathan, the Robert A. Stranahan distinguished professor of pediatrics and professor of medicine at Harvard Medical School, have been friends since Bok’s first incarnation as Harvard’s president.

The five GSAS students honored were: Rachel Garoff Eaton (psychology), Paul Edlefsen (statistics), Jennifer Ferriss (the classics), Kelly Heffner (engineering and applied sciences), and Brandon Tilley (English and American literature and language).

At the prize ceremony, GSAS Dean Theda Skocpol read citations featuring comments from undergraduates and faculty. Professor Xiao-Li Meng, chair of the statistics department, said Edlefsen “has no peer” for his contributions to the quality of teaching in the department. And one classics undergraduate praised Ferriss for her “sensitive understanding of where a student’s difficulties with the material might lie.”

James Wilkinson, now in his 20th year as director of the Bok Center, has consulted with hundreds of teaching fellows on a wide range of teaching-related matters, from handling controversial issues in the classroom to grading papers. Teaching fellows, he says, are part of what makes Harvard unique.

“TFs are usually the ones who are in closest contact with undergraduates, whether that’s through sections, tutorials, labs, or as resident or nonresident House tutors,” says Wilkinson, who earned his PhD from Harvard in 1974. Just imagine Harvard without TFs, he says. “The tutorial and House systems would vanish … the Houses would just become dorms, and we couldn’t teach the labs.”

At the awards ceremony, Bok reminded the audience of students, faculty, and staff: “Teaching is always at risk in a research university where the rewards are more visible for research and less tangible for teaching. There’s no silver bullet to remedy the situation, no single way to lift the level of pedagogy. Rather, we must do many things at once to achieve a cumulative effect.” One way is through the Bok Awards.

—Susan Lumenello

from the dean continued from page 1

GSAS to move toward universal Harvard Science Fellowships would be to extend toward the sciences and engineering the same advantages we have already offered to young scholars in the humanities and social sciences.

Harvard Science Fellowships would demonstrate to incoming—and prospective—PhD students that at Harvard they are free to explore their intellectual interests from their very first year. These fellowships would also improve the competitiveness of training grant applications and enhance the overall level of resources Harvard commits to the sciences.

In the years to come, it is my hope that many Graduate School alumni and friends will find Harvard Science Fellowships an ideal outlet for giving that makes a real difference—not just to our university but to the entire world, whose well-being will be served by the discoveries made by our future science PhDs and the leadership they will provide across the globe in academia, industry, and government.
And the dividing line is, of course, who can afford it.

MS: Yes, and that’s a very important point. Now that eugenics is basically a free-market activity, those who will avail themselves of genetically enhanced children will be those who can afford it. The risk is that the gap between rich and poor will be genetically reinforced, will be reflected in the use of these genetic technologies, and that seems to me a very serious concern.

Could you foresee a situation where there was financial aid for people who couldn’t afford genetic enhancement, in order to level the playing field?

MS: It’s a good question. In principle, you could level the playing field and provide public subsidies or financial aid—the equivalent of need-based scholarships—for genetic enhancement technologies. The reason I would not welcome that alternative is that I think the recourse to genetic enhancement is undesirable for rich and poor alike. I don’t think the fundamental problem is inequality of access because I think it’s a spurious good in the first place, in part because it’s at odds with important norms, like the norm of unconditional love of parents for children.

But if we as a society came to believe that genetically increasing, say, IQ was as important as healthcare, then I could see an argument for providing public subsidies for it. I’m not optimistic, by the way, that that would come to pass. We haven’t even managed to achieve universal healthcare, never mind universal access to genetic enhancement. So I would rather that we enact universal healthcare than have a society where the affluent can... buy genetic technologies to enhance their children, while other children in our society lack basic healthcare. That seems to me to be, morally speaking, the worst of both worlds.

You served on the President’s Bioethics Council (2002–05). Should a body be created to regulate genetic technologies?

MS: First of all, I think there should be an explicit public debate about the use of new genetic technologies for nonmedical purposes. I also think that there should be some regulations placed on the nonmedical use of genetic engineering. The United States probably has less regulation in this area than any of the other advanced industrial democracies. Unlike the European countries, we have not even been able to enact a ban on human reproductive cloning.

Why is that?

MS: The attempt to do so repeatedly got caught up in the debate over embryonic stem cell research. There are for-profit fertility clinics in the United States that for $18,000 will let you choose in advance the sex of your child... for reasons totally unrelated to any medical need, truly preferential sex selection. These for-profit clinics have virtually no regulation, unlike [in] Britain, Canada, France, Germany, all of which have a very careful regulation of what these days is called reprogengenics, the use of new genetic technologies for reproduction.

What do these European and other countries regulate?

MS: They regulate sex selection. They regulate human reproductive cloning.... It’s odd that my barber is subject to more licensing and regulatory requirements than for-profit fertility clinics that are carrying on these experiments with new genetic technologies.

The resistance [to regulation] comes from two ends of the political spectrum. There are some who are pro-choice on abortion who are concerned that any regulation of fertility clinics will be the “first step” toward regulating abortion. And there are those from the right-to-life end of the political spectrum who oppose any regulation of fertility clinics because they oppose in vitro fertilization as such and they’re afraid that regulating fertility clinics would implicitly condone fertility treatments, which they’re against. So, together, from these different ends of the political spectrum, there has been this resistance in the United States which one does not find in European countries [or] Canada.

One other reason that regulation is important: We had a debate in recent years about embryonic stem cell research, and I was among those in the minority on the President’s Council on Bioethics who argued in favor of federal funding for embryonic stem cell research. Having responsible regulation to prevent abuse of these technologies makes it easier to make the case for responsible science, including embryonic stem cell research. For example, one of the arguments [that] opponents of stem cell research raise against therapeutic cloning—the use of cloning techniques for stem cell research—is [that] it could lead to human reproductive cloning.

So, if we had a ban on human reproductive cloning—as all European countries do—it would be easier, not harder, to make the case for responsible science, including embryonic stem cell research.... I think it would help the cause of biomedical research to have some regulations to prevent abuse and to assure the highest ethical standards.

Would you favor regulations for some of the other technologies you discuss in your book, such as implants for memory enhancement and other items in the buffet of genetic improvement?

MS: That’s a harder question. I think we need to know more about how exactly memory-enhancing drugs or genetic therapies will develop in order to know whether and under what circumstances they should be permitted. But I do think we should have a public debate about the ethics of these technologies.

If we’re going to have a public debate about genetic technologies and their regulation, the major political parties will have to play a key role. How effective have they been in setting up this debate?

MS: First, I should say I was surprised to have been asked to serve on the President’s Council for Bioethics. They surely knew when they invited me that I’m not a Republican. In the debates we had about embryonic stem cell research, I was critical of the President’s restrictions on federal funding for embryonic stem cell research, so there’s no secret about that.

But stepping back in the way that your question suggests, I think that neither party has done a very good job at framing public debate on the broader issues. So far, the public debate has been restricted to the question of embryonic stem cell research, which too often has tended to track the abortion debate. A much broader range of moral questions is at stake in the question of genetic engineering or enhancement. I don’t think either party has come to terms with this yet, in part because both parties tend to approach the question with old reflexes.
Old reflexes?

MS: Reflexes that were shaped by the abortion debate. So, many liberals think first about questions of autonomy and individual choice, whereas many conservatives focus on the moral status of the embryo. But neither of those frameworks is adequate to the fuller debate we need to have about the use of genetic technologies for enhancement. Both liberals and conservatives need to begin to develop a way of thinking about bioethics—and what some are beginning to call bio-politics—that reaches beyond the abortion debate, pro-choice versus pro-life.

You write: “The connection between solidarity and giftedness…saves a meritocratic society from slipping into the smug assumption that success is the crown of virtue.” Can you talk about that connection?

MS: The idea of giftedness goes along with a willingness to be open to the unpredictability of life. To appreciate children as gifts, for example, is to accept them as they come, not as we might “design” them. This idea of giftedness looms large in the argument that I try to make because it emphasizes the importance of what theologian William May calls “an openness to the unbidden,” [that is,] the unchosen—and that openness, which involves a certain humility and restraint, seems to me to be very important morally but also to have civic consequences.

Which brings us to solidarity. If we put aside genetic engineering for the moment and just think, why do the fortunate owe anything to the less fortunate in a society? One answer to that question depends heavily on the idea of giftedness. Some people are fortunate or blessed or gifted through no doing of their own, and if many of our advantages can’t be said to be our own doing, then that gives a powerful moral impetus to solidarity with those less fortunate than ourselves.

So, my concern is that the moral and civic basis of solidarity would be diminished, would be eroded, if we really did come to think of ourselves as self-made …[if] biotechnology enabled us really to become, so to speak, the self-made men and women of Promethean aspiration…. Whereas if I think of myself as the beneficiary of gifts or luck or grace or fortune, then I think there’s a greater tendency be able to look at someone else and say, ‘There but for the grace of God—or the luck of the genetic lottery—go I.’ … Some of the advantages I enjoy are not my own doing; they’re gifts, things for which I’m indebted, not things that I control wholly. That way of thinking lends itself to solidarity. Whereas if I think, “Everything I have I did, I made, my own doing. I’m not indebted to anyone or anything for it,” that way of thinking makes the case for solidarity much more difficult.

In the book, you use health insurance as a good example of solidarity. People buy into this pool because one never knows what will happen with one’s health. With more self-determination, though, one will know more things and perhaps be less empathetic about other’s medical woes.

MS: Yes! Even if we are able to map our own genomes—now, it’s millions of dollars to map a person’s genome, but they say eventually the cost will go way down—what will it be like when we know all about genetic propensities to various diseases? Well, we still won’t know how likely we are to be the victim of accidents. But the sharing, the pooling of risk, that is involved in health insurance…will become much more difficult.

Humility and restraint don’t really characterize our age.

MS: (Smiles.) They don’t.

How will you reinforce your argument in the public arena, or are you just hopeful?

MS: That’s a good question too. I think you’re right: There are precious few resources for humility and restraint in our society, and I’m trying to lean against the current, which is very much in the direction of increasing our mastery, dominion, and control over nature, including human nature. There’s always been a powerful drive—especially in America—toward thinking of ourselves as being self-made. But now biotechnology comes along and empowers that drive even more deeply.

So, I think it’s all the more important to notice those features of our moral and civic landscape that depend on a certain measure of humility and restraint, and to try and shore them up. Now, some people will say, “But all of medical advances, all of scientific advances, depend on rejecting restraint—for example,] surgery and using tools to cut open the body.” And I accept that. I’m all for mastery when it comes to restoring health and curing disease, but what I’m trying to point out is that there is still an important place for humility and restraint, and that certain important social and civic practices depend on those virtues. How to deal with the fact that society is headed in the other direction? The only way is to try to encourage a public debate that recognizes these important domains of life that depend on moral resources at odds with the drive to mastery and control, at odds with the Promethean ambition.

Do you think Barry Bonds should have an asterisk next to his name in the baseball record book?

MS: Yes. In fact, I would prefer [that] he not break the record, but that won’t come to pass. By the time [this interview] appears, he will long since have surpassed Hank Aaron. My interest in baseball by far predates my interest in biotechnology. I grew up near Minneapolis, Minn., in the days when Harmon Killebrew was the great homerun hero—without the help of any performance-enhancing drugs—and then Willie Mays. So I do think [Bonds’s is] a lesser achievement and, sadly, a sign of the times.
NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH RECOGNIZE WORK OF HARVARD FACULTY

In September, the National Institutes of Health (NIH) awarded millions of dollars in grant funding to 12 new Pioneer Award recipients, each receiving $2.5 million in direct costs over five years, and 29 New Innovator Award recipients, each receiving $1.5 million in direct costs over the same period. Several recipients are Harvard faculty members and GSAS alumni, as well. Among the Pioneer Award recipients are Emery N. Brown (AB ’78, MD ’87, PhD ’88, statistics), a professor of health sciences and technology and professor of computational neuroscience in the Harvard-MIT Division of Health Sciences and Technology, who will develop a systems neuroscience approach to study how anesthetic drugs act in the brain to create the state of general anesthesia; and Takao K. Hensch, a professor of molecular and cellular biology and a professor of neurology, who will explore the role of noncoding RNAs in brain development and as a potential treatment for brain disorders. Frances E. Jensen, a professor of neurology, will examine how seizures in early life alter the developing brain and lead to cognitive disorders.

Among the New Innovator Award recipients are Sarah Fortune, an assistant professor of immunology and infectious diseases, who will investigate the mechanisms by which tuberculosis escapes the immune system response; and Levi Garraway (AB ’90, MD/PhD ’99, medical sciences), an assistant professor of medicine, who will use a novel genetic and chemical screening approach to identify changes in malignant melanoma tumor cells that could be targets for new treatments. Nir Hacohen, an assistant professor of medicine, will use a new genetic approach to dissect immune system pathways that sense disease-causing agents; Konrad Hochedlinger, an assistant professor of medicine, will study the reprogramming of adult mouse and human cells into embryonic cells by defined factors; Mark D. Johnson (MD/PhD ’95, medical sciences), an assistant professor of neurosurgery, will examine the role of decreased synthesis of microRNA, a recently discovered class of molecules, in the development and aggressiveness of human cancer; and Alan Saghatelian, an assistant professor of chemistry and chemical biology, will develop advanced analytical chemistry approaches to characterize biomedically important enzymes.

ALUMNUS WINS “GENIUS” GRANT

Sven Haakanson, PhD ’00, anthropology, was named one of 24 John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation fellows for 2007, it was announced in September. Haakanson is the executive director of the Alutiiq Museum in Kodiak, Alaska, and is the driving force behind the revitalization of indigenous language, culture, and customs in an isolated region of North America. He is also an adjunct member of the faculty at the Kodiak College campus of the University of Alaska in Anchorage and the former chair of the Alaska State Council on the Arts. Fellows work in a range of fields across the arts and sciences. Each will receive $500,000 in “no strings attached” support over the next five years. The inaugural class of MacArthur fellows was named in 1981. Including this year’s fellows, 756 people, ranging in age from 18 to 82 at the time of their selection, have been named MacArthur fellows since the inception of the program.

ALUMNUS, FACULTY MEMBER WIN HEINZ AWARDS

The Heinz Family Foundation, whose $250,000 awards place them among the largest individual achievement prizes in the world, announced in September 2007 the recipients of the 13th annual Heinz Awards. The achievements of these six individuals “have helped expand human understanding, spur innovation, and enhance the world’s capacity to sustain itself,” said a foundation statement. Hugh Herr, PhD ’88, biophysics, won in the technology category. Herr, a double-amputee who holds patents on several pioneering prosthetic limbs, is an associate professor of media arts and sciences and an assistant professor in the Massachusetts Institute of Technology-Harvard Division of Health Sciences and Technology. He also directs the Biomechatronics Group at the MIT Media Lab. Harvard faculty member Donald Berwick, a professor of health policy and management and a clinical professor of pediatrics and health care policy, won his award in the public policy category. Berwick heads the Institute for Healthcare Improvement, a nonprofit global healthcare organization founded in 1991 and based at Harvard Medical School. He has also launched the 100K Lives Campaign, an initiative to make American hospitals safer for patients by reducing medical errors.
ALUMNA’S PRIZED PARROT DIES
Alex, the grey parrot who served as the centerpiece of Irene Pepperberg’s research for three decades, died in September 2007, at the age of 31. A faculty member in psychology at Brandeis University, Pepperberg, PhD ’76, chemical physics, shifted her scholarly focus to avian intelligence soon after concluding her doctoral research at Harvard. She found Alex, then a year old, in a pet store and began working with him. Over the years, Alex learned to use speech to identify dozens of objects, colors, shapes, and number concepts up to six. According to the Alex Foundation homepage, the parrot also used phrases such as “I want [X]” to refer to certain labels, and he had acquired concepts of various categories, including bigger and smaller, same and different, and absence. Pepperberg has noted that Alex demonstrated a level and scope of cognitive abilities never expected in an avian species. Emotionally, he was equivalent to a two-year-old child; intellectually, to a five-year-old. Pepperberg’s research with Alex shattered the generally held notion that parrots are only capable of mindless vocal mimicry. Reports of Alex’s accomplishments have been featured on many public television science programs and in publications such as the Wall Street Journal and the New York Times. Pepperberg wrote about this work in her 1999 book The Alex Studies: Cognitive and Communicative Abilities of Grey Parrots (Harvard). Alex was named for Pepperberg’s postgrad project, the Avian Learning Experiment. Parrots can be expected to live to age 60; the cause of Alex’s death was not known at the time of this writing.

GSAS ALUMNUS ELECTED TO BOARD OF OVERSEERS
Richard R. Schrock, PhD ’71, chemistry, was elected in June 2007 by University alumni/ae as one of five new members of the Harvard Board of Overseers. Schrock is the Frederick G. Keyes professor of chemistry at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, where he has taught since 1975. He won the 2005 Nobel Prize in chemistry (with Yves Chauvin). Harvard overseers are elected for six-year terms.

ALUMNUS ELECTED TO BOARD OF OVERSEERS
Richard R. Schrock, PhD ’71, chemistry, was elected in June 2007 by University alumni/ae as one of five new members of the Harvard Board of Overseers. Schrock is the Frederick G. Keyes professor of chemistry at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, where he has taught since 1975. He won the 2005 Nobel Prize in chemistry (with Yves Chauvin). Harvard overseers are elected for six-year terms.

ALUMNUS ELECTED TO BOARD OF OVERSEERS
Richard R. Schrock, PhD ’71, chemistry, was elected in June 2007 by University alumni/ae as one of five new members of the Harvard Board of Overseers. Schrock is the Frederick G. Keyes professor of chemistry at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, where he has taught since 1975. He won the 2005 Nobel Prize in chemistry (with Yves Chauvin). Harvard overseers are elected for six-year terms.

ALUMNUS ELECTED TO BOARD OF OVERSEERS
Richard R. Schrock, PhD ’71, chemistry, was elected in June 2007 by University alumni/ae as one of five new members of the Harvard Board of Overseers. Schrock is the Frederick G. Keyes professor of chemistry at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, where he has taught since 1975. He won the 2005 Nobel Prize in chemistry (with Yves Chauvin). Harvard overseers are elected for six-year terms.
HEALING
A Life With Chronic Illness
By Marguerite Guzmán Bouvard, PhD ’65, government

This memoir follows Bouvard’s journey from diagnosis to a stage of coping with the crippling disease interstitial cystitis. An author and human rights activist, she found new ways of approaching her craft and her passions in life. The author is a retired professor of political science and creative writing at Regis College (Mass.). Her previous books include The Path Through Grief: A Compassionate Guide and Revolutionizing Motherhood: The Mothers of the Plaza de Mayo.

THE RISE OF THE CHINESE EMPIRE
Vol. 1: Nation, State, and Imperialism in Early China, ca. 1600 BC–AD 8
Vol. 2: Frontier, Immigration, and Empire in Han China, 130 BC–AD 157
By Chun-shu Chang, PhD ’64, East Asian languages and civilizations
University of Michigan Press, 2007, 506 pp. (Vol. 1) and 352 pp. (Vol. 2)

This monumental history began as the author’s revised dissertation back in the early 1960s. It fills a gap in early Chinese history when empires were being generated, new lands being claimed, and wars being fought—with a focus on the profound influence of frontiers and “peripheral zones.” Chang is professor of history at the University of Michigan and co-author of the books Crisis and Transformation in 17th-Century China and Redefining History: Ghosts, Spirits, and Human Society in Pu Sung-ling’s World, 1640–1715.

MISSING ALICE
In Search of a Mother’s Voice
By Susan Letzler Cole, PhD ’68, English and American literature and language

Through oral history of conversations between mother and daughter, as well as excerpts from her mother’s girlhood diary and the author’s own diary, Cole has constructed a biography of her mother’s last months and of a daughter’s efforts to retain memory. Cole is professor of English and director of the creative writing program at Albertus Magnus College (Conn.). Her previous books include The Absent One: Mourning Ritual, Tragedy, and the Performance of Ambivalence and Directors in Rehearsal: A Hidden World.

LAWRENCE AND AARONSOHN
T.E. Lawrence, Aaron Aaronsohn, and the Seeds of the Arab-Israeli Conflict
By Ronald Florence, PhD ’69, history

Both Lawrence, better known as Lawrence of Arabia, and Aaronsohn, a Palestinian scientist, worked for British intelligence during World War I. While the Great Powers battled in theaters across Europe, these two unlikely leaders worked to garner support for England from Arab and Jewish settlers. Their efforts, writes Florence, planted the seeds for the modern Arab-Israeli conflict. This is that story. The author is a historian and a novelist, whose previous books include Blood Libel: The Damascus Affair of 1840.

HOW TO MAKE OPPORTUNITY EQUAL
Race and Contributive Justice
By Paul Gomberg, PhD ’72, philosophy

Both Lawrence, better known as Lawrence of Arabia, and Aaronsohn, a Palestinian scientist, worked for British intelligence during World War I. While the Great Powers battled in theaters across Europe, these two unlikely leaders worked to garner support for England from Arab and Jewish settlers. Their efforts, writes Florence, planted the seeds for the modern Arab-Israeli conflict. This is that story. The author is a historian and a novelist, whose previous books include Blood Libel: The Damascus Affair of 1840.
The author proposes a radical “contributive” theory of justice in which all labor is shared and all citizens have actual equal opportunity. A market-driven society, he argues, cannot provide a level playing field for many black Americans and for the poor of all races, and he offers a new paradigm. Gomberg is professor of philosophy at Chicago State University.

**THE LIMITS OF SOVEREIGNTY**

Property Confiscation in the Union and the Confederacy during the Civil War

By Daniel W. Hamilton, PhD ’03, history

Today, government confiscation of private property without fair compensation would be considered a gross abuse of power and, frankly, un-American. Yet that is what happened in the South—through the actions of both Union and Confederate forces—during the Civil War. The Congressional debates and subsequent legal remedies, amid the carnage of war, are the subject of this book. Hamilton is assistant professor of law and co-director of the Institute for Law and the Humanities at Chicago-Kent College of Law.

**RENAISSANCE VISION FROM SPECTACLES TO TELESCOPES**

By Vincent Ilardi, PhD ’58, history

It was in his capacity as a historian of the Italian Renaissance that the author encountered new archival documents related to the early history of eyeglasses, invented in Italy. This book, winner of the 2006 J.F. Lewis Award from the American Philosophical Society, is the result of that discovery. It tells the delightfully absorbing story of the development, design, manufacture, and distribution of arguably one of the most important inventions of the last 2,000 years. Ilardi is professor of history emeritus at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst. His previous books include Studies in Italian Renaissance Diplomatic History.

**THE FBI**

A History

By Rhodri Jeffreys-Jones, GSA ’66

Jeffreys-Jones, an expert on American intelligence agencies, traces the Bureau’s roots to the 1870s, when Congress sought to quell Ku Klux Klan attacks on black Americans. In this brief but probing history, he contends, for one, that J. Edgar Hoover’s role has been overestimated by historians. The FBI, he writes, has “always been a showcase for human frailties and bitter controversies,” including in its handling of the events leading up to and following the 9/11 terrorist attacks. He outlines the Bureau’s failures and successes over the decades. Jeffreys-Jones is a professor of American history at Edinburgh University. His previous books include Peace Now! American Society and the Ending of the Vietnam War and Cloak and Dollar: A History of American Secret Intelligence.

**ARCHIVE STYLE**

Photographs & Illustrations for US Surveys, 1850–1890

By Robin Kelsey, PhD ’00, history of art and architecture

The government-funded geologic surveys of the 19th-century American West were done for practical purposes—for example, to show earthquake damage or document the Mexican border. Kelsey finds that the work anticipates the rise of photography as an art form and that the photographers under discussion had a style and sensibility surpassing “the job.” Kelsey is the John L. Loeb associate professor of the humanities in Harvard’s Department of History of Art and Architecture.

**BLUE-CHIP BLACK**

Race, Class, and Status in the New Black Middle Class

By Karyn R. Lacy, PhD ’00, sociology

Because of stereotypes held by both whites and blacks about race, class, and status, middle-class blacks often find themselves negotiating and renegotiating their identities as they interact with different groups, pulling from what the author calls an identity “tool kit.” Lacy is assistant professor of sociology and an associate of the Center for Afro-American and African Studies at the University of Michigan.

**HENRY JAMES, OSCAR WILDE, AND AESTHETIC CULTURE**

By Michèle Mendelssohn, GSA ’02, special students

Purveyors of an approach to literature known as Aestheticism, James and Wilde had a complex relationship, freighted with mutual admiration and jealousy. Mendelssohn shows how they influenced each other, and British and American literary culture. The author is assistant professor of American literature at the University of Edinburgh.

**GEMSTONE OF PARADISE**

The Holy Grail in Wolfram’s Parzival

By G. Ronald Murphy, PhD ’74, Germanic languages and literatures

Wolfram von Eschenbach’s *Parzival* (c. 1210) described the Holy Grail not as a chalice, as it is usually portrayed, but as a stone—the “gemstone of paradise.” In this literary mystery of sorts, Murphy unravels a different explanation for the object of this great search—that it may have been seen as a portable stone altar—and finds connections between it and...
the Crusades. The author is a professor of German at Georgetown University. His previous books include The Owl, the Raven, and the Dove: The Religious Meaning of the Grimms’ Magic Fairy Tales.

**THIS ONE TREE**

Poems


In this collection, Peterson compares the life of the senses to the life of the intellect, offering “a self-portrait of the world,” writes William Olsen in the foreword. The idea of a tree is used throughout to emblemize matters of time passing in the world and in ourselves. *This One Tree* won the New Issues Poetry Prize for a first book last year. Peterson will join the faculty of Deep Springs College ( Calif.) in 2008.

**GLOBALIZATION CHALLENGED**

Conviction, Conflict, Community


As president of the International Rescue Committee, Rupp has immersed himself “on the ground” in countries such as Afghanistan and Sudan. He concludes that globalization has led to instability in many underdeveloped nations because of a “failure to recognize and institutionalize a constructive role of government beyond its support of unfettered markets and unimpeded capital flows.” He also criticizes governments and aid groups that overlook the importance and organizing power of religion in regions being buffeted by globalization. Rupp, the former president of Columbia University, received a GSAS Centennial Medal for alumni achievement in 2004.

**NAKBA**

Palestine, 1948, and the Claims of Memory


Al-nakba means “the catastrophe.” To many Palestinians of a certain age, it refers to the events of 1948: the war, the creation of an Israeli state, and the ongoing aftermath of partitioning, in which many Palestinians became refugees. Here, writers present personal memoirs, cultural analyses, and scholarly histories on the period. Abu-Lughod is professor of anthropology and gender studies at Columbia University. Her books include *Writing Women’s Worlds: Bedouin Stories*.

**FACING THE LATE VICTORIANS**

Portraits of Writers and Artists, from the Mark Samuels Lasner Collection

Margaret D. Stetz, PhD ’82, English and American literature and language University of Delaware Press, 2007, 158 pp.

Portraits of writers and artists, writes Stetz, filled newspapers and journals in Victorian-era England. And having one’s portrait done, as well as being able to analyze the portraits of others, was a pastime of the creative set. Here, Stetz explains the cultural context of the phenomenon. The author is the Mae and Robert Carter professor of women’s studies and professor of humanities at the University of Delaware. Her several previous books include *Gender and the London Theatre, 1880–1920*.

**DRAGONS AT YOUR DOOR**

How Chinese Cost Innovation Is Disrupting Global Competition


The Chinese way of doing global business is having enormous impact on world markets and displacing some established businesses. The authors describe the strategy of cost innovation—offering variety and customization at low production costs—and how companies can best prepare for and even benefit from it. Williamson is professor of international management and Asian business at INSEAD, the international business school in France and Singapore, and the author of *Winning in Asia: Strategies for Competing in the New Millennium* (2004).

**At last… Tax-free gifts from IRAs to Harvard**

It’s easy! Now you can give vital support to help GSAS advance its mission. Those 70½ and older can take advantage of this opportunity through 2007. For details, call 617-496-4149 and ask for Sarah Carothers in Gift Planning.

617-495-4647 • 800-VERITAS (Office of Gift Planning) www.post.harvard.edu/pgo • E-mail: ogp@harvard.edu
In Their Words: New GSAS Students on Why Funding Matters

By Abigail Adair

Each year, premier research universities compete for the top graduate students around the globe. Graduate financial aid is increasingly a critical factor in GSAS’s recruitment efforts. Following are accounts from just three members of the new cohort of GSAS students for whom funding was a significant piece of the graduate school decision-making puzzle.

Mateo Muñoz, PhD candidate in the history of science, from Colorado Springs, Colorado.

“I really wanted to come to Harvard, but money definitely factored into my decision. Harvard made me a good offer, but other schools were offering me more money. I thought about the next five years and how difficult it might become to secure funding, especially during the last year of dissertation writing. I wanted to be able to have time to focus on my own research and move my work along. Funding mattered, because that’s a big part of getting through graduate school.

“When I found out that I was awarded the Ashford Fellowship in addition to my regular funding package, it was a relief. I felt like I could go ahead and make my decision. I am interested in the history of medicine, particularly the history of gerontology.

Shan Lou, PhD candidate in medical sciences, from Hangzhou, China.

“I only applied to schools in America, and I got three different offers. Most of my teachers at my undergraduate university received their graduate and post-graduate education in America. The United States has the best environment for graduate work. I was impressed that three professors from Harvard came to China to interview us.

“When I was admitted to schools, funding certainly played a role in my decision. I think most Chinese students my age cannot afford to go abroad, especially considering the current [exchange] rate of the US dollar. There is a very huge gap. If I didn’t have enough funding, I would not have come here. With my funding, however, I can focus on my studies instead of looking around for part-time jobs.”

Shan Lou was a biology major at Fudan University in Shanghai prior to attending Harvard. She is interested in molecular and cellular developmental neuroscience, and the focus of her research is neurodegenerative disease, especially Alzheimer’s disease.

Edgar Barroso, PhD candidate in music, from Guanajuato, Mexico.

“When I came here, I knew some of the professors because I had participated in an international composition contest through Harvard’s music department. During the finals for the competition, I became interested in applying to the program because I got a sense of the creative environment and the great relations between the alumni and the faculty.

“I didn’t even apply to other schools. Harvard was my only choice. I spoke with many students and learned that if I got accepted I would get the funding from somewhere to do my research here. I am fortunate to receive funding from CONACYT and Fundación Mexico en Harvard, organizations that sponsor outstanding PhD students from Mexico. I also receive additional funding from GSAS.”

Edgar Barroso taught music composition and music technology to post-graduates in Barcelona, Spain, before enrolling at GSAS. He has a bachelor’s degree in music composition from Universidad de Guanajuato, Mexico, as well as a master’s degree in digital arts and a postgraduate diploma in composition and contemporary technologies from Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Spain. His contemporary and electroacoustic works have been interpreted in important forums in North America, Central America, Asia, and Europe, and he has won several international music composition awards.

Abigail Adair is the assistant director for communications with the University Development Office.

For information about supporting the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, contact Marne Perreault, director of GSAS Giving, at 617-495-1629 or marne_perreault@harvard.edu.
Alumni Events and Notices

Please e-mail gsaa@fas.harvard.edu or call the Office of Alumni Relations at 617-495-5591 for more information about any of the following events.

CHAPTER EVENTS

Tuesday, October 23, 2007 | Chicago, Illinois
John Stauffer, professor of English and American literature and language and of African and African American studies, will speak on “American Protest Literature: Remaking the Self and Reforming Society.” Stauffer’s most recent books include Meteor of War: The John Brown Story (with Zoe Trodd) and The Black Hearts of Men: Radical Abolitionists and the Transformation of Race.

Thursday, November 29, 2007 | New York, New York
Andrew P. McMahon, the Frank B. Baird Jr. professor of science, will speak on “Signaling Development.” Professor McMahon will focus on the hedgehog family to highlight critical roles played by cell signaling in mammalian development and disease, and to illustrate the clinical opportunities that come from an understanding of normal developmental processes.

Monday, December 3, 2007 | Santa Barbara, California
Joseph P. Newhouse, the John D. MacArthur professor of health policy and management, will speak on “The Paradox of Health Care Costs.” His most recent book is Pricing the Priceless: A Health Care Conundrum. Newhouse, AB ’63, PhD ’69, economics, is a faculty member of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, the Kennedy School of Government, the Medical School, and the School of Public Health.

HARVARD ALUMNI ASSOCIATION GLOBAL SERIES
March 28–30, 2008 | Shanghai, China
President Drew Faust and HAA will lead a distinguished delegation of Harvard faculty, alumni/ae, and other leading experts on China and the region. A formal invitation with registration and event details will be mailed in January 2008. Until then, visit http://post.harvard.edu/globalseries for the latest schedule. For more information, contact haa_globalseries@harvard.edu.

ALUMNI WEEKEND

Friday, April 4, 2008 | Cambridge, Massachusetts
Department of Government Graduate Alumni Reunion
Be a part of the first-ever reunion for graduate alumni of the Department of Government. Details on this event will be sent to alumni/ae early in 2008.

Saturday, April 5, 2008 | Cambridge, Massachusetts
GSAS Alumni Day
Keynote speaker: Jeffrey Sachs, PhD ’80, economics, the director of the Earth Institute, the Quetelet professor of sustainable development, and a professor of health policy and management at Columbia University. Sachs serves as a special advisor to UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon. Attendees will also be able to hear from Harvard faculty about their recent scholarship, catch up with old friends, and enjoy a day of intellectual and social refreshment. More information on these events will be mailed early in 2008 and posted at http://gsas.harvard.edu/alumni/alumni.php.