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As former Provost Maurice Glicksman reminds us, we are half-way to our 500th Anniversary. Like other contributors to this issue, he describes how our predecessors and we ourselves have helped the University come this far. Maurice suggests that we consider becoming a resource for the continuing education of our alumni and alumnae. In an informal way; this has been happening anyway -- mostly through ongoing contacts of graduates with faculty they know. For example, this practice is fostered in the global scholarly community by the Humboldt Foundation, whose members readily host new younger, new members; Maurice envisions an even broader implementation of this practice.¹

We have become used to campaigns launched under specific titles, such as the Plan for Academic Enrichment. Keith Brown explains how this is being done, by encouraging scholarly collaborations fed by intense sessions with international gatherings. He discusses how to improve our rank in international assessments and how to achieve de-parochializations in specific areas.

Jane Lancaster, describing and discussing how we’ve reached our present situation, points out how much we are influenced by political and other off-campus factors in our choice of new emphases, and how changes in our expanding local physical presence influences the paths we choose. Jane describes in detail the sources she used in writing her review of Brown’s first 250 years.

Bill Simmons, another former Provost, focuses on the significance of the heraldic trappings of Brown University, especially in our solemn and joyful public moments. These trappings include seals, coats of arms, bells, songs, a mace, chains of office, mountable diplomas and certificates, and formal processions such as that for graduation, where everyone gets two chances to see other members of the Brown community.

Important for us all are our individual recollections. Sir William Wakeham starts by describing his early introduction as a post-doc to research life at Brown. He has been especially one of us because his visits to Brown were spread across decades, and he has observed our changes here as well as being able to create changes elsewhere. In particular, he notes opportunities taken to improve town /gown relationships as part of a full academic life. From such services, he has been honored with his knighthood.

¹ The Alexander von Humboldt Foundation has a world-wide network of Humboldtians that encourages and supports senior members to act as hosts for younger ones; see “Humboldt Life”, a new networking site.
Leslie Bostrom offers her recollections by selecting samples from the many sketches she has made, especially of people taking important roles as members of the community, meeting together for many purposes, and unselfconsciously displaying their concentration in the process. It is intrinsically necessary for us to hold meetings and discussions, and to help one another do better than we would be likely to do in solitude.

Julie Strandberg reminds us that a consequence of the New Curriculum – probably not anticipated at the time it was introduced – is that we value the making of the arts, including dance just as highly as the humanities and the sciences, and that the making of arts has its own criteria and methods of assessment, while encouraging the development of skills, apprenticeships, originality and collaboration in performance.

Peter Richardson, who has been at Brown during the most recent fifth of its overall history, reflects back on discussions held at the 200th anniversary, evaluates changes in Brown’s Faculty Governance since then. He also uses a specific faculty group to illustrate how we were able to handle changes smoothly, and gives typical examples of where faculty came from -- and often where they moved to later on. (There is turnover, in corporate bodies like ours, just as in the tissues of our individual bodies.)

Walter Feldman, another old-timer at Brown, voyages into a fresh mode to express ideas that in the past had influenced his graphic arts (many of which have graced previous issues of the Faculty Bulletin). This is new territory to which he takes us, which defines his past work while expressing his own idiosyncratic approach to going forward still further. Let us all hope this will be a feature of the Brown yet to come.

Peter Wegner, in discussing Alan Dershowitz’s new book, reminds us again that we are part of a larger world, where many seek justice and a proper hearing; and although we have no Law School at Brown there are eminent ones nearby, whose faculty are willing to tackle real cases and not simply expound theoretical principles for others to apply. They have done so even in Rhode Island cases -- for instance, in the von Bulow case, where the issues were partly medical. Will Brown establish its own Law School in the next 250 years? Only time will tell.

Meera Viswanathan, from her perspective while on leave in Jordan, seeks to bring our ways of viewing aspects of life that unite us in our desire to understand other religions around the world, while acknowledging that our differences in religion also divide us; even as a child, Meera experienced practices of several different religions. Many of us are in a diaspora from somewhere; we are divided by memories of (and even longing for) our homelands; yet we are united in our desire to belong together, respectful of our differences, and thankful that our university abides as a homeland for us all. We hope for a future in which it will be even more than that.
Thoughts at Brown University's Semi-Quincentennial

Maurice Glicksman
University Professor Emeritus and former Provost

Universities and education continue to play a vital role in our world. Individuals have come together in an organized way to discuss and learn about their world for perhaps three thousand years, with early schools or academies in Greece, the Middle East, India and China, followed by Universities in Europe. These have been seen as beneficial to the groups or nations involved and have been supported and sponsored by individuals and groups desiring the benefit of educated people in their society.

In the United States, the early educational institutions (colleges which developed into universities) were often sponsored by religious organizations, as had been done in Europe by the early Christian Church. Brown’s founding as a College in 1764 was a response to the Baptist Church’s need to train its ministers. Although the original College which is now Brown University was required by its Charter to be led by a President trained as a Baptist minister, and to have set numbers of individuals committed to different Protestant denominations on its governing board (the Brown Corporation), its original Charter mandated that its purpose be “forming the rising generation to virtue, knowledge, and useful literature, and thus preserving in the community a succession of men duly qualified for discharging the offices of life with usefulness and reputation.” It explicitly noted that there would be no religious test for students, i.e., that students of any religious group should have equal access to the College or University. The inclusion of women as students transpired in the late 19th century. The requirement of religious commitment to various denominations for members of the Corporation and the President lasted into the 20th century; the election of Henry Merritt Wriston as the first non-Baptist-minister President occurred in 1938.

Brown has always been open to progressive and ground-breaking academic initiatives: a medical school (third in the nation) in the early 19th century (but lasting less than two decades); an engineering program (third civilian institution program in the nation) in the mid-19th century; curricular innovations during the 19th century; and the “New Curriculum” in 1969, which gave students the responsibility for determining (with faculty approval) what courses they will take and which is still in use. Brown was late among its peer Ivy institutions in developing formal professional schools, giving the title of School to its programs in Medical Education and Public Health, and founding its Division of Engineering only in the last decade. It continues to have a single Faculty, its Graduate School overseeing the quality of its graduate programs. Hence all of the Brown regular faculty members are expected to provide teaching services at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Undergraduate students have access to faculty engaged in research, and many of them participate with mentoring faculty in cutting-edge studies.

What of the future of higher education? Will technical development lead to different arrangements for individuals desiring to increase their knowledge and understanding of the world? A substantial and growing number of young (and older) people get answers to
their questions and instructional lectures from Internet connections -- some of dubious quality. What is difficult to provide technologically is the social quality of relationships -- among students and with teachers -- which play an important role in the learning process. Technology can and does aid in the educational process, but I believe it will not provide the valuable personal interaction that is a key part of education. (The advent of the printed book expanded the number of libraries without inhibiting the growth of the residential colleges.)

However, one change in our society calls for some attention: namely, the increasing percentage of adults who have attended colleges and who want to broaden their knowledge and understanding, if only to keep up with a moving target as those understandings develop apace. The rapidity of change, particularly in the sciences, leads one to conclude that education is not just for ages five to eighteen, or five to twenty-two, but rather for a lifetime. **So why not have the University recognize this by offering to be an educational resource for its matriculating students throughout their lifetime?**

What might this mean, and would this offer be seen as attractive to young people? Here I list some of the services that spring to mind, which could be offered to lifelong students, at varying costs and hence for varying fees:

1. Easy access to reference material, both hard copy and digitized;
2. Access to faculty, through office hours' visits, chat rooms, SKYPE sessions, e-mail, etc;
3. Access to live video and recorded video of lectures offered in departments and to the general public;
4. Interest groups, mentored by faculty or other life-long students, “meeting” on a regular basis to study a given topic or discuss recent advances (like the “journal clubs” of yore);
5. Lecture and seminar courses or mini-courses offered on line by faculty, as an audit or for credit, which could include live student contributions;
6. Lecture and seminar courses or mini-courses offered in residence by faculty, as an audit or for credit;
7. Programs leading to advanced degrees from Brown.

These and other ideas need to be fleshed out; and they clearly require the support of the faculty if they are to succeed. Marketing studies should be undertaken to define the range of services offered, encourage proposals for desired services and explore ways of funding such a program. Payment for services that use the Internet is not popular; there are groups actively seeking to make on-line services free (e.g., the Digital Public Library of America (DPLA) with a platform providing world-wide access to metadata).

However this idea is developed, if Brown University were to formally extend educational services to its lifelong students, it would not only take advantage of technologically-driven change in higher education but also maintain its reputation as an educational leader.
Going Global, Together: The BIARI\(^1\) story so far

Keith Brown  
Professor of International Studies (Research)  
Thomas J. Watson Institute for International Studies

In the Brown Faculty Bulletin published in May 2012, Executive Vice-President for Planning Dick Spies offered his own “Reflections on the Plan for Academic Enrichment,” (hereinafter PAE), where he noted in particular the long-term impact of the increase in faculty FTEs, increased funding to the Graduate School, and the introduction of need-blind undergraduate admissions. In the same issue, Provost Mark Schlissel also emphasized the increase in Brown’s capacity that the Plan mapped out. Both these senior administrators were able to point to the hard metrics of the Plan’s success, in terms of increased revenue from both gifts and grants, alongside continuous increase in undergraduate applications and selectivity, as the sticker price of tuition and fees rose from $26,184 per year in 2001-2 (when the PAE was announced) to $43,758 for 2013-14.\(^2\)

The PAE represented a major mobilization of energy and resources, which kick-started macro-measurable change. It also had positive effects in domains for which the metrics are fuzzier. In his brief overview, Provost Schlissel noted that the PAE had also contributed toward “great strides [in] internationalizing Brown.” Here I want to echo that sentiment and point out that this effect, while made possible by investment from the Provost’s office as well as by effective stewardship on the part of the Development office, has also relied enormously on faculty voluntarism, as well as staff generosity and commitment. In my own discipline of anthropology, scholars have long devoted extensive attention to the spirit of the gift -- that is to say, the ways in which people get by, help one another, or effect positive change by harnessing sentiments of solidarity, mutuality or goodwill that are hard to explain through purely quantitative measures. What I want to highlight is the resilience of such sentiments at Brown, as well as their paramount importance for the future of the University as a place of teaching, learning and research on pressing global issues.

Phase II of the PAE, extending the impetus created during the Plan’s first five years, was launched in February 2008. A key component of this second phase, affirmed also in a resolution passed by the Brown Corporation, was to ensure Brown’s standing as a “truly global university.” Like other leading US universities, Brown recognized the coming economic and cultural transformations which, according to one 2013 survey, now rank

\(^1\)Brown International Advanced Research Institute

\(^2\)These figures are calculated from [http://www.collegecalc.org/colleges/rhode-island/brown-university/#.U1M0NsfUt2c](http://www.collegecalc.org/colleges/rhode-island/brown-university/#.U1M0NsfUt2c).  
The figures from Brown’s internal reckoning for 2001-2 are slightly higher, at $26,568 (see [https://www.brown.edu/Administration/News_Bureau/2000-01/00-089.html](https://www.brown.edu/Administration/News_Bureau/2000-01/00-089.html)) while those produced by US News for 2013-14 are $45,612. In either case, the sticker price increase is around 70% over thirteen years, over which the cumulative U.S inflation rater has been 33.5%.
twenty-seven universities outside the United States ahead of Brown.³ So 2008 saw the arrival on campus of legal scholar David M. Kennedy (‘76) as the inaugural Vice President of International Affairs, and the creation of the Office of International Affairs.

Phase II included a number of concrete internationalization goals, such as bringing more international scholars and programs to Providence, and building on the strength of existing centers and programs to develop world-class centers devoted to important global issues. These, though, were relatively conventional, and responded directly to the metrics used by the ranking agencies. More innovative was Kennedy’s commitment, in the language of the PAE, to “use Brown’s convening power, focused on the rising generation of the world’s leading scholars, writers, scientists and politicians, to make Brown the place for sustained dialogue among the world’s leading thinkers.”⁴

This aspiration was swiftly followed by action. In June 2008, with seed funding from Santander Universities, Brown hosted a pilot program to launch what was then called the Brown Institute for Advanced Research. Under Kennedy’s leadership, prominent Brown faculty organized and led initiatives in Global Governance, Archaeologies of Memory, Development and Inequality and Social Movements in Latin America. Various formats were used, including knowledge-sharing among young archeologists and curators on issues of knowledge-production, cultural heritage and collective memory; training early-career scholars in new methodologies to assess inequality; and developing comparative multidisciplinary approaches to social movements and new forms of public authority in Latin America.

On the basis of this successful pilot initiative, Santander Universities and Brown University signed a three-year cooperation agreement on November 13, 2008, formally establishing the Brown International Advanced Research Institutes (BIARI) within the Office of International Affairs. Dr. Ileana Porras was appointed director, and wider participation was invited from Brown faculty across all schools and departments. A common template was established of four two-week intensive residential institutes convened by Brown faculty, featuring distinguished visiting speakers and bringing together early-career scholars and practitioners from the global south for individual professional development as well as to explore collaborative opportunities. A subsequent memorandum of understanding was signed in February 2012, providing increasing funding to BIARI, which President Simmons declared a “shining success,” for a further three years.⁵

Over five years of full operation (2009-2013), BIARI has now offered institutes on nine different topics. These have included areas of established strength (such as Development and Inequality, Global Health and HIV/AIDS, and Critical Global Humanities) as well as

⁵ http://news.brown.edu/features/2012/02/biari
accessed April 20, 2014
domains where faculty and administration sought to build university capacity (including Entrepreneurship, Global Governance and Climate Change). Four themed institutes have run over complete three-year cycles; three have been offered twice, and two have been offered once. Over this period twenty-five Brown faculty served key roles as conveners, marshaling the input of over forty of their Brown colleagues, and a further 50 visiting faculty from beyond the campus, in lectures, seminars, studios and workshops. All told, 722 participants have attended, representing citizens of 96 countries. For BIARI 2014, we are anticipating 142 participants from 53 countries, who will be on campus June 9-23. As in the past three years, this cohort has been selected from a pool of around 1,000 applicants: the majority of those who attend hold PhDs or have equivalent professional experience in their fields.

Institutes offered in BIARI, 2009-2014

(Four Institutes run in parallel each year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LSTGG ¹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech. Entrepreneurship and Mgmt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development and Inequality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Global Humanities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Health and HIV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater and Civil Society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population and Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections and Flows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSHR ²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECI ³</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Law, Social thought and Global Governance  ²Human Security and Humanitarian Response  ³Ethnicity Conflict and Inequality

On the basis of regular consultation with faculty conveners and senior university leadership, post-institute surveys of alumni, and ongoing research on professional development programs elsewhere, BIARI has continuously evolved. A key component, added after the first two years, has been alumni programming. Residency grants now give individual alumni the opportunity to spend 1-4 months at Brown, working closely with faculty members they have identified. Collaboration seed grants allow alumni teams to continue working together on projects they began, or conceptualized, while at BIARI.
Outcomes thus far include the innovative online journal *Rethinking Development and Inequality*, established by a multi-national editorial board who met at BIARI; several original comparative research projects bringing together scholars working in and on Latin America, Africa, Asia and Europe; pedagogical collaborations, including for example a pilot project in multi-campus co-teaching in performance studies which connects South Africa, India and New Zealand; and several web-based outreach and networking initiatives on key topics in climate change and sustainability.

These grant programs have measurable impacts. The stimulus of seed grants from BIARI of less than $10,000 each have directly contributed to BIARI alumni teams receiving further grants from the Mellon Foundation (USA), the Carolina Foundation (Spain), and AHRC (UK), totaling over $410,000. Meanwhile, residency recipients have won international recognition, including the Distinguished Scholar Award by the Arab Fund for Social and Economic Development and South Africa’s NRF Career Advancement Fellowship. These are the high-visibility success stories to date, culled from the reporting of the 22% of all alumni—over 160 from the entire network of 722—who have received some level of further financial support from BIARI.

Obviously, BIARI cannot claim sole credit for outstanding individuals’ professional accomplishments. What participants regularly stress, though, is the unique added value of meeting face-to-face, in a rigorous academic context, with an array of colleagues-to-be -- whether mentors, interlocutors, sparring partners, collaborators, or even (dare we say it?) friends. Since 2010, BIARI’s logistics have been geared toward creating pathways of new acquaintance, especially among participants who might otherwise never meet. Beyond the work of BIARI’s small administrative staff and the faculty conveners, this has involved the generous support of a wide array of campus constituencies.

The Watson Institute has served as the principal venue for BIARI since 2011, and is now the program’s institutional home, permitting substantive cooperation with other forms of internationally-oriented programming. Efficient visa processing by OISSSS means that almost all those accepted are able to attend, including citizens of countries such as Iran, Cuba, Pakistan and Sudan, for whom such travel can be complicated. They add their distinctive perspectives and voices to a multi-continental, diverse community in which the larger presence of participants from different continental “giants”—India, Brazil, China and Nigeria—never dominates. Thanks to the commitment and expertise of Facilities Management, all four institutes now start one week after Commencement and run in parallel, so that all participants could theoretically meet each other.

Shared keynote sessions, including a powerful and memorable reading by the late Chinua Achebe in 2011 and a lecture by Brown President Christina Paxson in 2013, provide a common experience for the entire cohort.6 And in the past two years, participants have responded positively to the invitation to further enrich their individual BIARI experience by benefiting from faculty expertise. In 2012 and 2013, BIARI’s welcome letter suggested

---

6 Besides a well-received address from Professor Anthony Bogues, BIARI 2012 also featured live performances of the activist works “Rosa Cuchillo” by Ana Correa from Peru, and “NK603” by Violeta Luna from Mexico. The 2014 keynote will be delivered by Ambassador Nirupama Rao, the Gandhi visiting fellow at the Watson Institute.
that participants use the Directory of Researchers at Brown to identify faculty who shared their interests, and offered to help facilitate meetings. In 2012, 30 participants asked for meetings with a total of 57 faculty members at Brown, as well as staff at centers of interest (such as the Sarah Doyle Center, around LGBTQ programming). Although many faculty are away in June, and a few chose to protect their own research time, twenty-five faculty members met one-on-one with BIARI participants, mostly over lunch at the Faculty Club. In 2013, over a third of the participants (56) requested meetings with a total of 80 faculty members. Over fifty faculty members made time to meet, so that of the 128 total requests from participants, we were able to set up 68.

Combined with the direct involvement of leading administration figures in BIARI programming—including, besides President Paxson’s keynote speech, presentations by Provost Schlissel, Vice President of Research Clyde Briant, and Dean of Medicine and Biological Sciences Edward Wing—this broad-based support from Brown’s faculty shows that habits of mutuality and instincts of goodwill are robust and widespread on campus.

This is not to gainsay the benefits for individual faculty of such meetings. As noted above, BIARI participants constitute a truly impressive group of people by any standard; for Brown faculty with particular interests in developing their own international networks or getting up to speed on the key issues being raised and thinkers being debated in other parts of the world, they represent a tremendous learning resource. In a few cases, an initial lunch meeting has been the first step toward a residency application closely tied to the Brown faculty member’s own research.

Clearly, though, direct and measurable payoffs are not the driving impetus for Brown faculty—just as they are not for BIARI participants. These lunch-time conversations, together with all those other interactions involving participants from different continents, Brown graduate student volunteer facilitators, library personnel, keynote speakers, and guest faculty from US and global universities, think-tanks and government agencies, all steer BIARI toward that aspirational goal declared back in February 2008: to make Brown the place for sustained dialogue among the world’s leading thinkers.

Are we there yet? What metrics would tell us? These are core questions for any program of campus internationalization, in which data on rates of study abroad, percentages of international students and faculty, and numbers of Memoranda of Understanding are at a premium. Thanks to the enthusiasm of Santander Universities, the support of the Office of the Provost—and crucially, the enormous resource of human capital represented by Brown’s faculty and staff—the University has been able to persist with this distinctive experiment. And so as this bulletin goes to press, we will be sending out the welcome letter to BIARI’s 2014 participants, who will be attending institutes on the themes of Population and Development; Ethnicity, Conflict and Inequality; Human Security and Humanitarian Response; and Water, Energy and Digital Information in the Global South. We will point participants to the new Researchers@Brown online resource and hope that this year’s interest will match or exceed that of 2013. This year we are also asking participants to provide keywords and a short profile outlining their interests, with the goal of preparing an electronically accessible directory.
In the spirit of continuous scholarly match-making, the BIARI team will be more than happy to share the directory with any Brown faculty wanting to proactively engage with this energetic and accomplished community of scholars, and to set up meetings with particular attendees. We cannot, of course, promise measurable benefit; only the conviction, in the spirit of the gift, that such meetings, and the conversations they engender, are of value in the shared and elusive enterprise of making Brown a “truly global university,” through the indispensable, though often invisible, investments of its faculty.
A Lively Experiment: The First Two Hundred and Fifty Years of Brown University

Jane Lancaster
Adjunct Assistant Professor of History

In 1663, the Royal Charter establishing Rhode Island declared the colony would be “a lively experiment” in religious toleration. The phrase became an enduring part of the identity of the colony, then of the state. In 1764, one hundred and one years later, the Rhode Island General Assembly created another “lively experiment” by chartering a college open to “youths of all religious denominations” who would “receive a like, fair and generous treatment during their residence therein.” Known as Rhode Island College until 1804, when Nicholas Brown II gave $5,000 to endow a professorship and a grateful Corporation changed the name, Brown has been “a lively experiment” for 250 years.

Every institution has turning points, decisions that change the direction and which affect future choices, and Brown is no exception. One was the move from Warren to Providence in 1770; another was the acceptance of federal funds starting with the Morrill Land Grant Act in 1862, and continuing through two World Wars and the McCarthy era to the present day. The establishment of a graduate program in the late 1880s facilitated the notion of a “University College,” a phrase first used in 1908, but which had increasing resonance in the late twentieth century. The admission of women, teaching them the same curriculum, awarding them Brown degrees, but housing them separately, encouraged the growth of a women’s culture. The militarization of the University in both of the World Wars, and the later rejection of ROTC affected the campus and Brown’s relationship with the U.S. government. The decision in the 1950s to build a major dormitory complex undermined the fraternities and helped make Brown a national rather than a regional college; and the decision in 1954 to join the Ivy League, initially a sporting conference, became ultimately a source of high status. The $5 million purchase of Bryant College’s East Side campus in 1969 enlarged Brown by ten acres and twenty-six buildings, and even though Brown’s finances were far from healthy, permitted student expansion, a proliferation of new departments and a new emphasis on the creative arts. The adoption of the new curriculum in 1969, after decades of curricular experimentation was of major importance, while what did NOT happen in the late sixties—there was no violence, a walk-out but no sit-ins—was also a turning point, leading to affirmative action on African American admissions and ultimately, greater diversity in the student body. The decision in 1971 to merge Pembroke, the separate women’s college, with the men’s college, to make Brown a fully coeducational university completed a process that had begun thirty years earlier during World War II. Professional schools were reestablished, beginning with the medical school, followed by the School of Engineering, though as yet Brown has resisted creating business or law schools. In the recent past Brown has started to move off College Hill and spread into the so-called “Knowledge District.”

There has been no full history of Brown since 1914, and the occasion of the 250th anniversary and a recommendation from the Slavery and Justice Committee inspired Provost David Kertzer to ask me to write a new history of the University. It should be published next year, and it traces the development of Brown from a tiny Baptist college on
the margins of the British Empire to a major, secular university in the middle of a
globalized world, and, amongst other themes, examines the evolution of the undergraduate
curriculum, the development of the graduate school, the life of students, changes in the role
and qualifications of the faculty, and the role of slaves, slavery and slave traders in Brown’s
early history.

The college experience has changed almost beyond recognition in the last 250 years.
Today’s Brown would amaze a colonial student by its size and complexity, by its facilities,
by the presence of women and minorities, and by the wide choice of subjects available.
Brown began with no money and no buildings, one fourteen-year-old (male) student and
one professor. By 2014 it had 6,182 undergraduates, fifty-two per cent of whom were
women, 1,974 graduate students, and 463 medical students, 736 full time faculty, almost a
third of them women, a total of 4,450 employees, a crowded campus of more than 235
buildings, and an endowment of $2.86 billion.7

In the colonial era, and well into the nineteenth century, a Brown education was restricted
to a few young men who were taught by recent graduates little older than themselves.
Tuition and fees were relatively high, but bursaries and scholarships were available for
poor boys. Living conditions were Spartan, there were no recreational facilities, and the
food left much to be desired. Education was mainly by “recitation” or rote learning, where
the students literally recited the previous day’s lesson, though there were occasional
lectures by visiting experts. No professor boasted an advanced degree: the Ph.D. had yet to
be invented, and education usually involved passing on received information, rather than
creating new, knowledge.8

It was assumed that a thorough knowledge of Greek and Latin languages and literature was
essential for successful careers in the professions or public affairs. Brown did not disagree,
and its original curriculum embraced the classics, but also included natural science and
practical subjects such as surveying. In the early nineteenth century, Brown had a
pioneering medical program, and in 1847, as the United States industrialized, and
Providence was becoming a hub of industrial innovation, Brown became the first of the
long-established colleges to offer engineering. Brown president Francis Wayland’s 1850
“New Curriculum” designed to educate “the agriculturalist, the manufacturer, the mechanic
and the merchant,” was at least a generation ahead of Brown’s peers. He offered a wide
range of electives, writing “Every man among us is the architect of his own fortune, hence,
every man is desirous for himself . . . of that knowledge which is most essential to success in
the field which is placed before him.” He concluded that in a perfect system, “every student
might study what he chose, all that he chose, and nothing but what he chose.”9

The endowment figure was from June 30, 2013.
8 The first non-professional doctorates were awarded by the department of philosophy (hence the Ph.D.) at
Humboldt University in Berlin, which was founded in 1810. Yale awarded the first Ph.D. at an American university
in1851.
9 Francis Wayland, Report to the Corporation of Brown University on Changes in the System of Collegiate
Education, (Providence, George H. Whitney, 1850), 13.
Not all Brown’s experiments worked: the medical program was suspended in 1827, and did not resume for more than a century; Wayland’s reforms were soon abandoned and other colleges later took credit for instituting enduring elective curricula. Brown was a Land Grant college for more than thirty years, but the federal government’s experiment in financing higher education and broadening the curriculum was no more acceptable to a conservative Corporation than Wayland’s reforms had been. On the other hand, a century later, the New Curriculum, Brown’s liveliest experiment, is perhaps its most successful one. Passed by faculty in May 1969, it eliminated a core curriculum, made letter grades optional, and, with the option to experiment and if need be fail, gave students responsibility for their own education. They were at last “architects of their own fortune.” Clever but unconventional students flocked to Brown, making it by the 1980s one of the most desirable colleges in the land, renowned for the quality of its undergraduate education. No longer “new,” the free elective curriculum is still in effect almost 50 years later.

The student body was local, male, Protestant and white for many years, though there was a Chilean in the class of 1835, and the first African Americans arrived in the 1870s, though seldom more than two in any class. The university gradually developed a commitment to diversity in its multiple forms, including religion, gender, race, ethnicity, nationality and socio-economic class. Its progress was uneven as women, Jews, Catholics, blacks, Asian Americans and other groups have pointed out over time. There was, however, an effort to address economic diversity as early as the 1810s when the calendar was adjusted, to enable young men who needed to support themselves to teach school during a long winter vacation. By the 1890s demographic factors were forcing change as most of Brown’s students were still local, and Rhode Island was a heavily immigrant state, with Jews arriving from Eastern Europe and Roman Catholics from Italy and Portugal. Women gained admission in 1891 after almost twenty years of effort.

Diversification proceeded in the twentieth century, usually reflecting societal and educational changes. Federal support of higher education in the form of the GI Bill allowed Brown to recruit World War II veterans, while the experimental Veterans’ College opened the university to nontraditional students who lacked conventional entrance requirements. In the early 1960s, when there were worries about juvenile delinquency, Brown experimented with the “Tom Sawyer” students, clever young men deemed to be at risk at their high schools. The civil rights movement was in full swing in the early to mid-sixties, but it was not until African American women walked out in 1968 that the University committed itself to active recruitment of minorities. The women’s movement followed the civil rights movement and when a woman anthropologist was denied tenure in 1975 she became a “squeaky wheel” and sued: although Brown had dithered about admitting women, Brown became, with the Lamphere Decree, a pioneer in improving the gender balance in the faculty.

In 2000 Brown became the first Ivy League university to appoint an African American president, and Ruth J. Simmons began a transformative effort to raise Brown above its long-deserved reputation as an outstanding undergraduate college and turn it into a major research university. In the early 2000s when there was a well-publicized reparations
movement, she appointed the Steering Committee on Slavery and Justice, which reported in 2006. It was a brave example of truth-telling, one that other colleges such as William and Mary and Emory have emulated.

In researching Brown’s history, decisions had to be made: I am a biographer by inclination and experience, and I wanted to tell the story of the university through the people who worked, learned and played there. I am also a micro-historian, finding larger truths from smaller stories, and this influenced my desire to include vignettes about people and events. Accordingly I consulted private papers, including student diaries, letters and scrapbooks, student publications, and the usually reliable and not too boosterish Brown Alumni Monthly. I used Martha Mitchell’s marvelous Encyclopedia Brunoniana, which is now online. I read faculty memoirs, novels set at Brown, and read histories of other, similar, institutions. The University archives are organized both chronologically and thematically, and I made use of presidents’ papers from Manning through Swearer, from 1764-1987. More recent papers are closed, as are Corporation papers less than fifty years old, so I relied on materials kept by faculty members or departments, journalism and (sometimes contradictory) oral history: I interviewed almost a hundred people; including faculty past and present, alumni and administrators; the oldest interviewee a black woman graduate of the class of 1925, the youngest, a member of the class of 2003. Although much of the book is organized around presidential tenures, this primarily reflects the nature of the sources: I do not mean to suggest that presidents are the most important actors in a university’s development. They can do little without the university’s other elements; the faculty, the students, the Corporation, money—and none of these can operate independently of larger historical forces.

Finally, I wanted to challenge some of the conventional views of Brown's past, the heroic and Whiggish version that every day in every way things got better and better. Some experiments failed. Mistakes were made, and the consequences had to be borne.

This is a story of Brown, warts and all.
Symbols and Ceremonies of Brown University

William S. Simmons
Professor of Anthropology

Symbols underpin all human social and cultural life. They can be objects, words, or social practices that communicate shared meanings and ideas. They create a sense of solidarity and inspire identification with something beyond the self, distinguish groups from one another, and orient action. They encode precedents and principles that serve as guidelines for initiating, resisting, and incorporating change. While symbols may seem to be stable and eternal expressions of enduring truths, they are surprisingly dynamic and easily adapted to new meanings and uses. Brown University’s symbols and ceremonies have changed since its founding 250 years ago, yet they provide a unifying sense of purpose, enshrining a version of the University’s past that burnishes even its newest traditions and guide us in imagining the future.

Colleges and universities are among the most symbolic sites in our culture. Brown’s founders selected for its location an eight-acre tract on College Hill that already had strong communal, theological, and ethical meanings that seeped into the college they planted and that exists today.

SEAL AND COAT OF ARMS

First among the symbols of all American colleges and universities, and first among the symbols of Brown University, are the seals of their governing bodies. They stand for the authority of the institution and authenticate its degrees. As with a sacred religious relic, access to the seal is carefully guarded at the highest levels of the institution. The 1764 charter of the College of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations empowered the corporation of this college to create such a seal “to use for all causes, matters, and affairs whatever, of them and their successors, and the same seal to alter, break, and make anew, from time to time, at their will and pleasure; which seal shall always be deposited with the President or senior Fellow.” Brown’s first seal depicted the profiles of King George III and Queen Charlotte of England as the central element in its design. Around its border is written Sigillum Collegii in Colonia Ins. Rhod. & Provid. Plant. (The Seal of the College in the Colony of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations in America). The motto above their heads, Amor et deliciae human generis, (Love and delight of the human race) expressed praise for their benevolent authority (many thanks to Professor Joseph Pucci for help with Latin passages). Modified and enlarged reproductions of this seal can be seen in the John Hay Library, on the west face of Sharpe Refectory and by the entrance to Marston Hall.

Following American Independence the Corporation mandated that this seal be broken and replaced with another appropriate to the new Republic. The domed temple with five columns on the new seal reflected dedication to classical learning. On and between the columns are abbreviations for the seven liberal arts--Grammar, Rhetoric, Logic, Music,
Arithmetic, Geometry, and Astronomy. Between the three central columns are two stands, one supporting a book and the other a telescope. The Latin motto above and below the columns sends an inviting message (A temple sacred to knowledge is open to all). A second motto, also in Latin, (Virtue is more to be cultivated) suggests hopeful expectations of the new political order. Fittingly, the word Republica replaced Colonia in the wording of the previous seal.

The Corporation introduced a third seal in 1834 in tardy recognition that they had changed the name in 1804 to Brown University in gratitude to Nicholas Brown Jr. for his timely support. This seal continues to be Brown’s most prominent symbol today. Although those who designed this seal left no record of their symbolic intent, we can surmise aspects of its meaning. The cross of Saint George at the center of the white shield has associations with the Reformation, the Colonial flag of New England, and the heraldry of the Commonwealth and Protectorate periods of English history. The open books under and above the arms of the cross, while not identified, are a recurrent motif in the colonial seals of Harvard, Yale, and Princeton where they speak to the sanctity of learning. The motto, In Deo Speramus, closely resembles and is probably derived from the Latin translation of Rhode Island Colony’s motto, In God We Hope. Finally, the sun with eyes that rises radiantly above the shield has no parallel on other early college seals (the original seal of the College of William and Mary being a partial exception). The closest local examples of this seeing and radiant sun that would have been known to members of the Brown Corporation in 1834 appear on four gravestones in Providence’s North Burial Ground (one being that of Chad Brown, the progenitor of the Browns of Providence, and on whose ancestral home lot the Brown campus began) and on one in the burial ground of Saint John’s Episcopal Church. These carvings may have been the inspiration for this symbolic element of the third seal, particularly given that its purpose was to commemorate the Brown name.

The next most prominent symbol is the coat of arms that serves as institutional decoration and identification—with the expectation that it be used with dignity. Derived from the seal, the design elements of the coat of arms may be displayed separately or in combination. While derived from the seal, it must not include the Sigillum Universitatis Brunensis of the official seal. The coat of arms is widely emblazoned on the faces and entrances of buildings, signage, regalia, letterhead, publications, and numerous mementos. It also provides a versatile template for the logos of diverse campus groups including Native Americans at Brown, the Brown Pre-Dental Society, the Brown Muslim Students Association, the Korean American Student Association, and Engineers Without Borders.

THE BEAR

College mascots are a particularly animated and often combative category of symbol that showed up in the late nineteenth century to support intercollegiate athletics and generally as an expression of school spirit. They often have nicknames, are celebrated in songs and cheers, and appear on sports regalia, athletic websites, campus art and sculpture, and even on toddler clothing. This competitive world of bulldogs, tigers, lions, rams, buffalos, and huskies also includes more reserved symbols such as Quakers and trees. Brown chose well with its bear. It is an indigenous species, said by its admirers to be strong, reserved, and
worthy of respect. The Brown Bear's name, Bruno, as noted by Theodore Francis Green, means Brown: "it is good natured and clean....courageous and ready to fight, it does not look for trouble for its own sake....is not one of a herd, but acts independently....is intelligent and capable of being educated." The mascot has proven to be an emotional and resilient collegiate symbol that distinguishes its institution from others with which it competes and reinforces community with those whom it represents (mainly students and alumni/ae), some of whom go so far as to dress like their bear, tree, or tiger, transformed by school spirit.

ALMA MATER

College songs, particularly the hymn-like alma mater, had powerful communal effects in American colleges and universities as they expanded and secularized in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. As Brown President Faunce and Pembroke Dean King noted, learning, song, and long-term loyalties were deeply interwoven in the campus culture of their day.

"The American College is inconceivable apart from college songs....the college is vastly more than a place for acquiring information and mental discipline--it is a place of fellowship, of ancient traditions, precious memories, and noble loyalties. Such things are better expressed in song." (William Perry Faunce 1908)

"...the college song is not for the undergraduate alone. It follows her as she leaves college and on in the years afterwards. It comes back to her again and again, reviving her memory of college days and helping to keep alive within her devotion to her Alma Mater." (Lida Shaw King 1917)

Brown's Alma Mater, originally written as a poem entitled "Old Brown" by James Andrews DeWolf (who also adapted it to the tune of "Araby's Daughter"), was renamed Alma Mater in 1869. Once a favorite of students who gathered to sing on the Sayles Hall steps at twilight, Alma Mater is sung primarily at convocation, commencement, inauguration, and following some Brown athletic victories.

THE MANNING CHAIR

The Corporation presents the President with three important symbols at her inauguration, the 1764 Charter, the Chain of Office, and the Manning Chair, named for Brown's first President, James Manning. Once the property of Governor Stephen Hopkins, first Chancellor of the College, this chair is where the President sits on the most formal public occasions. While possibly as old as Harvard’s presidential chair, Brown’s is not your usual chair in that it was seized from a privateer en route from Spain to the West Indies where it was to have been delivered to a colonial governor. Instead, it was delivered to a governor in Rhode Island where it became the seat of honor for presidents of Brown.
CAMPUS BELLS

Bells also inhabited Brown’s earliest days. Historically, the bell symbolized the coming of Christianity to England and Ireland and found its way into the soundscapes of the earliest colleges and universities. Today, bells and bell towers are among the most prominent public symbols of American colleges and universities. The bell over University Hall rings for convocation, commencement, and inauguration, and also for holidays, public gatherings, mourning, weddings, vigils, and memorial moments such as the anniversary of 9/11. This bell has neighbors, including the one in the First Baptist church that sounds for Brown commencements and the one given by John Carter Brown to Grace Episcopal Church on the condition that they will ring their tower chimes in the morning and afternoon of every Brown commencement. Grace Church has played Brown’s Alma Mater twice each commencement day since 1861.

PRESIDENT’S CHAIN OF OFFICE

The President’s gold chain of office is a relatively new tradition at Brown, initiated by President emeritus, Henry M. Wriston, and first worn by President Barnaby C. Keeney at the 1965 commencement, on the occasion of Brown’s 200th anniversary. The chain, to be worn on ceremonial occasions when the mace is carried, displays a number of symbols, including the coat of arms of the State of Rhode Island, the Brown coat of arms, and images of the earlier two seals. Along with the mace, the President’s chain was a new way for graduates to honor their alma mater and to dignify its ritual processions while invoking earlier European ritual traditions.

THE UNIVERSITY MACE

The mace has a noble lineage in the academic processions of British and other European universities that extends from medieval times to the present. Having originated as a weapon, it evolved into a brightly decorated symbol of sovereignty in civil, religious, and academic settings. American colleges and universities adopted the ceremonial mace since the late nineteenth century often as a gift to the president by an alumnus/a. Brown’s mace, a gift from Mrs. George St. John Sheffield, made its first appearance in the commencement day procession of 1928. The President selects the macebearer, who must be a Brown professor who is an alumnus or alumna, to lead academic processions at convocation, commencement, and on other important occasions.

The mace condenses in its figures and inscriptions the key symbols of Brown, including the three seals, a selection from the immortal passage in the 1764 charter barring religious tests and praising liberty of conscience, and the names of past Brown presidents and distinguished graduates. The Corporation must approve any additional inscriptions or other modifications to the mace.
CHANCELLOR’S CHAIN OF OFFICE

The Chancellor’s chain of office, the gift of an anonymous alumnus, dates to Brown’s 1983 commencement when presented by President Howard Swearer to Chancellor Richard Salomon. This chain, as with the President’s chain and the President’s mace, is dense with important symbols of Brown, including the seal of the university, a likeness of the first Chancellor, Stephen Hopkins, and depictions of the Van Wickle Gates and University Hall. The Chancellor wears this chain on the most formal occasions including convocation, commencement, and inauguration. Chains and collars of office, while inspired by much earlier British ceremonial practices, are a twentieth-century innovation in American colleges and universities.

PROLIFERATION OF SYMBOLS

The proliferation of campus symbols following the Civil War and extending into the twentieth-century is reflected in colleges and universities across the country. The societal context of this proliferation helps to understand the readiness with which colleges and universities sought new ways to symbolize themselves both internally and externally from this time forward. Limiting our focus to Brown, this change included the growth of local industrial wealth and power, increased ethnic, religious, and class pluralism, a growing awareness of higher education as a critical opportunity for social mobility, the heyday of the melting-pot ideal of assimilation and its mirror image of stigmatizing differences, the importance of science and technical subjects, religious secularization and the aura of earning a degree from an esteemed institution. Such factors affected the communities from which Brown would draw its students, faculty, administrators, and trustees, which in turn would affect the characteristics of intellectual and community life within the institution.

Brown’s symbols had unifying influences in this context. Its diplomas would become available to a broader community of students by virtue of their abilities. Mascots gave a sense of spirit and community both to teams and to students—a form of identity that cut across other societal distinctions. Similarly, the alma mater, memorized and sung in chorus, deepened a community of sentiment. Bells and songs entered long-term memory and the unconscious to reinforce connection and community with the college throughout life. Reunions were an occasion to return to the source described by one alumnus, Horatio Rogers, as the fountain of youth.

SENSE OF PLACE

As emblems, traditions, songs, bells, memorials, and ritual occasions intensify meanings, so does the place itself. English colleges and universities, for example, often begin their histories with legends of what preceded the college in that location. Brown’s place can be understood in this light.

The settlement meaningfully named Providence began along the eastern bank of the river beneath College Hill. In drawing property lines the colonists adjusted to this settlement pattern of houses closely spaced along the water by allocating home lots that were very
narrow north to south, and very long west to east, extending up and over the hill in what appear on a map as ribbon-like stripes. In contrast to neighboring English colonies that claimed possession of the land by authority and consent of the King, Providence settlers took the unusual position that no King had the right to convey land that belonged to the indigenous inhabitants. Under Roger William’s leadership, they acquired Providence by purchase from both the Narragansett and Wampanoag tribal leaders whose authority in this respect they acknowledged.

Upon moving from the College’s original home in Warren to Providence, the Corporation purchased two adjoining four-acre properties on which to build their college. Both properties were on the original home lot of Chad Brown, a Baptist elder and the ancestor of Nicholas, John, Joseph, and Moses Brown. Both deeds made the point that the land had been legitimately purchased from the native Indians. For all that Providence stood for at this point in time, Brown’s first college building, University Hall (1770), would stand in the center.

It also stood far above and apart from the settled areas of Providence with views of the rising sun to the east and of the great hill with the Narragansett name, Nutaconkanut, that marked the boundary of the Indian deed to Providence to the west. By 1840 Brown appeared as a straight line of four splendid buildings,[University Hall 1770; Hope College 1822; Manning Hall 1834; Rhode Island Hall 1840] that opened out on a large lawn and faced the city.

As Brown and other colonial colleges differed from English models of governance, so they differed in campus design. Harvard, Yale, William and Mary, Princeton and Brown did not attempt to replicate what architect Paul V. Turner described as “the traditional English pattern of the enclosed collegiate quadrangle.” Rather, they looked outward to the communities they had been created to serve. Brown’s old college embodied this ideal.

TOWARD THE PRESENT

Now in its 250th year, Brown has expanded far beyond the venerable home lots to include former industrial areas of South Providence and the historically legendary Mount Hope site in Bristol where their research and teaching operations are carefully marked with the official university coat of arms. The old campus and its vicinity continue however as Brown’s symbolic and ceremonial center, with the Van Wickle Gate and Memorial Arch as the front and rear doors to the sanctuary. By 1904 the older space bordered by Prospect, Waterman, Thayer, and George Streets had been almost completely fenced and University Hall moved its front door inward from city-side to the Middle Green.

Converging influences shaped this inward turn. One was the rise of graduate programs inspired by the allure of research oriented German universities. Another was the move toward more specialized and differentiated academic programs accompanied by the formation of disciplinary associations. Yet another was the wealth available from trustees and alumni. The ascent of science and retreat of religion, the dawning of academic freedom and the growing influence of departments and faculty autonomy contributed to the new
order. Amidst the opportunities and uncertainties of this age, Brown found its *terra firma* by identifying itself as a university college. This meant that Brown would commit enthusiastically to graduate education to better advance its liberal arts mission and enhance the intellectual timbre of its faculty, but only with respect to existing liberal arts and science programs—no professional schools. The idea of the university college symbolized what Brown stood for and by which it navigated in this protracted historical moment.

This moment too is passing with ever more accelerating change driving Brown’s transition to a multiversity and beyond that to what is being tentatively referred to as the emerging global meta-university. Interestingly, as the idea of a university college has outlived its original definition it persists as a meaningful category akin to a *genius loci* that is seeking to relocate itself in the emerging Brown.

**PROCESSIONS**

Brown holds its most important processions at convocation, commencement, inauguration, and to commemorate 50/100-year anniversaries. All mark intense transitions in the annual, leadership, and long-durational cycles of the university. On these occasions the social order of the university and its most important symbols are assembled and displayed in public view. The commencement procession, for example, draws upon a global gathering of the extended Brown family of alums, relatives, honored guests, new graduates, faculty, and university administrators. For the alums in particular it is a pilgrimage to a remembered Brown that has all the qualities of a sacred place. For the students it is the rite of incorporation into the world following four years of separation from that world and immersion in collegiate living.

The procession organizes and makes apparent the social categories that comprise Brown, all visibly laid out in the order of march. The route they follow and the manner of walking are highly structured. By an ingenious process referred to as inversion, those marchers at the head of the procession form a gauntlet-like corridor immediately after passing through the Van Wickle Gate. There they stand to applaud those marchers who follow who in turn join and thus extend the gauntlet to applaud all who follow them. Once the last group in the procession marches through the Gate and enters the gauntlet, those who were the first in the original line follow the last and in turn march through the gauntlet thus restoring the original order and recovering the lead as those in the gauntlet fall in behind. By the time they reach the bottom of College Hill, through these two inversions, all participants in the global Brown community have applauded and been applauded by every other member of the procession. For these few ritual moments the entire living world of Brown in attendance has shown and received the support of every other member face-to-face. Seen in these terms, the inversion symbolizes the esprit of the endless procession whereby age leads youth who replace age and who are replaced in turn by youth.

The last stop of the day is the gathering of concentrators, parents, faculty, and Corporation members at their respective departments where students are individually introduced and honored. Following the actual awarding of degrees bearing the mark of the third seal and a
communal lunch, all depart. Those days following commencement seem strange as if a spell has been broken—which it surely has, but not for long.

NOTE

This article is based on research pertaining to the Haffenreffer Museum exhibit, In Deo Speramus: The Symbols and Ceremonies of Brown University for which the author is guest curator. The exhibit, which opened in March, 2014, honors Brown University on the occasion of its 250th anniversary. The author is grateful to Dr. Jennifer Stampe, Postdoctoral Fellow in Anthropology, Nathan Arndt, Haffenreffer Museum Assistant Curator, and Jennifer Betts, University Archivist, for immensely valuable help.
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My Stint at Brown University

William Wakeham
Senior Vice-President of the Royal Academy of Engineering

My first glimpse of Brown, in September 1969, was from the windows of the taxi that took me from Union Station, Providence to the (then) Minden Hotel. It had been a long and somewhat difficult trip from my hometown in South-West England via London and Boston, and all I wanted to do was sleep. The contrast between the urban setting of the old Brown buildings and the leafy rural campus in Exeter, UK (at a university only fifteen years old) where I had obtained my PhD in Physics only two weeks earlier, was profound and, somehow, the reverse of my expectations of the relationship between the British and American university systems.

I had come to Brown to take up a postdoctoral research position in Engineering with Joseph Kestin, whom I had never met, but who had been persuaded by Ed Mason that it was an acceptable risk to take on an experimental molecular physicist in his transport properties laboratory. I shall always be grateful to both of them for the many opportunities to work with the two of them both at Brown and throughout my subsequent career. I had come from a small university as the sole PhD student of a physics professor to join a team of engineers; this was the first of several culture shocks. The idea that the science we studied could also be useful in commerce and beneficial to society had not featured in my thinking or in my courses up to that point; so, during the two years I spent in the Barus & Holley Building, the fact that it brought together physical sciences and engineering showed me a path which I have followed ever since.

Kestin’s laboratory in the basement of the building had no windows; and, when I joined him, a series of experiments were in progress that required 24-hour shift work, which I shared with Koiche Watanabe, my predecessor as a postdoctoral fellow. The autumn season, combined with the round-the-clock shift, meant that for the first few months I scarcely saw daylight and seldom met anybody outside of the laboratory; Thayer Street remained a mere rumour! It also meant that I chose to live within a ten-minute walk of Barus & Holley. However, Joseph Kestin and Ed Mason made sure that when this immediate demand had been satisfied, I met people within the greater community at Brown. My twice-daily visits to the Common Room on the top floor of Barus & Holley provided an opportunity to interact with others in the Division of Engineering, including Peter Richardson (who had escaped from the UK rather earlier than I did), Roger Tanner, and a host of other faculty. Joseph also introduced me to the University Club, whose rules never ceased to amaze me -- but, like Ed Mason, I quickly learned to keep a necktie in my desk drawer and a jacket at hand for unexpected calls to visit the Club for lunch! This habit is still with me!

At that point, my computer experience was limited to the use of paper tape and Algol; so the Computer Centre near Barus & Holley, with its punch-card system and use of Fortran, imposed new demands, late at night, to join a queue for punch machines and job
submissions that generated tensions and encounters beyond engineering. In that sense and others, it was a far more productive and conducive environment than the Library back then, which did not encourage interaction. It was through the Computer Centre and Engineering that I discovered one of the Brown soccer teams and started playing for them against South American and Portuguese opponents. That, in turn, led me to the discovery of the Graduate of the School Bar – where I really understood the limitations of American beer at that time!

It is fair to say that during those two years at Brown I failed to establish a real balance between work and a social life; the former dominated my time and my thinking as I worked with a succession of colleagues, graduate students and visitors with whom I have established friendships that endure to this day. Although we had been brought together by Joseph Kestin for scientific endeavour, he valued and encouraged the relationships we built in the team.

After my return to the UK in 1971, to take up a faculty position at Imperial College, London, I continued to visit Brown as a Visiting Professor most summers for two months or so until the early ‘80s, to work with Joseph Kestin and to advance the collaborative work we were then doing between our groups. I had learned much from Joseph about the strategic direction of research as well as about science and engineering. At that time, I saw many more developments at Brown and in Providence than I had noticed during my initial two-year stay. New buildings were completed, including the library (a great advance) and I enjoyed one summer ensconced within it, finishing a book co-authored with Joseph. I was also then better able to appreciate the surroundings of the campus and the delights of New England; it was a far greater pleasure to venture downtown than it had been back then. The City was being transformed, and with it the presence and role of the University. These observations of my time at Brown have been important to me and I owe much of my subsequent career to the people I met there and to the place itself. My two final roles have been as Vice-Chancellor (i.e., President) of the University of Southampton in the UK and now, in retirement, as Senior Vice-President of the Royal Academy of Engineering. In the first of those roles, I found a large university located within a significant city but in a poor relationship with that city; the Brown experience taught me that this was not an unavoidable situation and that things could be changed. In the second role, I have completed my integration as an engineer, which began at Brown and has contributed greatly to my professional journey.
My Experience at Brown University

Leslie Bostrom
Professor of Visual Arts

When asked to write for the Faculty Bulletin about “My Experience at Brown University” (a rather broad topic), I thought it might be interesting to submit drawings instead. All drawings are photo-copied from my sketchbooks, and are not altered in any way. They record time spent in faculty and committee meetings, at lectures and events, at the Pembroke Seminar, in class, at the morphology lab, and other places. They are a few of the hundreds of drawings I’ve done over the years.

Disclaimer: I mostly draw people because people are the most challenging and interesting subjects. Some people in the drawings will be recognizable, and not all will be flattered. However, I never intend to be snarky or mean. These are candid drawings, not posed, so the subjects are moving, or get up and leave before I am finished, forcing me to work from a very faulty memory. All the comments (or random notes) written on the drawings are mine.
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THE ARTS -- BROWN’S NOT SO SECRET WEAPON
How Brown has and can continue to have an advantage over its peer institutions

Julie Adams Strandberg
Senior Lecturer/Founding Director of Dance

Many of qualities that characterize Brown students -- such as risk taking, entrepreneurship, creative thinking, collaborative skills, personal accountability, and understanding of culture -- are learned in their art courses and through their engagement in art making.

A remarkable unforeseen consequence of the Brown curriculum -- instated in 1969 and mandating that all courses be given the same value and that distribution requirements be abolished -- is that Brown students, are equally educated in both the content AND the methodologies of the humanities, the sciences AND the arts. This is rare in higher education. The emphasis in most academies is on the humanities and the sciences -- many with some distribution requirements. The emphasis in conservatories is on the arts. Brown students have the unique experience of being educated in an institution of higher learning that values and supports all three.

In terms of content, the arts are an ideal way to come to know and understand one’s own culture as well as other societies. However, equally important are the methods of the artist. Our education system -- from pre-k through higher education has revered both the research method and the scientific method of approaching material. These methods have become so sacred that they take on the status of moral codes. We become incensed with plagiarism because of the code of behavior we expect from research. We become irate with misrepresentation of data and statistics because of the code of behavior we expect from science. We are angered not just because of misinformation, but because of a betrayal of trust.

What we tend to forget is that we were taught these codes of behavior since childhood when we wrote our first papers and did our very first science experiments. Like most things taught in early life, they take on the aura of religious truths that can be accepted without questioning. We apply this moral behavior to all of our actions, knowing almost instinctively when each one is appropriate. However, the repertory of responses and moral decisions inherent in the artistic approach to problem-solving has never been systematically taught within the education system.

Most aspects of the research and scientific methods are familiar. Less understood and well known is the artistic method, which provides additional necessary skills either missing or not emphasized in the research and scientific methods.

In 1993, in response to a crisis in the field of dance education, my sister, Carolyn Adams, and I co-authored “American Education and the Arts: A Balancing of Visions for Cultural Transformation: a discourse on the relationship of the arts to the culture as exemplified by
eight arts education models.” Chapter One was “The Artistic Method” and included the description of eleven components of the artistic method.

- The Artistic Method emphasizes the synthesis of information
- The Artistic Method looks for the familiar in the new and the new in the familiar
- The Artistic Method values divergent thinking
- The Artistic Method necessitates personal accountability
- The Artistic Method recognizes and celebrates occasions of multiplicity, ambiguity, and the elusive
- The Artistic Method in the performing arts develops skill in collaboration
- The Artistic Method in the performing arts provides one with the heightened experience and risk of the intensity of the moment
- In the Artistic Method the practitioner is always involved in the creation of knowledge
- The Artistic Method naturally and organically integrates practice and skill acquisition
- The Artistic Method is rooted in the apprenticeship, coaching, one-on-one model of education.
- Assessment is an integral part of the artistic method and in the performing art is ongoing and multi-faceted.

Each of these codes of behavior - the research, the scientific and the artistic - have appropriate arenas and each individual should be skilled in each so that he/she can respond to the universe with the totality of his/her being and potential. It is neither correct nor necessary to elevate the researcher, the scientist, or the artist. To do so is often to promote arrogance and elitism. The elevation belongs to the codes themselves and it is up to each practitioner to be guided by those codes. There are overlaps in both the content and methodology of the arts, sciences and humanities. The truly educated person approaches problem-solving holistically integrating both content and methodology from a broad and deep repertoire. It is most crucial to recognize that while some people devote their lives to the service of one area of human expression, the potential to function in each domain is open to each and must be available to each. When these three approaches are perceived as the legs of a tripod upon which to build human understanding, it becomes obvious that without all three, human understanding is impossible.

This unique experience at Brown of being equally educated in both the content AND the methodologies of the humanities, the sciences AND the arts, is the direct result of the fact that all courses are given the same value in terms of credit AND that there are no distribution requirements. Either one would have been revolutionary but the combination of the two has been transformative.

The provision of equal credit for all courses, not only gives students the time to devote to the arts with rigor, but also creates an unspoken culture of mutual respect. The lack of distribution requirements has meant that students and faculty convene around disciplines at the highest level of inquiry. Introductory courses need not be specifically designed for students who must take a course to satisfy a distribution requirement, but can be designed
for students who have a genuine interest in a subject they have never had the opportunity to study. There is a subtle, yet profound difference between these two types of introductory courses.

At Brown the arts, sciences and humanities are not silos. Brown artists, scientists and humanists work side-by-side seamlessly sharing content and methodologies and approaching problem-solving holistically from a broad and deep repertoire.

This impact of the arts at Brown is not adequately revealed in the number of arts concentrators, but by the fact that every semester, over a thousand non-arts concentrators take classes in the arts. The performing groups in dance, theatre and music are comprised primarily of non-arts concentrators. Alongside their studies in the humanities and the sciences Brown students are rigorously engaged in the arts in curricular and co-curricular pursuits, developing other sets of responses and moral decisions inherent in the artistic approach to problem-solving and exercising their brains in different ways.

While it is generally recognized that Brown is a “cool” place to go if one is interested in the arts, it is the integration of and equal valuing of the arts, humanities, and sciences that is a critical key to its success, is one of the advantages that it has over its peer institutions, and is one the university’s “hidden secrets.” Brown is not just a place where one can do art, but a place where the arts are central to a Brown education.

This under recognized impact of the arts on the holistic education of Brown students is profound and real, but difficult to capture in words or to measure quantitatively. In the creation of art, much of what is actually taking place is invisible to the eye. But it behooves Brown to continue to find ways to articulate, capitalize, and promote the arts as an integral part of the Brown experience. This “hidden secret” of Brown’s success should neither be “hidden” nor “secret.” The critical role that the arts play in the holistic Brown education should be more overtly sited, supported, acknowledged, and celebrated.
Turnover among Faculty in the Past 50 Years, and Changes of Priorities

Peter D. Richardson
Professor of Engineering and Physiology

Every so often an administration at a university sets out to establish new priorities for itself as an institution. But also faculty members themselves frequently set new directions for themselves, even though this may include moving to other universities. Is this good or bad for the university? Here, I use part of Brown as a test example. I came to Brown not very long after it had committed to founding the Division of Applied Mathematics, early in WW II, as described in a History thesis here by Clare Kim, submitted in 2011 [1]. This priority had a profound effect on Engineering here, through the influence of its first Chair, William Prager, and others. One of his collaborators was Daniel C. Drucker, who was Chair of Engineering for a while and left in 1968 to become Dean of Engineering at Univ. Illinois-Champaign.

Fashions at research-funding organizations can affect the choices of priorities. When I first joined Brown the NSF considered that getting a PhD had simply been training in how to conduct research, and to propose anything closely related to one’s PhD thesis topic showed a regrettable lack of imagination. There was no start-up money, either. Those situations have changed. Also, people here in the first group I joined frequently changed the directions of their research, left to continue their careers elsewhere, or both. We also attracted many academic visitors for periods of leave.

Fifty years ago: a comment from a panel of Presidents

In 1964, when we were at Brown’s 200th anniversary, there was a Panel discussion here on “Future Directions of the University” with a panel of University Presidents: G.W. Beadle (Chicago), J.S. Dickey (Dartmouth), R.F. Goheen (Princeton), J.A. Perkins (Cornell) and O.M. Wilson (Univ Minnesota). One of these men brought out the issue that at that time many academic staff members had better knowledge of people outside their institutions than inside, a feature which could lead to problems in establishment and development of institutional identity. Senior administrators also moved: we soon saw Brown’s President Barnaby Keeney become the first Chair of The National Endowment for the Humanities in 1966-1970.

Over the past 50 years: changes at university level

How did this play out at Brown? The US research funding agencies underwent reorganization: for example, NSF created its Division of Engineering in February 1965. Also, in 1965 William Prager – our first-ever NAE member (The National Academy of Engineering, founded in 1964, is much younger than the National Academy of Sciences, founded in 1863) – became at odds with the then President here and decided to move to the West Coast. (Several years later he returned to Brown, but as a faculty member in Engineering.) Faculty Governance at Brown was in a relatively token form; there was a
Secretary of the Faculty and Parliamentarian, for Faculty Meetings, and the Faculty Rules came in a slim booklet, produced by the Registrar. That changed, because there was a swell of support among the faculty to take charge of more of the rules under which the educational programs were based. Faculty Governance was strengthened first with the 18-member Faculty Policy Group (FPG), somewhat unwieldy to gather its elected members together at common times. It was replaced with a slimmer Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) of 9 members, with the Faculty Officers raised in number from being just the Secretary and Parliamentarian to include the Vice-Chair, Chair and Past-Chair of the FEC. Various Committees were developed, including attempting to make standards more uniform across the University, so that there were not, for example, the differences between the Physical Sciences Council and other subject-group systems in recommending appointments and promotions across the university that may have prevailed earlier. This, at least, meant that the criticism of faculty not knowing well or helping to run their home institution changed demonstrably here.

However, grade inflation has been noticed, passing from 11.8% of grades being A’s in Sem I 1969-70, to 25% in Sem I 1974-75, to 39.1% in 1992-93 and to 53.4% in 2012-2013 Academic Years, per figures reported in the Daily Herald (forwarded by Prof. P. Leis). Will this be an issue soon? The European Union is exploring how to make comparisons between different universities in different countries which belong to it, experimenting with the ECTS system, which needs information about ranking of students in their studies, such as the top 10%, next 25%, and so on. It may reach a point where admission of our undergraduates to graduate programs there could become handicapped by our grade inflation.

Over the past fifty years: a close-up within Engineering

Reverting to Engineering, initially under the eye of the Physical Sciences Council here: From well before 1964 Engineering had an undergraduate program, accredited by the Engineers Council for Professional Development (ECPD) in aerospace, civil, electrical and mechanical Engineering. Engineers can become licensed in various States as Professional Engineers (PE), with various rights, responsibilities and Codes of Professional Ethics. Graduating from an accredited program is important for this, and has been a requirement for some Government positions. The evolution of the New Curriculum at the end of the 1960s led to challenges and opportunities, and before long the national accrediting organization – formed by alliance, as previously, by the professional societies of engineers – changed into the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET). Institutional reviews were conducted at least every six years. Biomedical engineering was accredited at Brown by 1974, then the third such undergrad program in the US. (Similar national professional organizations exist elsewhere in the world, but the US then led in biomedical engineering, partly because of developing artificial organs and other assist devices.) The engineering PhD program attracted many excellent candidates from around the world – the first Ph.D. was Paul F. Maeder, a Swiss, in 1951 - as well as the US. Bill Prager became the first practical director of our digital computer center, in the days of punched-card inputs and outputs.
The past fifty years: In the Fluid Mechanics and Thermodynamics Group in Engineering

Turning to Fluid Mechanics and Thermodynamics faculty specifically, as part of Engineering, the 1950s-1960s hirings had been influenced in part by the burgeoning Space program, such as Boa Teh Chu (e.g. detonation in dusty gases; but he moved to Yale), Richard J. Goldstein in heat transfer (he soon moved to Minnesota, was elected to the NAE (National Academy of Engineering) and was President of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME, of which Alexander Holley – a Brown graduate - is regarded as the founder); Ronald F. Probstein in hypersonic flow (who soon shifted to MIT, as well as to the rather different field of physicochemical hydrodynamics, as for extracting some pollutants from soil – he became in due course another NAE and also National Academy of Sciences (NAS) member); Sture K.F. Karlsson – a Scandinavian – from graduate study at Johns Hopkins in Kovasnavy’s group, who brought Taylor-related stability studies and experimental magnetohydrodynamics to be explored at Brown, while also well-experienced in hot-wire anemometry – as was Paul F. Maeder, with interests in transonic flows, and turbulence in boundary layers.

Joseph Kestin, by origin a Pole interested in transport properties of gases but also in convective boundary layers, in geothermal energy conversion and in teaching thermodynamics, became our first straight-engineering NAE member. Joe Clarke [who used to joke with me he was “the American” in a group with many Europeans] had research interests in wing-body interactions in high-speed flight, and Harold H. Sogin, a heat and local-sublimation-based mass transfer expert moved to Tulane, where he became Chairman of Mechanical Engineering. Joe T.C. Liu, is a theoretician with interest in turbulence, especially large-scale structures, frequently seeing colleagues in France and the UK. Salvatore P. Sutera was another classical fluid-dynamicist but also had a research program on blood red-cell motions – Bob Hochmuth, one of his grad students, was our first PhD in biomedical engineering, taking a faculty position at Duke – but Sal left in 1968 to go to Washington University in St Louis, where he was a respected administrator, including a spell as Dean of Engineering; Ted F. Morse was hired as a theoretical gas dynamicist, who later switched to experiments, developing fiber-optics with radial gradients of optical properties through them, and left to go to Boston University. ‘Dick’ (Richard A.) Dobbins was another classical fluid dynamicist, with strong interests in combustion, and continued to publish well into retirement.

Egyptian-born Hassan Aref, in Engineering here from 1980-1985, was known best for the concept of chaotic advection, and moved on to UC San Diego, then U Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, then Virginia Tech, where he had briefly been Dean, dying suddenly in 2011. Roger I. Tanner, a theoretical and experimental non-Newtonian fluid dynamicist – he complemented Bruce Caswell in that area of fluid mechanics - left after eight years here to go to the University of Sydney, where he continues and was recognized with Fellowship of the Royal Society (FRS). Bruce is now emeritus and researching with George Karniadakis in Applied Math. Merv Sibulkin came from a spell in aerospace industry, and I recall his
interests in combustion of solid structures in air but also his research on why blunt, re-entering bodies generated an unexpectedly large radar image as they came in from space, through photo-ionization reaching ahead of the curved shock wave and being a big radar reflector. And, of course, I broadened from thermodynamics and convective heat and mass transfer into biomedical fluid and solid mechanics and artificial organs with Pierre M. Galletti, VP for Biology and Medicine, my leading but far from solo research partner – I have some in Germany and the UK – and I too had been elected FRS.

Jason D. Harry joined us relatively briefly from Harvard, where his advisor had been Thomas McMahon, a biomechanician and novelist, and like many young new faculty members Jason was immediately successful in teaching assignments. He moved over to the Solid Mechanics Group and soon out of Brown, into the medical device industry with a company making minimally invasive cardiovascular implants, and has moved on further to founding a company himself, while keeping some links here. As McMahon had invented and demonstrated an improved running track, *inter alia*, that improved runners’ speeds and reduced injuries, this shift in his priority was not surprising.

Kenny Breuer was the first of a new wave, joining Brown in 1999 from MIT, with research interests in microfluidics and bat flight. Petia Vlahovska spent 2 post-doc years at Brown, 2003-2005, and rejoined in 2010, with interests in complex fluids, earning at Dartmouth the nickname of the ‘Chocolate Lady’, molten chocolate being a complex fluid. Anubhav Tripathi joined in 2003, with interest in suspensions and biomedical devices. Shreyas Mandre joined a few years later, with interests in fluid-surface phenomena, including splashing drops and waves. (I apologize to even more recent additional colleagues for not mentioning them, doubtless they will be recalled by 2064.) My opinion was that my colleagues had been chosen well, and that many of us shifted our research – and some teaching – to reflect real changes in the world.

There were a few spin-off companies initiated by members of this group over the 50 years, but more typically as side lines. After a while, chemical engineers were added to the Engineering faculty, but Prof. J. Calo wrote a previous article in the Faculty Bulletin about that recently, so I will not expand on it here [2].

Also, in the earlier part of the past 50 years, there had been a frequent but unstructured discussion process among faculty, rather like the famous early Common Room of the Laboratory of Molecular Biology at Cambridge UK, stimulated by Max Perutz. The LMB was famous for being the ‘hot-house’ which led to 10 Nobel Prizes. Here, Lloyd’s coffee shop at the south-west corner of Brook and Waterman Streets was the frequent faculty venue. Many projects started as scribbings on Lloyd’s paper napkins. (The building containing that shop was subsequently razed, and its site is covered by part of the CIT building.) Thus there were collaborations with Applied Math, Chemistry and Physics, and also across groups in Engineering – for example, Joe Gurland of the Materials group and I co-advised a PhD on spark machining. When E.J. Mason (of Chemistry, and a steady collaborator of Joseph Kestin) passed away close to the time that Joseph did, we obtained some funds to have J.M. Holl, a historian of science (for a while as Chief Historian at the Department of
Energy) come and assess the papers left by both, to have collections selected and stored in the John Hay Collections on campus.

A distinguished and frequent research visitor, now Sir William Wakeham, advanced from his regular position in chemical engineering at Imperial College in London to become Vice-Chancellor (equivalent to university President in the US) at the University of Southampton in the UK. An earlier visitor, who spent several years as a visiting professor here, was Mayo D. Hersey, Rhode-Island born in 1886, famous for his work on lubrication, and who in 1965 was the first recipient of the ASME Mayo D. Hersey Award, and in 1974 received a gold medal awarded by a group of British engineering societies. Another was the Norwegian Leif N. Persen, who collaborated here and later wrote books in fluid mechanics and solid mechanics. Later, J.T. Stuart, FRS, a theoretical fluid dynamicist with a prime appointment in Mathematics at Imperial College, London, was a frequent visitor (also, like M.J Lighthill, FRS, granted an honorary doctorate by Brown). We had collaborations with academic visitors to other departments at Brown, such as John R.L. Allen in Geological Sciences – his interest in sedimentary rock formation had led his interests to include the complex fluid dynamics of sedimentary deposition and we collaborated on that. He returned to the University of Reading, UK, and is now another FRS who has spent time with us. A Physics collaborator I much appreciated was a sabbatical visitor, Bruce Brackenridge, who drove to Appleton WI to bring back and lend me optical equipment for some research at hand here.

Conclusions

So, the visiting Presidential group which spoke in 1964 of faculty being attentive to peers in their fields at other institutions, and opportunities elsewhere, described well the group of faculty here in Fluid Mechanics and Thermodynamics. Taking this as a sample faculty group, faculty at Brown chose widely to alter from the initial plans for them – with individual shifts in interest largely picked well, as new research areas opened up, and as demonstrated by their extensive later personal professional recognitions. Another group of Engineering Faculty chose a different strategy, with strong concentration in one sub-field – fracture mechanics, and associated issues. An advantage of this strategy was that it made it easier to apply for various US-government research funds around a cluster of related problems involving the behavior of solid materials. Issues of national importance included the development of better armor, the safety of nuclear reactor designs, composite materials, and so forth. This too led to major national recognitions, such as elections to the National Academy of Engineering and, more rarely, to the National Academy of Sciences. My opinion is that this progressive shifting was beneficial to Brown, with faculty keeping moving into fields where their graduate students could obtain leading faculty positions – such as Jean Yves Parlange, now emeritus at Cornell and elected to NAE in 2006 - and including overseas such as Michel Y. Jaffrin as Professor of Bio-fluid mechanics and Biomedical Engineering at the University of Compiègne in France, and Kazuo Tanishita being a leader in bioengineering at Keio University in Japan.

From the university-management point of view, it is probably useful to make sure that ‘golden times’ are continued by having faculty covering an age-range and prominence wide enough that the strategies in developing those ‘golden times’ are maintained with effective
faculty oversight and encouragement as time moves on. Clare Kim showed how that was important in the case of Applied Math.

Some years ago, a published reflection covering more than the past fifty years pointed out that, very roughly, the size of the Brown undergraduate body grew as the population of the USA grew, and the faculty roster grew too. Both are still growing. It is possible that the integration which occurred here in faculty governance may need to devolve somewhat into separate Schools, not merely because of sheer numbers, but also because the pace of developments inviting multiple subject research skills, such as the Engineering examples described above, may not occur in some humanities. Overall, change is a continuing process in higher education, and once the effective use of on-line education has been honed, it may lead to more changes not only in structures but in delivering and evaluating education.

A Few Thoughts about Making Art

Walter Feldman
Professor Emeritus of Art

I have been retired from teaching at Brown University since 2007. I was recently asked to write about my experiences and to reflect about these experiences that I spent engaged with students in the non-verbal area of art which I love and in which I have devoted almost my entire adult life.

I recollect that when interviewing prospective students I was invariably asked by a parent if the applicant had the necessary “talent” to become a successful (money) artist.

The only reply I could make was that if it was a necessity for them, and if the prospective student possessed a deep love of making art, then the basic requirements for a future in art was a possibility.

To be an artist is fulfilling and rewarding...

In writing this paper for the Faculty Bulletin, I am going to proceed as if I were painting a new canvas... not a very large one, perhaps 24 x 36 inches.

So, I have just selected the size and the texture of the canvas... I have no special reasons for these selections... just that I have those sizes of stretcher bars in the studio...

I am selecting the font size and its face just as I select the brush and the thin color for the initial marks. The gestures with my wet brush seem to make my stomach muscles clench and the quad muscles bunch. I watch my right arm move as if it belonged to somebody else... I’ve started a new adventure and a new experience is beckoning... After some time I stop to inspect and analyze where I’ve been... What negative spaces can I utilize?... How close do the shapes come to the edge?... There seems to be a great deal of pull toward the bottom edge... Shall I emphasize this?... It’s time to turn the canvas face to the wall and let the paint dry some... before I proceed...

Before I started on this work, I made a decision as to the color orchestration... light ... dark ... warm... cool... just as the early choices led me in this direction... For me, this way of thinking permits all manner of ideas to be welcomed... I’m not seeking to relate an Impressionist story but am seeking to tap into all my nerve endings so as to be able to sense whether the work “feels” right and is comfortable for me... I’m re-reading these words to see whether I can clarify or glaze down at color or value...

Actually, I have come back to this modest essay and “turned” the canvas around to see it anew... There are several areas that I have eliminated for not contributing enough to the color and value that I am seeking...
Now I can continue to evaluate what I have done to this point. I feel the need for more basic structure... and I must learn to empathize with ideas that come from the completely different point of view...

I am now looking at the paintings of two artists who are very dissimilar... Josef Albers and Robert Motherwell... My work and thinking is certainly influenced by the color theory of Albers and the abstract emotionalism of Motherwell... New words... New nuances... New explorations for me...

I shall try to “write” with my computer. Perhaps I can change the physical boundaries and study the magic forces of color... Looking at their work closely, I shall try to see through their eyes. I seek to make my self-criticism more incisive... I look to examine the boundaries between shapes and want to make some harder or softer with the use only of hue and value...

In my efforts I wish to be able to invent a new color, one that is unique... or seize a reader’s curiosity and open up new thoughts and directions.

Putting down some of these thoughts is helpful to me. Just coming back to this paper, I shall change the brush that I have been using. I can’t control the pencil too well because of some nerve acting up. It has happened often to me when a favorite brush was so worn that it wouldn’t behave... So another choice comes... I have frequently painted with acrylic rather than oil paint when the need was for flexibility...

I should like my work to live after me and in good condition... Hopefully, my paintings and prints may gently provide guidance to younger artists that are searching for their personal responses, even as we talk back and forth... right here and now.
Alan Dershowitz, *Taking the Stand*

Peter Wegner
Professor Emeritus of Computer Science

Alan Dershowitz was born on Sept 1, 1938 in Brooklyn exactly one year before the outbreak of World War Two. He attended a Jewish day school, where he was classified as a weak student because his critical writings and classroom comments were not accepted by his teachers. But he became an A student at Brooklyn College and Yale, was hired as a clerk, first by an appellate court and then by the Supreme Court. Later he was appointed Assistant Professor at Harvard Law School in 1964 at the early age of 25. He was promoted to a tenured professorship at Harvard in 1968 at age 30, by a unanimous vote of the law faculty, based on the high quality of his teaching and his research, and is still teaching there in 2014, fifty years later.

Dershowitz moved away from teaching based on written texts in favor of Socratic teaching based on interaction with his students, and became a popular teacher whose classes were widely attended. He also published papers relating to his research on civil liberties, with substantive emphasis on freedom of speech as specified by the First Amendment, under which both positive and negative views on a variety of topics should be freely permitted, even when dissenting from the views of the U.S. government or of other governments. He was occasionally criticized for his legal defense, in the name of the First Amendment, of lecturers who express unpopular viewpoints that are opposed by their audience and by many of Dershowitz’ colleagues. He believed freedom of speech was more important than the right to bear arms because it represented an advance in social control of society from fighting to thinking.

Dershowitz’ view of civil rights included rejection of the death penalty as a legitimate method of punishment. In addition to teaching legal theory, he also in practice defended clients in actual cases. His strong views on freedom of speech and opposition to the death penalty contributed to the form of his arguments as a defense lawyer and frequently produced a reversal of conviction on appeal. He has been part of the defense team of well-known clients like Bill Clinton, O. J. Simpson, and Claus von Bulow (one of whose jurors took my class at Brown); and I was interested to note that von Bulow’s conviction for murdering his wife was overturned on appeal primarily as a result of Dershowitz’ contribution to the appellate arguments.

Arguments for freedom of speech and expression under the First Amendment are sometimes challenged by the need for secrecy about government actions relating to war, national interests, or terrorism. These arguments arose in relation to disagreements about the Vietnam war, where several well-known individuals like Dr. Spock and the Rev. Sloan Coffin expressed opinions that were challenged by the government. The Pentagon Papers, published in 1971, presented a military viewpoint that the government wished to exclude from publication but which was considered politically legitimate by both Dershowitz and
the Supreme Court because it was an instance of freedom of speech under the First Amendment.

Dershowitz believed that the legal rules of rape made it hard for women to prove they had been raped because it required women to produce witnesses and also to prove their previous chaste behavior. He contributed to changing the law so that women could prove rape more easily. The new laws helped Dershowitz to reverse the rape conviction of boxer Mike Tyson, by showing that the woman who claimed he had raped her had in fact consented to intercourse, but had changed her story because her father had blamed her severely for consenting.

The last chapter, “Closing Arguments”, discusses the degree to which legal institutions will change over the next fifty years, and how these changes will impact law school education. Dershowitz believes that many institutions have replaced their concern with justice by partisan considerations. This is true of the Supreme Court, whose decision in Bush v. Gore was based on partisan support of a Republican president, and similarly of the United Nations, whose characterization of human rights is based more on partisanship among nations than on global justice for the societies whose view of human rights is in question. Because both the US Supreme Court and the United Nations base their decisions on partisanship rather than justice, their contribution to society will diminish in its effectiveness. Law will cease to make an effective contribution to society, though it will continue to contribute to trials in the US relating to issues like civil rights and rape. Law schools should adjust their teaching to the changing functions of justice and partisanship in the role of law in American society.
“If Not Now, When?”

Meera S. Viswanathan
Professor of Comparative Literature and East Asian Studies

A few years back, I took a leave from Brown to spend two years in the Middle East as a visiting professor in the English Department at the University of Jordan. During this time, I also was asked to serve as the architect for the curriculum at the first co-educational boarding school with financial aid in the region, King’s Academy, which was being established by my husband Eric Widmer. Working with faculty and administrators from the Arab world, the West and elsewhere, as well as with a band of newly minted college graduates largely from various universities and colleges in New England, we debated at length various secondary curricular models.

Much of our course of study was prescribed according to three rubrics. We relied on the American advanced placement high school curriculum as our primary exemplum, in which students were mandated to study standard disciplines including English, math and science upon which our American accreditation depended. In addition, the Ministry of Education in Jordan stipulated additionally the study of Arabic, national civics and theology for all schools for which they had oversight. Lastly, also prescribed were the courses that would allow our students to take standardized tests not only for college entrance in the US, the UK and elsewhere, but also the many more SAT Subject tests and AP tests needed to secure equivalency for the Tawjih or school-leaving exam without which no professional could practice in Jordan whatever other illustrious credentials he or she might possess.

So it came as no small pleasure when we turned our minds to what it was that we as a school deemed as essential for students’ education, above and beyond the courses noted above. Those of us in the early planning group decided that we needed to underscore the importance of technology in the form of computer literacy beyond word-processing and email; the exploration of the arts; and finally, something of a first in Jordan at the high school level or even collegiate level, we determined that all students should study something about the major faith traditions of the world, not as theology (religion viewed from ‘the inside’), but rather as an academic study grounded in history, philosophy and culture. The purpose, we reiterated, was not to teach students “what” to think, but instead “how” to think. Further, we wanted our students to possess some understanding of how others might think or have thought about the world as well.

Given the demands of teaching a required course for all as well as the limited time of one term to be given over to the five major religious traditions of the world, the course was begun as a corporate venture with several faculty from various departments participating in team-teaching the different segments. There were a number of teachers from other areas able and willing to undertake the Islam and Christianity sections of the course. By default of my own background and area of academic expertise, I came to assume responsibility for the overviews of Hinduism and Buddhism. When we came to Judaism, the situation not surprisingly became more fraught. For many Arabs in the region, Judaism
was understood as synonymous with Zionism, especially in Jordan where more than half of the people are Palestinian or Jordanian-Palestinian, arousing much suspicion and angst. Given the absence of a faculty member at that point whose academic training was in Judaism, some suggested that we simply eliminate the inclusion of Judaism from our course. Yet since we dwelt in a place where the sunlight could be seen glinting off the windows of Jericho every afternoon, it struck me that that would simply be a case of ignoring--dare I say it?--the proverbial camel in a tent.

Perhaps because as a Hindu child whose mother, lacking any alternatives closer to home, sent her to Christian Sunday School, Catholic Mass, Buddhist temple for Hana Matsuri and the Obon festivals and who sometimes lit Shabbat candles on Friday with her best friend’s family who were Reform Jews, I felt more at home than many in a number of traditions (or perhaps equally at sea). In college, I had become interested in thinkers like Rabbi Hillel and Rabbi Akiba while studying Judaism and the Old Testament. Unlike the Biblical Barak, I plunged in foolhardily, only too aware of the difficulty and delicacy of the task at hand and especially my own serious limitations. For several months, I read assiduously, reviewed various curricula from courses at other institutions, reviewed textbooks and discussed the course with colleagues and friends.

Just as we had organized each two and a half week segment for each of the other religions around some general recurrent theme as heuristic (the idea of illumination in Islam, emptiness in Buddhism, seeing as union in Hinduism and rebirth in Christianity), so too did we ponder what might represent the trajectory of the Jewish tradition for Jews in some general sense. As with the other traditions, we also wanted a thematic that would allow our students to engage with, to understand sympathetically, and to comprehend something of the cultural-historical development of Judaism, which interwove, intersected and impinged on their own history. Ultimately our focus became the search for home and homeland, an irony not lost on the many Palestinian students settled in Jordan whose families still proudly, albeit sadly, displayed the large iron keys to the family homes in Haifa, Nablus, or elsewhere from half a century before.

Relying on both primary and secondary documents for our truncated historical overview (we also discussed metaphysics, ethics and philosophy for each segment), we began our readings on Judaism with the narrative of expulsion from Eden and progressing to the traversings of Abraham, the figure regarded as patriarch by all of the peoples of the Book and hence familiar to our students. Then we went onto Moses and his wanderings, cognizant of our intimate connection with the narrative, given that our school was situated in a country dotted by sites like ‘Ain Musa (Moses’s Well) and Wadi Musa (Moses’s Valley). As we reviewed the idea of homelessness and exile necessitated by the Assyrians’ destruction of the First Temple built by Solomon, the destruction of the Second Temple by the Romans, the diaspora of the Twelve Tribes, the persecution in the European Middle Ages of the Ashkenazi Jews, the expulsion from Iberia of the Sephardim as well as the Muslims under the Spanish Inquisition, the pogroms in Russia and elsewhere, the students listened avidly and respectfully.
Finally it was time to discuss Theodor Herzl and the birth of Zionism as a political movement. Students stiffened palpably, but heard with interest Herzl’s first idea of a homeland for Jews being situated in British East Africa. We read the Balfour Declaration from 1917 and about the Sykes-Picot Treaty following WWI in which the Arab lands were divided at the whim of European powers and the conflicts that were then generated. Lastly we talked about WWII, the Nazi concentration camps and the Holocaust, and finally the establishment of the state of Israel in 1947.

On the last day of the section, I ended our formal discussion a few minutes early so that there would be time for general comments. In one class, the students sat silent, ruminating for a few minutes and then suddenly one student, a highly intelligent and rambunctious class clown, raised his hand and said simply, “Thank you, Dr. Meera, for teaching us something about Judaism and Jewish history, which we had not known. We understand now why they needed a homeland.” Then he paused and added, “but why did it have to be ours?”
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