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   Summary
As this academic year begins, I want to pay particular attention to the use of graduate students in the College’s teaching over the course of time. We should give special consideration to the appropriate number of advanced graduate students who should be allowed to teach stand-alone courses in the College, the time in their careers when they should do this teaching, their training (or lack thereof), their performance, and compensation for unaided graduate students. Other colleagues will have other questions to put on the table as well. Our goal this year will be to engage our professional school colleagues and students who should be allowed to teach and practices for graduate-student teaching as the new aid packages are awarded—prac-
tices and standards that are consistent with what we expect of the faculty.

The plan for this year is to convene a discussion that will be as inclusive as possible. The Committee on Education, along with some members of the Committee of the College Council, will be charged with drafting a College policy on graduate-student teaching over the course of the year. Our goal will be to produce a set of general guidelines for the use of the graduate-student teaching assistant (GSA) role for department chairs, program chairs, Deans, and other senior administrators and faculty engaged in the process of graduate training and academic governance to contribute to the discussion.

The Committee on Education for Ca-
reers in the Health Professions, ably chaired by Martin Feder, reported to the faculty and the masters in the Spring Quarter, and we are beginning to implement its recommen-
dations for changes in the ways that we advise students applying to medical school, adding coaching and other initia-
tives designed to help them understand and explain their career aspirations and to successfully maneuver the complex process of medical school admissions. One key step that we have already taken is to restructure the health professions advising group by conducting a national search for a new posi-
tion: the director of the Chicago Careers in the Health Professions (CCHP) Program. In the future, the director of the CCHP will be part of a new team of leaders based in Career Advising and Planning Services (CAPS), working with colleagues in our Chicago Careers in Business (CCIB) Program and our prelaw advising program.

The Committee on Education also identified more than a dozen issues and initiatives with the character of science teaching in the College and the structure of our curriculum, and we will begin to address these issues in the coming year.

The CCIB, which provides elective courses at the Graduate School of Busi-
ness and a range of coaching and training internships and opportunities for students preparing for business careers, had a very successful first year of operation. CCIB’s success set us to think about the far broader perspective of how we want to translate that education into a coherent and confident start to a profes-
sional career. What we are constructing with respect to the health professions, and already do successfully via our prelaw advis-
ers in the College for students interested in the study of law, is in the same spirit. It is natural for the faculty to mentor College students aiming for PhD programs and academic careers; we want to do all we can with our own resources, and in collabora-
tion with other professionals and students, to assist students in succeeding in other careers as well.

International education is also moving forward under new leadership. Martha Merritt, a scholar of Russian politics who was educated at Oxford and was formerly director of the Russian and East Eu-
ropian Studies Program and our prelaw advising program.

The College is committed to the goal of continuous improvement in the quality of residential life. We want to be able to assure our students that our institution will make the opportunity to live in our House System for four years. This means moving forward promptly this year with the planning for another residence hall, in addition to the one currently under construction south of Burton-Judson Courts.

As we work through all of these mat-
ters over the course of the year, it is wise for me at the start of this academic year to explain our faculty and students who share our love of learning and our willingness to work hard in the pursuit of knowledge.
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is no accident that our students share our ideals. Our predecessors built this institu-
tion on the specific belief that a place where learning and teaching would find a
congenial and supportive home and where they hoped) the world would find
inspiration. Across the generations, we have also sought ways to encourage our
faculty and students to interact with the wider world in search of new knowledge
and cultural understanding.

Only a decade ago, in the 1996–97 aca-
demic year, nine College students applied
for grants to the Fulbright U.S. Student
Program competitions. In the next season,
ten other students applied. The College re-
cieved four grants in each of those years—a
record number for our students. Since then we
have been gradually increasing the number of students applying for Fulbrights and at the same time increasing our efforts
to support them through the application
process. There were twenty-four applicants in
2006–07 and nine winners. Then there were fifty-eight applicants for the 2007–08
academic year and twenty awards. We have
just completed interviewing sixty-seven
applicants for the 2008–09 academic year.
Most were quite strong, and we will know the
results in the spring. The sixty-seven
applications in the 2008–09 competition
were for projects in thirty-nine different
countries.

Students who won Fulbrights last year are all over the world this year: in
China, to examine a village’s efforts to build ag-
icultural cooperatives under the “rural
construction” approach to rural eco-
nomic development; in Norway, to conduct
research at the University of Oslo on the
cause and effect of Norway’s gender quotas
insofar as they impact a country with a dem-
ocratic society and an advanced economy;
in Jordan, to conduct ethnographic research
in major Palestinian refugee camps in and
around the West Bank in search of new
knowledge about the relevant social, and
religious institutions. This growth is a tribute to the ambitions
and its belief in the value of enrichment
of speeches that Harper and his colleagues
also well known, at least to a few. But the
influenced by English scholarship, and the
institutions seeming better to the Germans in March 1904.
nation than in specific institutional innovations.
If one asks where the early University
stood our best to canvass the other nations
The fact is that the prominent scholars are
were fifty-eight applicants for the 2007–08
academic year and twenty awards. We have
just completed interviewing sixty-seven
applicants for the 2008–09 academic year.
Most were quite strong, and we will know the
results in the spring. The sixty-seven
applications in the 2008–09 competition
were for projects in thirty-nine different
countries.

This growth is a tribute to the ambitions
of our students and to their increasing will-
iness, under the guidance and inspiration
of our faculty and our curriculum, to think
and work beyond the borders of the United
States and even of the English-speaking
world. This is certainly not the only way
that our students show their capacity to approp:
imate what we do for them and to
develop themselves. But it does exemplify
a creative internationalism that is firmly
embedded in the institutional culture of the
University of Chicago and that has deep
roots in our traditions.

The University has profited enormously
from its connections to the wider world of
scholarship and education. Not only is it a
place of learning and discovery has been
fundamentally shaped by these relations-
ships. On this the tenth anniversary of the
foundation of the University, it was present at the beginning.

The story that I tell in this essay is multi-
faceted and often astonishing, and perhaps
all the more fascinating for that.
divinity instead. Breasted cleverly managed Breasted had first come to know Harper at tails of Near Eastern history and culture. plus immersing himself in the arcane de-
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For example, James Tufts spent only one year in Germany and gained a clump of valuable experiences. But unlike the case of Breasted, it would difficult to argue that these experiences transformed Tufts's life. Yet his career offers an example of Harper's perspicacity in identifying talented young American scholars, offering them a preliminary job contract, and then urging them to go to Europe for additional seasoning. Tufts, who eventually became a prominent American philosopher of pragmatism with a specialty in moral and social philosophy and in theories of social relations, taught at Chicago from 1892 to 1930. In 1889, Tufts had been appointed an instructor of philosophy at the University of Michigan with a salary of $900 a year. He decided that plan of study. He had been scheduled for a promotion to assistant professor at a salary of $1,600 annually. Tufts was not unhappy with his current job—he had a chance to work with John Dewey, who was already developing a reputation for analytic preciseness as a scholar and teacher, and he admired the less privileged and more open-minded atmosphere of the Midwestern university (Tufts called it a “stimulating and wholesome world”).

Bristol flourished in Berlin—taking courses in Egyptian grammar, doing ar-
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University but also its willingness to slowly
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1880, he decided to travel to Germany to study classical languages. During his three years at various German universities he
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German critics he visited to be filled with “gloomy, dirty streets” and with “hideous faces.” He then vividly remembered how quickly he felt that “[t]he boasted superiority of the German races is pitiable to one who comes from Paris and northern Italy to Germany and finds himself in the midst of a race of sedentary, German, finding that “[t]he Rhine is no more beautiful than the Hudson and the sickening, watery cabbage grows and blows over the dumpy hills are unbearable after the intense coloring and graceful distinct outlines of Piedmont.” Berlin he found to be not too much better, being filled with “insignificant buildings we should never make any fuss over in America.” Ending up in Bonn at the university, he found the lectures that he attended were “very dull and I can’t make much out of them—nothing but isolated facts some of which I had known and forgotten and others which I still remember.” He also found that “German society is so unruly and vulgar that a true picture of it is not at—sight for the rest of the world. . . . The country, the manners, the civilization or rather barbarism, the language and the thought are all essentially repugnant to me.” In Leipzig he found his classmates were “all infected with Hegel to a greater or less extent,” and where it was also the case that “[t]he ideas, methods, and illustrative quotations are all very stale to me.” Shorey was self-conscious enough to reason that his isolation might have been his own fault, and wondered why he felt “cold and unvivacious” whenever he was forced to converse with his fellow Germans. He had better luck in Munich, where he worked with Wilhelm von Christ on a dissertation on Plato’s ideas about human nature and found von Christ to be a supportive and sympathetic mentor. He finally completed his work in June 1884. But the more he read in German, the more he grew frustrated by its abstruse and highly technical nature. He complained to Payne: “I cannot be a classical scholar according to the German standards. My mind refuses to grasp their methods of reasoning and I have not and cannot have enough minute grasp of the precepts of German thought and I have no time to sustain me. It is almost physical, certainly a nervous pain to me to follow a chain of reasoning that has absolutely no cogency for me.”

Shorey’s acerbic, deeply opinionated personality, given to making controversial and occasionally outrageous comments about all manner of events and persons he encountered. In one essay published in 1908, he denounced the culture of the city of Chicago as one marked by ugliness and vulgarity. In another in 1912, he defended strikebreakers in a local union dispute by telling pro-labor students that they were engaging in “sentimental anarchy.”

Shorey’s unhappy memories of his time in Germany persisted through his subsequent years in the United States. As a French ambassador to the United States, visited Chicago in May 1901, Shorey was a member of the organizing committee. At a dinner given in his honor, French ambassador to the United States to mark the success of the French spirit to subdue its strength and earnest spirit into finer uses. “In 1911, Shorey authored a tough-minded critique of German educational practices in The Nation, entitled “American Scholarship,” which was later expanded into a book. In this essay, Shorey examined the current model of a research university in America was one that was staffed by scholars who were “made in Germany,” and he pointed out that the emphasis on abstract, unverifiable hypotheses values led to a maladaptation in which U.S. educational institutions were badly integrated into the culture of their own nation. What was most troubling was not the German innovations of the seminar, the doctoral dissertation, or the final oral examinations, which were in theory good innovations, but rather the “aims and ideals” of the system as a whole. What was needed was for Americans to “emancipate ourselves from a slavery subservience to German influence without losing the lessons or forgetting the debt of gratitude that we owe to Germany.” U.S. universities had the potential to have, more than their German counterparts, a “unity and continuity of culture, uninterrupted contact with the national life and education, and the more intelligent and sympathetic personal guidance” with students. Shorey saw the greatest need in encouraging general cultural training and erudition among U.S. graduate students, and for this the German universities were completely useless. Instead a slavish imitation of German methods resulted in younger scholars trained as pedants who practiced the “game of investigation” for its own sake, and the universities were completely useless. Instead a slavish imitation of German methods resulted in younger scholars trained as pedants who practiced the “game of investigation” for its own sake, which soon became a “parody of scientific research” consisting of a “pyramiding of unverifiable hypotheses.” What was wanted was a genuinely American tradition of higher education, which would be more closely integrated to English and French ideals of style, eloquence, and empirical restraint.

Shorey’s essay in The Nation sold dog in 1885, and six years after it was published, Shorey was nominated to hold the one-semester Roosvelt visiting professorship at the University of Berlin in 1913–14. Even though he called attention to The Nation article when he accepted the appointment to the professor—ship, visiting professorship, and research chair, he expressed his disdain for the one-semester Roosvelt visiting professorship at the University of Berlin in 1913–14. Even though he called attention to The Nation article when he accepted the appointment to the professor—ship, visiting professorship, and research chair, he expressed his disdain for the visiting professorship. Shorey wrote a long, exculpatory letter to the selection committee, protesting that quotations from the article in The Nation were being taken out of context and that he had in fact great respect for German culture and German literature, but the letter was uncharacteristically tame and unconvincing for a personality who indeed seemed to thrive on controversy, overstatement, and polemic involving German society and politics. Since his primary responsibility was to deliver a cycle of public lectures on the German economy, politics, and culture, in Berlin, Shorey found himself trying to explain American culture and society to German students by using the theme to elaborate on his “American exceptionalism” which he argued was a result of America’s democratic political and social practices and how it influenced the development of a peculiarly American form of civilization. Shorey gave lectures there well into the course of the nineteenth century. Although he admitted that democracy might not be a self-evident foundation for the growth of a complex and rich culture, he insisted that American society was on a path that would make its way “very clear and that, to take but one concrete example, America would soon have a secondary educational system equal to that of the fabled German institutions. By then we should be much easier for the universities to produce a strong elite of powerfull leaders. Ironically, at the end of the semester in February 1914, Shorey was honored at a dinner attended by over one hundred German scholars. At least one report of the affair indicated that in an impromptu speech he expressed regret at the formulations that he had used in the 1911 article, thus seeming to apologize for his expressions. Adolf Harnack, the distinguished biblical scholar and head of the Royal Prussian Library, was reported as declaring: “Shorey has put the German professors to shame by admitting that he could make mistakes.”

Shorey was a brilliant teacher and a tough-minded critic who was fearless in challenging what he considered pomposity (not to mention wrongheaded propaganda refuse to face.”

Still Small devoted a great deal of time to studying and interpreting the work of major German social scientists, and he urged other graduate students to spend time in Germany as well. Traveling to Germany had also led to subtle changes in Small’s personal values. Late in his life Small remembered that the first time he had ever taken a walk with a girl on a Sunday afternoon was in Weimar in 1879. The young woman, the daughter of a German general, later became his wife. Growing up as the son of a Baptist minister in Maine in the 1860s and 1870s, where a strong residue of Puritan culture dominated politics and private behavior, such “recreation” on the Sabbath—especially with a member of the opposite sex—would have been sternly forbidden. But in Germany, a new society in the old world, it seemed plausible and natural for the young graduate student.

Small’s adult intellectual universe was Pacific. Small read widely, and built a library of his key ideas and concepts—invoking social process and social planning and the linear movement of society toward greater progress and unity under the sponsorship of an enlightened state—came from the German Kathedersozialisten, Adolf Wagner, Gustav Schmoller, and Hermann Heinze, with whom Small studied in 1871, and from subsequent engagement with the work of Albert Schaffle, Paul Barth, and Gustav Ratzenhofer. Small’s book on the German and Austrian cameralists published in 1909 was a searching effort to explain the origins of an elite-driven civic political system that was efficient, was goal-oriented, and would and could restore itself to achieve more coherent and integrated civil society. He insisted that “Americans have much to gain from better understanding of the Germans” and “the efficiency of the German civic system is beyond dispute. As an adaptation of means to ends, it operates with a remarkably low rate of waste.” He also believed that, in contrast to the financial system of the United States, of which he said, “there is hardly room for debate upon the proposition that in sheer economy of social efficiency Germany has no near rival and probably none at all.” Small was deeply indebted to the ideas of the German collectivists, a policy perspective that Small applied to British socialism and American socialism. Moreover, the organizational example of the German Verein für Sozialpolitik provided a model of collaborative
professionalism and research proclivity that Small and other early social scientists sought to transplant to America. Small's last words on the matter were famous: "Without the intellectual heritage, partly the creation of the men of higher mathematics."]

---

**Harper's comments on Moore**

Harper's comments to Moore were part of a larger reassessment on his part of the importance of teaching and reflected his sense that the German model, in its worst manifestations, could generate a disregard for undergraduate teaching. This may explain Harper's eventual reluctance to hire Americans who were returning from long stays in Europe. Harper had insisted to Moore in 1919 that he suspected they spent at least two years elsewhere in America before he would consider them for a job at Chicago.

In my opinion it requires at least two or three years for a student who has studied five years abroad to become Americanized so as to take a satisfactory position in an American institution. On account of my knowledge of the facts in the cases of so many American students who have taken a German Doctorate, I have practically refused to consider applications for such persons until they have been back in the country at least two years. I understand there may be exceptions, but the experience of 1919 is so far in my observation that it has practically become a working rule for me.

---

**Harper's concerns notwithstanding, Eliakim H. Moore's**

Harper's concerns notwithstanding, Eliakim H. Moore's inquiring for German-trained scholars to succeed Oskar Bolza in 1910. Wilczynski was born in Hamburg, Germany, grew up in the United States, and returned to Berlin to take his PhD in 1897. In many ways he was the last of the great German mathematician and Göttingen professor in 1902, and then he accepted an appointment at the University of Illinois from 1907 to 1910. His coming to Chicago has been described as the first step in bringing another Berlin-trained colleague who had taught astronomy at the University of Chicago since 1893 and who tried to identify an academic position for Wilczynski at Chicago as early as 1897. Such informal networks among the émigré scholars must have been strong, especially given the lack of job security that the younger foreign scholars faced.

Many other examples of German influ-
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the direction of Hermann von Holst, more easily bridged the gap between graduate and undergraduate students. He was an obvious choice for names for themselves by writing popular as well as professional scholarship. Still other European-trained scholars had a strong collective memory of the impact of original research. Adolf Carl von Noé came from Graz, Austria, and after studies at Graz and Göttingen ended up in Chicago where he took both a BA and a PhD. Noé began his career at Chicago in 1904 in Germanic languages. But after 1920 he moved into geology and paleobotany, in which he had also had prior university training. He eventually became an expert in world coal formations, and he was one of the designers of the underground coal mine at the Museum of Science and Industry.\(^{40}\) Noé, who was also deeply involved in creating the American Committee for Vienna Re-
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er professional self-development.\(^{46}\) The early German and Romance language departments also hired Central European scholars—including Camillo von Klenze, a Swiss national who had a Harvard BA and who had studied for his doctorate at Berlin and Marburg; and Hans M. Schmidt-Wartenberg, who was born in Germany and trained at Jena, Berlin, and Cornell, and who ended up in endless feuds with his colleagues over who got the right to use August Sch Nicolai,\(^{58}\) accusing them of anti-German prejudice and becoming a source of considerable frustration to Harper.\(^{47}\)

Perhaps the most fascinating example of the early internationalism of the University was the case of Hermann von Holst, and von Holst leads us to a further dimension of the German professors in 1904. Von Holst was certainly the most distinguished European academic recruited by Harper for full-time service in the early faculty. A chaired professor at the University of Freiburg and the author of the monumental eight-volume Constitutional and Political History of the United States (published in English translation between 1876 and 1892), von Holst had already rejected of-

professors of professorships at Johns Hopkins and Clark. Harper's vision of a great new university in the middle of the vast conti-

nued intriguing him, however, and von Holst eventually succumbed to Harper's urgent appeals. When he appeared in Chicago in late 1892 he brought with him clear professional credentials as a University of Freiburg full professor, and Harper was forced to accommodate these demands. Benjamin S. Terry, a younger American scholar working on his doctorate at the University of Freiburg who assisted Harper in conduct-

the negotiations with von Holst in the fall of 1903. The appointment of von Holst was also hired by Harper as a professor at Chicago), wrote candidly to a confidant of Harper about the danger of intruding on the sense of sovereignty that the senior German scholar brought to his vocation.

The man who has spent his active life in a German university makes much of "Lehrfreiheit", von Holst is like the rest of them. He does not believe, that you will get him to enter into any stipulation as to the number of hours per week [of teaching] in the amount or kind of work that he is to do. He simply asks for the liberty to do what he shall think is best for his department and for his work. He asks for confidence on the part of the authorities. Harper cannot do better than commit this whole matter to von Holst himself. You need have no fears that he will not earn his salary. As a simple advertisement, all that he costs will be well spent. More than that, he is much more widely known, and has a much more extensive per-
sonal acquaintance among wealthy Germans of America than I think you are aware of, to say nothing of his wide acquaintance with the eminent men of his own department in both Europe and America.

The prospect of hiring Hermann von Holst did not meet with universal approval, generating the part of a few subtle pangs of resentment and jealousy. Harper's sec-

on-front in the early University, interventional adverse to the interests of the University to make the great majority of the conscientious students pay the penalty for any dereliction of duty on the part of a few by changing the character to the work, i.e., by lower-

were limited to the scholarship

and the role of the labor unions during the

questionable public issues, such as denouncing American foreign policy in Latin America in 1903 and the American annexation of Hawaii in 1898 (much to Harper's chagrin and embarrassment) and in his staunch pro-

of his own Lehrfreiheit, however, von Holst served as a powerful example to his local Chicago colleagues of a senior German Ordinarius, and the freedom that von Holst claimed and regularly practiced must have offered an alluring model for other senior members of the faculty of the early University.\(^{33}\) Even in the face of Harper's displeasure, von Holst insisted that faculty were "not slaves but free men, everyone entitled to his own opinion and free to avow them."

Von Holst was a tough advocate of aca-

demic quality control, and more than once he sent Harper comments to that effect. In the case of a Mr. Jude, von Holst wrote that "it would not be calculated to build up its reputation for a high standard if higher degrees were frequently conferred upon students of Mr. J.'s intellectual caliber."\(^{34}\) He also urged Harper to treat graduate students like adults, and he defended the autonomy and freedom that he acceded to graduate students taking his seminar by insisting:

The work as conducted by myself does not admit of controlling the time spent by the students from day to day or even week to week. I nec-

cessarily must put the students upon their honor and try to make them realize that they do not work for my benefit, but for their own. It is, of course, possible to abuse of this, but to judge from the apparent interest manifested by the class in the work I have no reason to suppose that there are many who do so, if indeed any. If there be any I am at a loss to see how I could help it. For I would be unjust to the students and derogatory to the interests of the University to make the great majority of the conscientious students pay the penalty for any dereliction of duty on the part of a few by changing the character to the work, i.e., by lowering it from the University standard to that of the college.\(^{35}\)

This image of a famous senior professor steeped in the dignity and independence of the academic calling and defending uncompromising ideals of teaching must have offered his younger colleagues on the Chicago faculty a powerful model for their own professional self-development.

Von Holst's health forced him into early retirement in 1900, and in 1903 he wrote Harper, where his medical condition—intestinal ulcers—continued to worsen. In early 1903 J. Laurence Laughlin, the head of the Department of Economics, had been elected president of the University commission an oil portrait of von Holst. Laughlin had become an advocate of such portraits, reasoning that they would give the students admiring faculty rights and his high academic standards during their shared tenure at Chicago, and von Holst had published a trenchant essay attacking Eugene Debs and the role of the labor unions during the

The prospect of hiring Hermann von Holst, who now hangs in the history department's common room in the Social Science Research Building, portrays a seri-

American politics should be in charge
desirable for the University.\(^{36}\) Laughlin specifically

"I dislike the idea of a foreigner at the head of such a department in an American university. It seems to me that departments involving Ameri-

can history, American literature, and American politics should be in charge of Americans, if possible. Personally, I must confess that I don't fancy having to work under a German. I doubt if many American professors would."

Deciding to ignore Judson's petition, Harper proceeded to follow Terry's advice and successfully recruited von Holst. Given his age and troubled medical condition—benign prostatic hypertrophy and renal stones—von Holst did not develop a significant school of doctoral disciples in the time before he returned to Germany in 1900. He did have a powerful personal impact on the formation of the Harvard Department of Economics, in that both Benjamin Terry and Ferdinand Schevill had been his doctoral students at Freiburg, but his impact in the larger development of American historiography before 1914 was limited to the scholarship that he produced, and his willingness to speak his mind on contro-

The University Senate approved Laughlin's proposal, and within several months Karl Marin von Hoff, a noted German-American painter living in Munich, was busy at work on a full-length oil portrait of von Holst. Laughlin wrote to von Holst's brother, Mathias von Holst, who undertook the negotiations with<br>Marin, that the faculty wanted "a work of art, as well as a characteristic portrait of a great scholar . . . we wish the character of the von Holst we knew and loved and admired in America." Laughlin specifically

"a portrait such as Lenbach would have painted in his earlier years."\(^{37}\) Marin agreed to take the commission for a fee of $4,000. Ironically Marin himself had once observed von Holst lecturing in Freiburg, while visiting a friend at the university there, and he had been tremendously im-

pressed with the historian's demeanor.\(^{38}\) Marin completed his assignment within six months, shipping it to Chicago in early August 1903.\(^{39}\) Marin's portrait of Hermann von Holst, which now hangs in the history department's common room in the Social Science Research Building, portrays a seri-

ous, independent-minded, senior scholar, who is unencumbered by the cares of the world and oblivious to local intramural university politics as well.

Once the preparation of von Holst's portrait was underway, the question then became how to structure its dedication ceremony. Clearly, here was an opportunity for public visibility as well as remembrance and celebration. J. Franklin Jameson, who had succeeded von Holst as head of the Department of History, recommended on behalf of his department that the University (presumably in consultation with Harper)\(^{40}\) should invite Adolf von Harnack to come to Chicago to speak at the ceremony and to receive an honorary degree. Initially the Senate agreed to this idea, but J. Laurence Laughlin soon intervened with what he believed to be a better idea. Namely, why not invite four or five distinguished German scholars to attend the dedication ceremony.\(^{41}\) This plan was finally adopted, and the various faculty groups set to work coming up with lists of names of possible Germans who might be invited to receive honorary degrees.\(^{42}\)

The process went through several elaborations, as names of possible German professors worthy to receive honorary degrees went on and off the lists. It soon became apparent that the visits could not be arranged for October 1903, when the dedication ceremony was scheduled. The Senate therefore decided to uncouple the two events, allowing a smaller and local ceremony for von Holst's portrait in October and reserving the date for the dedication of the 1904 convolution in honor of the visiting Germans, thus making the dedication a day of German-American honorifics. For the dedication ceremony of the
portrait in mid-October, Harper, Jameson, and Laughlin all delivered stirring comments on behalf of von Holst, as a scholar and an academic citizen. Although the speakers praised von Holst’s scholarly contributions, it was his moral leadership and professional ethics that impressed his audience. Laughlin praised his friend’s demeanor as that of “a whole white spirit—a great moral force—blazed and gathered in his commanding attack,” he summed up the substantive importance of von Holst for the early University faculty. For Laughlin “[t]he one striking impression that he made, within the University and without, was that of a great moral force. With his students, as with the public, he not only set the chords of right and wrong to vibrating afresh, but he set every conscience on the right key.”

This left the Senate with a second opportunity for public display of value-laden rhetoric about the debt of the University to German culture. Walther Wever then entered the picture. Wever was an incredibly energetic consul general from Germany from 1900 to 1908 in Chicago, who saw as his personal and professional mission the cementing of good relations between America and Germany and who believed that one facet of this process could be undertaken by bringing German and American universities closer together. During his eight years in Chicago, Wever undertook a number of imaginative ventures that included the creation of professional exchange programs. He also functioned as an informal fund raiser for the University, persuading Catherine Sepp, widow of wealthy German-American businessman Conrad Sepp, to give a gift to subsidize prizes for the best essays written on German literature and culture. Wever was also well placed in German universities because of his brother, Hermann Wever, a high-rank- ing civil servant in the Prussian Ministry of Culture in Berlin, where he was quietly able to support his brother’s schemes. With Walther Wever’s support, invitations were sent to five leading German scholars, asking them to the University to stage an event honoring the impact of German academic culture on the new University of Chicago. These visits were subsidized by the imperial German government and local German businessmen, through the mediation of Wever. The senior faculty organized an elaborate convocation to honor distinguished guests in late March 1904, at which five honorary degrees were awarded. The honorees were Berthold Delbrück, Professor of Sanskrit at Jena; Paul Ehrenfest, Professor of Medicine at Berlin; Wilhelm Herrmann, Professor of Theology at Marburg; Josef Kohler, Professor of Law at Berlin; and Eduard Meyer, Professor of Ancient History at Berlin. All were eminent authorities in their scholarly fields, and as a group they represented a heightening of the University’s identification with the local German community in Chicago to practice transnational Kulturbetrieb. The self-confident desires of his own colleagues to bask in the light of German Wissenschaft in order to reveal their own significant research accomplishments led them to stage an academic event that both highlighted the progress that the University had made in becoming an international research university and formally acknowledged the intellectual debt owed to the German university system. Wever also gave a gift to subsidize prizes for the best academic work published in German universities. This action of the Trustees in 1917 had caused an extraordinary, if small, impact on the German academic community to Europe. The zenith of anti-German animus was so evident before 1914 was never to return. By the 1920s, it was clear that the great American universities had found their own identity. Writing to a colleague in Chicago, a German ambassador to the United States noted with some surprise that European scholars could no longer presume that, merely because they had graduated from a German university, they would be eagerly welcomed in the United States, and that “America has become more or less self-sufficient along

1904, John Coulter gave the speech at the convocation that I have already referenced, in which he showed how much we could learn from the values of Lehrefreiheit and Lernfreiheit. But the most remarkable speech of the day was given by William Rainey Harper himself. At the conclusion of his speech, Harper insisted that the University owed much to the ideals of German scholarship and was greatly indebted to German intellectual life. But he also used the scene to paint a large picture of the importance of international contacts and connections to the University as a whole. Reprising his 1899 address at the University of California–Berkeley on “The University and Democracy,” Harper now insisted that universities were among the most powerful agents of international understanding and comity, and that their capacity to sponsor and encourage an “intermingling” of “widely diverging ideas” was bound to lead to closer connections between the nations of the world. The University was thus a mediator not only of ideas but also of peoples, for its function was “to lead the souls of men and nations into close communion with the common soul of all humanity. This is a work which universities in the past have accomplished and which, perhaps, they are doing today more largely than ever before.”

Harper thus exploited the eagerness of the imperial German government and the local German community in Chicago to practice transnational Kulturbetrieb. The self-confident desires of his own colleagues to bask in the light of German Wissenschaft in order to reveal their own significant research accomplishments led them to stage an academic event that both highlighted the progress that the University had made in becoming an international research university and formally acknowledged the intellectual debt owed to the German university system. Wever also gave a gift to subsidize prizes for the best academic work published in German universities. This action of the Trustees in 1917 had caused an extraordinary, if small, impact on the German academic community to Europe. The zenith of anti-German animus was so evident before 1914 was never to return. By the 1920s, it was clear that the great American universities had found their own identity. Writing to a colleague in Chicago, a German ambassador to the United States noted with some surprise that European scholars could no longer presume that, merely because they had graduated from a German university, they would be eagerly welcomed in the United States, and that “America has become more or less self-sufficient along
scientific lines, and foreign visitors who do not receive a special invitation to lecture should not expect to find a warm and welcoming atmosphere. In the words of Harold Lasswell, who reported to Charles Merriam about the atmosphere in Europe she met in London, the Old World and about the fustiness of its ventured to Europe did so with an air of JanuArey 24, 2008.

I like the journalists and the Foreign academic work... or what of ancient traditions to be busted tening to them that I haven't taken position to teach... But in addition student's chances for recognition, or, university reacts unfavorably on a mate relationship with any particular... likely to find when they come back reason for this is that students go- country for graduate work. One students will go to any European schools.

In a few cases, brilliant young Europeans with PhDs continued to find places on the Chicago faculty. On the eve of the Depression William Zachariasen, a young postdoctoral fellow from Norway, joined the Department of Physics. He spent the next forty-four years in a distinguished career at Chicago, including service as chairman of the German section from 1945 to 1949 and 1956 to 1959 and Dean of the Division of the Physical Sciences from 1959 to 1962. It was tell- ing, however, that the most distinguished senior European scholar to assume a full professorship at the University of Chicago in the 1920s was Otto Struve from Germany, but from Great Britain. Sir William Craigie, who was the third editor of the Oxford English Dictionary and who dominated an endowed chair at Oxford in 1923 to work on the Dictionary of American Eng- lish project at Chicago, was rightly seen as a particularly prestigious appointment for Chicago to have engineered. Many young scholars who had studied in Ger- many before the war now remembered their personal connections with German academic culture with some ambivalence. Barry Karl has shrewdly observed about Charles Merriam, the brilliant Chicago political scientist who was one of the most influential scholars of American and Eu- ropean politics during the interwar period and who had studied at the University of Heidelberg from 1926 to 1927, that “after the war... Merriam tended more to deny the relationship than affirm it, though he continued to refer to the intellectual forebears of the problems his generation faced.”

Most important were the continuing challenges to the established empire and Europe that continued in the 1920s at the University of Chicago came about via the initiatives of individual faculty members. Merriam's nine-volume Studies in the Making of Citizens, a series of books devoted to comparative political thought in various European nations and the United States and published by the University of Chicago Press between 1929 and 1931, was informed by Merriam and also by traditional European political traditions and much more by his belief that after 1918 American political values of educat- ing responsible citizens, and especially the American ideal of participatory democracy, were “a model for the rest of the world.”

Similarly, the work of Merriam's colleague Quincy Wright on the causes and prevent- tion of war enabled Wright to maintain a large range of professional correspondences and other scholarly contacts in various European states, especially relating to the future of the League of Nations, but within a framework that was defined by Wright's conviction that America's involvement in collective security was in the world's interest, not merely in America's self-interest.

Quincy Wright also became the direc- tor of the Norman Wait Harris Memorial Foundation, which was perhaps the most ambitious and systematic program of engaging world affairs developed at the University of Chicago between 1918 and 1941. This foundation owed much to the internationalist perspectives of Albion Small, who like many U.S. academics had been deeply disillusioned by the chilliness of wartime rhetoric—especially that manufac- tured by jingoist newspaper publishers eager to boost circulation. In the summer of 1922 a local banker and his wife, M. Haydon MacLean and Pearl Harris Mac- clean, had attended a summer institute on international politics held at Williamsstown, Massachusetts, that was sponsored by Ber- nard Berelson. Small, who reported with abhorrence on the activities of Hitler's coming to power in Germany in 1933, the University of Heidelberg in 1936: “I can't see how a man of large enough political caliber to direct the storm.”

[...]

Europe Returns to Chicago: The 1930s and 1940s

Within a decade, Herbert Kraus's fear of a “strong personality” who could “direct the storm” in Germany came to pass. Adolf Hitler's coming to power in Germany in early 1933 inaugurated powerful new inter- national movements that had a deep impact on the University of Chicago. Most faculty looked with abhorrence on the activities of the Nazis, and most probably shared Frank Knight's conviction when he refused to ac- cept the award of an honorary degree from the University of Heidelberg in 1936: “it is with the deepest feelings of regret that I have to decline the pro- fered dignity. In the present state of political opinion, it simply would not do for an American to accept any standing as a liberal to accept an honorary degree from a German uni- versity. Such things are not, are not intended to be, and probably could not be, simply a matter between scholars and institutions of learning.
If the contrary were the case, I should of course be most pleased to accept a position as a professor of Romance languages at the University of Heidelberg. But I could not, under present conditions, give this affront, for it would be such, to me as a liberal, as if I were engaged in the free and impersonal promotion of truth, in America and elsewhere. As you know, a considerable fraction of these, including many of my personal friends and nearest colleagues, are Jews and I am sure you will recognize that this fact makes a difference, unfortunately, as that fact may be.66

Ironically, the most significant personal contribution that the University made to resisting Hitler’s terrorism was Franklin Roosevelt’s appointment in June 1933 of William E. Dodd, a distinguished professor of American History at Chicago since 1908, to be the U.S. ambassador to Germany. Dodd was a Jeffersonian Democrat and vigilantly internationalist who supported Woodrow Wilson’s foreign policy ideals. Under the direction of Erich Marks and Karl Lamprecht, he had spent two years at the University of Leipzig from 1897 to 1899, completing a dissertation on Jefferson’s conflict in 1786 with Alexander Hamilton and John Adams. Dodd was the son of poor North Carolina farmers, and his humble social origins shaped his distaste of class and caste privileges of any kind. He disliked privileged aristocrats but whom the Department of Philosophy and Its Academic Resources and Scholarly Community, Hans Rothfels, a talented political conservative German historian, wrote in relief to his former teacher Friedrich Meinecke that having arrived at Princeton University was impressed by the “scale of the place and high level of [scholarship and learning] which had on Rothfels “a stimulating effect after so many years of more or less elementary-level teaching.”67 Perhaps the most notable refugee scholars came in the physical sciences, with the atomic revolution of the 1930s winners of the Nobel Prize, being the most obvious. Once at Chicago, Franck developed considerable efforts to help colleagues left behind in Germany, telling Otto Straube during the Christmas holidays in 1938, “I used all my spare time writing letters on behalf of the people who are suffering in Germany.”68 But Chicago also hired Paul A. Weiss in zoology, Marcel Schein in physics, Konrad Bloch in biochemistry, and Anton Zügmand in mathematics, all of whom had distinguished careers with many significant scholarly contributions.69 The history of the Oriental Institute was dramatically shaped by a generation of brilliant European scholars who transformed it between 1930 and 1960 into the distinguished research center that it is today. Among these was Henk Fortkamp, Thorkild Jacobsen, Arno Poebel, Erich F. Schmidt, and Arnold Hauser, who were all333
ing Rudolf Carnap in philosophy, Arnold<br>Bergerstrasser in Germanic languages, Wil-<br>helm Schenberg in musicology, Marcel<br>deldorf, Ludwig Bahrofer, and Otto von Simson in art history. Among the regular<br>academic departments at Chicago, art his-<br>tory may have been the only one to experience<br>transformed by the refugee appointments.<br>But in the immediate postwar period, politi-<br>cal science also experienced a major impact<br>via the presence of Hans Morgenthau and<br>Leo Strauss.

Occasionally, a refugee scholar ended up<br>at Chicago via a set of completely id-<br>iosyncratic events, which, in retrospect,<br>related as much to intra-faculty political<br>wrangling as to the substantive merits of<br>the case itself. For example, Hans Rothfels<br>was appointed to a tenured professorship<br>in the Department of History during a<br>successful visiting appointment in the<br>Summer Quarter of 1946. Rothfels was a<br>prominent scholar of nineteenth-century<br>German political history who had stud-<br>ied with Friedrich Meinecke at Berlin.<br>Rothfels occupied a full professorship at<br>the University of Königsberg until he was<br>dismissed by the Nazis in 1934 and fled<br>Germany in 1939, gaining a temporary<br>appointment at Brown. The Department of<br>History had originally not intended to ap-<br>point a scholar in modern German history,<br>since S. William Halperin was already on<br>its staff, but rather hoped to hire a senior<br>scholar specializing in seventeenth- and<br>eighteenth-century European history. In<br>the years immediately preceding the appoint-<br>ment of Hans Rothfels the Department of<br>History found itself in an ongoing battle<br>with President Robert Hutchins over new<br>appointments. Hutchins had manifested a<br>consistently negative opinion of most of<br>the department’s personnel recommendations since the day that Department of History’s<br>chair during the later 1940s, William T. Hutchison, would later recall his colleagues’ “increasing sense of frustra-<br>tion born of the Central Administration’s unwillingsness to concede that the Depart-<br>ment knew either the proper content of its<br>own affairs or the proper function of its<br>representations of an outstanding historian.” 112

Seeking to rebuild its depleted ranks, the<br>department nominated a group of highly<br>promising historians in November 1943<br>including Franklin L. Bauer, Robert R.<br>Palmer, C. Vann Woodward, Wesley F.<br>Craven, and John C. Miller’s hoping that the<br>administration would at least approve of<br>offers to two or three, but Robert Hutchins rejected all of them. 113 The department then<br>nominated Wesley F. Craven in January 1944 for a full professorship in American<br>colonial history, but Hutchins turned this<br>recommendation back again as well. In<br>a kind of parallel action directed against<br>Hutchins, the department had already<br>voted in August 1945 not to appoint Ernst<br>Kantorowicz, the brilliant young American<br>historian of medieval history who was then at<br>Berkeley and was strongly favored by Dean<br>Richard McKeeon of the Division of the<br>Humanities. As McKeeon commented to the<br>Committee on Social Thought, and Robert Hutchins himself. 114 Defending its professional<br>prestige, the Department of History did not<br>feel it was to be Hutchins’s capriciousness<br>and high-handedness, the department even<br>polled seven major medieval scholars in<br>the United States, the majority of whom<br>ranked Kantorowicz as not being at the top<br>of his field. Kantorowicz wrote back with<br>“[h]e should not lecture to undergradu-<br>ates. I doubt that he should even lecture at<br>all, if he always performs as he did here.” 115<br>But in the immediate postwar period, politi-<br>cal science also experienced a major impact<br>via the presence of Hans Morgenthau and<br>Leo Strauss.
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relationships and ideological perspectives could also play. The one, Max Rheinstein, from Germany (1884-1960), came in 1937 and became an integral part of the Law School, while the other, Hans Kelsen, became a fixture in a critical story of the time: the experience of the refugee scholar. Both proved intellectually flexible in the face of the new American context and both fit the description of an ideal candidate for the Law School, as described by Dean Harry A. Bigelow in his letter to Dean Harry A. Bigelow, as someone with "an acute mind..."

In addition to teaching law, Rheinstein was involved in negotiating them). He was a "vigorous but pleasant" personality and a "veritable model of adaptation and ascribing a bright German refugee scholar who "is probably the most promising man available for comparative law work in the United States. While I should not care to be quoted on this, I think that he would do a substantially better job for us than some of the persons who are now on our staff." Additional qualities were noted in the same letter. Rheinstein's "passion of one of the most acute minds I have run into, an effective teaching personality, a rather remarkable command of English, and a range of interest which is little less than "amazing." He was "sold on the case," and arranged Rheinstein's appointment as a visiting assistant professor as of January 1, 1935, partly on the basis of temporary funds provided by the Rockefeller Foundation (these funds, it should be noted, were an early example of the Rheinstein's entrepreneurial spirit, in that Rheinstein himself was involved in negotiating them.). Rheinstein was renewed as an assistant professor until he was promoted to an untenured associate professorship in 1937. Solid funding for Rheinstein's job was finally secured by the use of a new endowment, the Map Pam Fund, to which the Law School gained access in 1936. Harry Bigelow praised Rheinstein to Hutchins as someone with a "vigorous but pleasant" personality and "very high" potential as a researcher. As to knowledge of the world. The "increased opportunities for all young lawyers to do their part," as was the case with Rheinstein, and these publications had an enduring impact. He also produced an English translation (with Edward Shils) of the sections relating to law from Max Weber's great work Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft. But the professional gambit that seems to have been particularly successful was the creation of new ways to sponsor the comparative study of the law. Rheinstein's Foreign Law Program was the work of a visionary teacher. In fact, Rheinstein was fifty years ahead of his time, and it has only been very recently that legal scholars have come to appreciate the salience and intrinsic scholarly value of the kind of systematic comparative legal studies, grounded in deep knowledge of different world legal systems, that Rheinstein advocated after 1945. In all of his projects and courses, Rheinstein sought to encourage in his students intellectual self-confidence, curiosity, and independence of thought. This came through rather strikingly in a letter that he sent to Peter Siemens, a German student he met in Berlin in 1947. In tones that are reminiscent of the final pages of Max Weber's Science as a Vocation, Rheinstein replied:

There is another point which I sense somewhere in your letter and which I should like to warn you about. Perhaps I can best tell you what I mean by indicating an experience which I had with some students in Marburg. In our conversation they repeatedly deplored the lack in present-day Germany of any "exemplary personality." I asked them what they meant and it turned out that they were anxiously searching the horizon for some man who would have impeccable character and such outstanding intellectual qualities that their entire lives would be oriented up to him and could only find himself in his idea, but quite particularly in the example set by him, the lacking guidance in their own lives. I have found similar thoughts in a good many places and I now sense them in the US. They are frequently unable to read any foreign legal publications, even though they may hold highly suggestive ideas for us. His plan was, in this sense, a large-scale effort toward trans-cultural and even trans-civilizational understanding, with the ultimate benefit being to "inject into the teaching and learning of American law those ideas which are engendered through their contact with the legal institutions and solutions of other countries, which have problems similar to ours and have developed solutions of their own ways through traditions of many centuries."
If Rheinstein’s example revealed how intrinsic talent and energy, an appealing personality, and social skills—be they legal or local—could all merge into one stunningly successful appointment, the story of Hans Kelsen demonstrated the contingent and idiosyncratic features that could easily outweigh the personal magnetism that would be a favorable circumstance in developing the “great distinction” of an appointment at Chicago. Kelsen, in his report to the Law School, expressed the belief that ultimately doomed the possibility of his coming to Chicago: “I could find no other place in the United States better suited for my work of an ideologically critical analysis of the idea of justice on which I have been working since many years,” but he realized what our problem is. Bluntly put, it is the problem of a third refugee and that Professor Kelsen should ‘be offered a term offer, but Kelsen was clearly interested in coming to Chicago and that Chicago “I could find no other place in the United States better suited for my work of an ideologically critical analysis of the idea of justice on which I have been working since many years,” but he realized what our problem is. Bluntly put, it is the problem of a third refugee and that Professor Kelsen should ‘be offered a term offer, but Kelsen was clearly interested in coming to Chicago.

In the aftermath of the Munich Crisis in October 1938, Kelsen decided that he did not want to move to the United States, and he wrote to Merriam asking if an appointment in 1939–40 academic year would be possible. He also wrote to other prominent U.S. scholars indicating that he felt that “I have availed myself of the New School’s short-term offer, but Kelsen was clearly interested in coming to Chicago and that Chicago “I could find no other place in the United States better suited for my work of an ideologically critical analysis of the idea of justice on which I have been working since many years,” but he realized what our problem is. Bluntly put, it is the problem of a third refugee and that Professor Kelsen should ‘be offered a term offer, but Kelsen was clearly interested in coming to Chicago.

In the aftermath of the Munich Crisis in October 1938, Kelsen decided that he did not want to move to the United States, and he wrote to Merriam asking if an appointment in 1939–40 academic year would be possible. He also wrote to other prominent U.S. scholars indicating that he felt that “I have availed myself of the New School’s short-term offer, but Kelsen was clearly interested in coming to Chicago and that Chicago “I could find no other place in the United States better suited for my work of an ideologically critical analysis of the idea of justice on which I have been working since many years,” but he realized what our problem is. Bluntly put, it is the problem of a third refugee and that Professor Kelsen should ‘be offered a term offer, but Kelsen was clearly interested in coming to Chicago.
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University of Notre Dame in early August
had contacted Waldemar Gurian of the
convictions and social contacts."
As the article in the “American Po-
tical Science Review” puts it nicely (p. 226): ‘His theory, as a theory, is indifferent to its possible political consequences. It is a positivist applying a supposedly formalistic normativism, on the other side in a kind of blind decisionism. As the article in the “American Po-
tical Science Review” puts it nicely (p. 226): ‘His theory, as a theory, is indifferent to its possible political consequences. It is a positivist applying a supposedly formalistic normativism, on the other side in a kind of blind decisionism.

Gurian’s striking imputation that Kelsen’s “relativism” was part and parcel of the reason why National Socialism suc-
cceeded requires some elaboration. Before coming to America, Gurian had worked as a journalist and sometime university lecturer in Germany. Gurian was a student of the German philosopher Edmund Husserl and a close confidant of the latter, who was a trenchant and striking writer, known for his “Vom Wissen und Wert der Demokratie,” Tübingen, J. B. Mohr, 1929; He is without a doubt a brilliant legal technician, but without any understand-
ing of political realities; though he “understands” everything, he is in his most important works op-
nosed to natural law, metaphysical concepts, etc. I think he represents a mentality which is completely out of date and which is responsible for the threatening breakdown of European civilization by the victory of primitive political religions. These religions rose partially in opposition to the empty logicism and relativism of an attitude a la Kelsen.

Gurian’s later work in the field of legal theory is indifferent to the political
consequences. I am directly inter-
tested in the formation of legal prin-
ciples and rules developed in the light of American and European
jurisprudence that insisted that modern moral sensibilities. When Hutchins argued
the sum that was originally intended by Pro-
testantism and neo-Thomists of the later 1930s might

But as the Department of Political Sci-
ence scrambled to put together a follow-
up offer for the 1941–42 academic year, Robert Hutchins was now less sympathetic to a multi-year offer, and indeed to any offer at all. The Law School’s continu-
ing lack of enthusiasm may have played a role in the original decision of John D. Davis and others, as well as the lack of expression of enthusiasm, which was not to be indifference to political or
social consequences.

In both of these exchanges Hutchins did not overtly associate himself with Gurian’s negative evaluation, but given his subsequent unwillingness to provide any University funds to support hiring Kelsen and the fact that he discreetly sent Redfield’s reply to John Nef, asking Nef what he made of Redfield’s rejoinder defending Kelsen, it seems likely that a combination of the Law School’s resistance and Gurian’s ac-
cusations had an impact. In deploying Gurian as a stalking horse against Kelsen, Hutchins revealed the extent to which
European—and in this case Austro-
German—political controversies, conveyed in person via refugees from across the Atlantic, were still able to influence the framework of ideological discourse in which American academics worked in the 1930s and 1940s.

Further, as the Law School dean at Yale where he had also taught from 1942 to 1945, and where he had supported the ideas of legal realism, a powerful movement in twentieth-century American jurisprudence that insisted that modern social and behavioral science had much to contribute to the formulation of legal principles and legal doctrine, Hutchins was aware of the growing interest to Kelsen’s philosophical perspectives, and on the margin, this too likely contributed to the final negation. Hutchins’s later flirtation in the 1930s with neo-Thomism and natural rights, via Mortimer Adler, had seemed to have compounded his uneasiness with a body of jurisprudence developed without explicit reference to moral sensibilities. When Hutchins argued
the sum that was originally intended by Pro-
tests himself directly against Kelsen’s insistence about the necessary (structural) divorce between ethics and the law. Indeed, one of the few points on which legal realists and neo-Thomists of the later 1930s might agree was that legal positivism was, as Karl Llewellyn once put it, “utterly sterile,”
neither because of its immorality (pace natu-
ral rights) or its seeming ineffectuality and impracticality (pace legal realism). Still, as Louis Wirth, Leonard White, and Robert
Redfield all insisted, Hans Kelsen was a figure of extraordinary importance in Euro-

One of the conditions that Robert Hutchins set for Kelsen was that he would now concentrate on looking for non-University support for Kelsen. This essentially meant that Hutchins refused to support the initiative, to the extent that money was involved. In the end, all of the Department of Political Science was able to cobble together was a one-year offer of $4,000, $1,500 of which came from the Jewish Welfare Fund and $2,500 from the Rockefeller Foundation. This involved no money from the University of Chicago’s own budget, which Vice-President Emory Froyd believed was enough to cover the cost. Kelsen must have sensed the patent lack of enthusiasm, noting to Quincy Wright that he was now being offered “almost half of the sum that was originally intended by Pro-
testor White,” and he eventually rejected Chicago’s offer in order to remain for an additional year in Tübingen. While in Tübingen in 1942 Kelsen accepted a temporary offer at the University of California–Berkeley that was converted into a full professorship in 1945, and he remained associated with Berkeley until his death in 1973.

Kelsen did have two subsequent sat-
isfactions in relation to the Department of Political Science at Chicago. First, Charles Merriam nominated him to receive an honorary degree on the occa-
sion of the University’s fiftieth anniversary celebration in September 1941, preparing a commendation that cited him as “one of the most brilliant living students of law and philosophy.” And, secondly, in 1943 a much younger German refugee, who was recruited to teach international law at the University of Chicago’s Law School and was later offered a position in the School of Social Science at the University of Chicago on a temporary basis (as a visiting associate professor), offered Hans Kelsen as one of the most interesting political socio-

The ideologies of early twentieth-century Central European liberalism and modern German Catholicism collided in this ex-
change, having sojourned from Cologne and Vienna to South Bend, Indiana, and to Chicago, but no less so for the dura-
tion of the journey. However, in the face of Kerwin’s and Hutchins’s interventions, Redfield re-
fused to buckle under. He wrote back to Hutchins:

Thanks for your quotation from a letter written by a German political scientist with reference to Kelsen. I understand that the writer intended to express an adverse criticism. Except for his last six lines (which express a very personal judgment) I do not see how what is there said about Kelsen supports an adverse opinion. Perhaps you will some time tell me why he is adverse to a man to say he is a positivist, or to say that his theory is indifferent to the political consequences. I am directly inter-
ested in this myself, because I have been called a positivist, and because I understand such theories as I work with to be indifferent to political or social consequences.

Concerning K. I am not astonished that there is a pressure [from the Department of Political Science] for him. But I think that it would be much better to write a man like George Gurvitch who is one of the most interesting political socio-

red a temporary basis (as a visiting associate professor) and was dismissed to buckle under. He wrote back to Hutchins:
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16 Further, as the Law School dean at Yale where he had also taught from 1942 to 1945, and where he had supported the ideas of legal realism, a powerful movement in twentieth-century American jurisprudence that insisted that modern social and behavioral science had much to contribute to the formulation of legal principles and legal doctrine, Hutchins was aware of the growing interest to Kelsen’s philosophical perspectives, and on the margin, this too likely contributed to the final negation. Hutchins’s later
quite credibly, and in October 1945 Hans J. Morgenthau's appointment was converted to a tenure-track position. But his theoretical perspectives differed from Kelsen's views of international law and political sovereignty. Hans Morgenthau wrote his dissertation on an international, political economy, and his personal debt in that it was Kelsen's vigorous advocacy of Morgenthau's tenure book on *La Réalité des Normes* that enabled Morgenthau to habilitate against the opposition of other senior faculty at the Graduate Institute of International Studies in Geneva in 1934.39

In many respects, Hans Morgenthau ended up in the full professor slot that Merritt and White had originally imagined for Hans Kelsen. Had Kelsen been appointed in 1940 or 1941, Morgenthau might not have been appointed two years later, and the subsequent history of political theory and international relations at Chicago would have been strikingly different. Morgenthau, in turn, understood the debt that he owed Kelsen, and it was without exaggeration that he would write to Kelsen near the end of the latter's life and in midst of Morgen- thau's dogged and controversial opposition against the war in Vietnam that "[y]our life has meant one thing for me: the consistent fearless pursuit of truth regardless of where it may lead to. Your example has taught me what it means to be a scholar. For that lesson I owe you a debt of gratitude which can only be discharged by following your example."40

Some European refugee scholars who appealed for assistance from Chicago had no luck at all. On Christmas Day in 1938 Dr. Hermann Ungar, a Viennese gymnasiuim professor, wrote to Robert Hutchins appealing for help from the University of Chicago. Ungar was a 63-year-old teacher, with a wife, a daughter, and a son who had lived in a middle-class neighborhood in the Landstrasse district in Vienna. He had studied mathematics, physics, and chemistry at the University of Vienna. Until the arrival of the Nazis in March 1938, he had taught science at a Viennese gymnasium—a position which as a Jew he had now been dismissed. Ungar was clearly desperate, and in somewhat marginal English he assured Hutchins that he was willing to accept any kind of job, however menial, in exchange for help. Ungar insisted that he could work as a lab assistant or even as a car driver. If those possibilities did not work out, he continued, "I should also willingly take the job of a watchman, parlor-man or caretaker or well qualified worker in any technical factory in the line of physics or chemistry, and I should content myself with the lowest possible position, because the personal experience of having crossed powerful and deep and painful boundaries...was too much for me...I am very little asked for in the imagination of American university leaders. I am not at all what can be called a young talent. I am a veteran, and I should content myself with the lowest position. The personal debt that I owe you is too much to be discharged by following your example."41

Happily, it was the sense of contemporary foundation and refugee aid officials and the general assessment of subsequent historians that, if the refugee scholars did make it through the eye of the appointment needle, most encountered respect and fair treatment, eventually gaining sympathy and support. Marjorie Lamberti is correct in arguing recently that "[d]espite the fears and gloomy forecasts, displaced [European] refugees did not have to fight to maintain...recognizes that the world included domains of cultural values that these scholars brought with them. Which to provide him.
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of an evaluation of war-time areas studies training programs. Redfield believed that the experience gained during World War II afforded promising intellec- tual possibilities to integrate the study of the customs, language, institutions, and literature of major civilizational areas un- der the larger heading of culture, and that one university or another might well seriously make an effort in that direc- tion with an Institute of Far Eastern Studies, or Russian Studies, or Latin American Studies. Such an enterprise would look to the long future, and would be content to develop a few first-rate scholars dealing with one aspect or another of the region chosen, and talking often with each other about their work. Such an enterprise would combine the study of texts and books with field study of the people living in the area today. The organization would include both representatives of the humanities and social sciences. For the conception which would give unity to the effort would be not so much the spatial fact that China or Russia or Latin America is one part of the earth’s surface, as the fact of culture. These students would all be concerned with a traditional way of life that had maintained a distinguishing character over long time, to great consequence for mankind. A literate people expresses its traditional way of life in what is written; and every people expresses it in institutions and customs and everyday behavior. Ultimately the conception of culture as a naturally developed round of life and the conception of culture as environment are only different faces of the same moral training, back to the same reality: a people with a way of life that is or can be a subject of reflec- tive study. The regional program of research may take the form of long study of the great world civilizations. With the support of the Ford Foundation, Redfield and Singer sought to explore ways by which world civilizations might be compared and classified. Their goal was to establish a comparative approach to the study of cultures and civilizations, but their project also supported research ventures in the study of specific historic civilizations. With the additional support of the Carnegie Corporation, the comparative civilizations project resulted in the creation of several of the great world civilizations courses in the College (e.g., courses covering the history of Islamic civilization, the history of East Asian civilization, and the history of South Asian civilization) that have had a profound impact on the scholarly work and academic studies of both postgraduate faculty members and students since the late 1950s.194 It is striking, moreover, that the Redfield-Singer project in the comparative study of world cultures in the early 1940s was situated at the University of Chicago at precisely the same time that Max Rheinstein’s theoretical work on the University’s organizational law also began to be implemented.195 Beyond these new theoretical and pedagogical initiatives in the study of world civilizations after 1945, the University also quite literally returned to Europe by launch- ing an extremely ambitious international program with the University of Frankfurt, a collaboration that ran from 1948 to 1961. Even the enthusiastic entrepreneur, Max Rheinstein, was not immune to the criticism of Daniel Kleitman of the Department of Physiology, proposed in the summer of 1945 that the University of Chicago should establish a campus in Munich to provide higher education resources to the families of U.S. Army and civilian occupation personnel who would be stationed there, and to the hundreds of thousands of displaced persons who were stranded in Germany in 1945. Kleitman was sure that the U.S. Army would make available a suitable physical plant for the branch campus, thus freeing the University from having to make any serious investments, and he was equally confident that “[t]hus it has organized expensive expeditions to dig into the ruins of past empires with a view of advancing our knowledge, it now has the opportunity, without cost to itself, to dig into the present day ruins of the German state and derive from its studies lessons valuable to all, as well as incidentally helping to fulfill an adult need of the Army of Occupation and of the Military Government in Germany.”196 Rheinstein was also certain that a German branch would be a timely investment, since it would “fill a need which will be felt very seriously within a short time.”197 Rheinstein tried to lobby Laird Bell, an influential University Trustee who was then serving as a assistant deputy military governor of the U.S. military government based in Frankfurt, but this gambit backfired, for Bell thought the idea was terrible, given the “depressing atmosphere” of defeated Germany.198 Instead, Bell believed that if the project were to become a reality in higher education in Germany it should do so in a serious, non-propagandistic way. He argued: I do, however think that there is a job to be done, and I’d like to see the Uni- versity of Germany do it. I believe it should be a joy ride for professors and students. A lot of bust is being talked about re-educating Germany. We are spoon feeding the Germans denatured text books and harmless movies (and incidentally treating them to radio crooners as a feature of our culture). I don’t believe the Germans are going to be re-educated from the outside. They’ve got to be given a chance to do it themselves. And despite the depressing moral collapse of the German intellectual world I have a notion that there is a kernel of sound stuff in the educa- tional world that can be built on. I believe there are scholars that want serious research and teaching, students and other scholars of other countries. I believe that the German people with their energy and industry will respond to the opportunity for education for their young. ... If they can’t have some intellectual opportunities, German professors and students will go to other universities. I believe the Germans are going to be re-educated, not by revenge. The University of Chicago and its tradition of pioneering should undertake to lead them out of the wilderness—both the scholars and the students. More specifically, I’d like to see the University of the University set up primarily for Germans with courses given by both Americans and Germans, with no propaganda, and German professors will follow from a good example, and aimed at the deficiencies of German education.

Bell was certain that the “U.S. Military Government might entertain an application for a serious university project” and added: “I don’t think a happy holiday kind of school will be welcome for a long time.”199 By 1947, Max Rheinstein had come around to Bell’s idea. In early April 1947, Rheinstein wrote to Wilbur C. Muemmeke that the War Department’s plans to spon- sor lectures by U.S. professors at various German universities had fallen through and that “an appeal has been sent to edu- cational organizations and institutions to raise the funds for the implementation of this program and quite particularly to send to Germany visiting professors. This appeal seems to me to constitute the entering wedge for our plan of a ‘University of Chicago in Germany.’”200 By June 1947, Rheinstein had refined this idea by urging Robert Hutchins to consider a “University of Chicago Fac- ulty in Germany,” but one now attached to a local German university.201 Hutchins de- cided to support this plan, and in July 1947 the University requested U.S. government approval to enable Chicago to collaborate in the reconstruction of the west German university system by sending a group of faculty to teach at a leading German university, Hutchins believed that “[t]he presence at a German university of such a group of American scholars is regarded as a considerable help in the reconstruction of German higher education, not only through the instructions they will give to the students, but also by the personal con- tacts they will establish with their German colleagues.”202 After initial misgivings on the part of General Lucius D. Clay, the U.S. military governor in Germany, who thought that the Germans might resent foreign professors as little more than propaganda agents, the War Department approved the University’s request, having received notice from the Office of Military Government in Germany that “[w]e are very anxious to take advantage of this very generous offer of the University of Chicago.”203 The University then applied in late December 1947 to the Rockefeller Foundation for a grant to support the initiative. The final proposal was formulated in early 1948 by a faculty advisory committee consisting of Earl Hamilton, Robert J. Havighurst, Philip M. Hauser, Richard P. McKeon, Wilhelm Pauck, Max Rheinstein, Otto von Simson, and Robert M. Stein. The other universities were initially considered as possible partners (e.g., Munich, Göttingen, and Heidelberg), after vigorous debates the faculty committee finally decided in late January 1948 to work with the University of Frankfurt on the grounds that it was associated directly with a much smaller university founded in 1919 that had suffered devastating losses during the war, it desperately needed outside assistance. At a general faculty meeting held in February 1948 to drum up support for the program an amendment was proposed (and was recorded in an after-the-fact report) that was unusually blunt in setting the practical and ideological parameters of the initiative. Rheinstein cautioned against using the word ‘re-education’ or ‘denazification’. He declared that the Germans do not want a program of ‘re-educa- tion’ and that they will regard the use of the term by Americans as evidence of hypocrisy and conde- scension. Furthermore, he cautioned applicants [who wished to teach in Frankfurt] not to expect Germans to be confirmed democrats. He declared that most of them had fought and suffered for nationalistic goals and should not be expected to abandon those goals two quickly. Others who had looked to democracy for libera- tion have subsequently experienced the utmost disappointment, he said. The key to the program, he stated, should be the solidarity of scholarship and learning and the reestablishment of professional and human contacts. If the University of Chicago faculty members exercise infinite personal tact and patience, Mr. Rheinstein declared, they will discover that un- der ‘the rough nationalistic façade’ which the majority of Germans have adopted as ‘protective coating’ they are in reality skeptics who seek faith. He concluded that the task is to break through this skepticism and to give again a sense of scholarly ideals.204

Using support from the Rockefeller Foundation, in 1951, from the Ford Foundation, Chicago agreed to send a delegation of six professors during the spring of the 1948–49 academic year, plus a few graduate students, to teach at Frank- furt, with the expectation that eventually Frankfurt faculty would reciprocate and visit Chicago. The group included Walter Hallstein, the rector of the Univer- sity of Frankfurt, Hutchins argued that “the presence at the University of Frankfurt of such a group of American scholars, and the possible future exchange of similar groups of German professors with this University, will help to reestablish the interchange of ideas through reopening channels of com- munication between German and American universities.”205 Each Chicago faculty mem- ber taught a course in his or her area of spe- cialization and was available for seminars and workshops with interested local faculty and students. During the first two years of the program twenty-seven Chicago faculty visited Frankfurt, and their reactions were exceedingly positive. Wilhelm Pauck of the Divinity School reported: We resisted the temptation to be- come propagandists of any sort and consciously decided to perform academic work by teaching in our special fields and by cultivat- ing professional and personal rela- tionships with German professors and students. The Germans soon recognized that we were serious and
honest in our intention to bring about a closer academic relationship between our University and that of Frankfurt, and they heartily received us into their community, treating us as equals in all respects. We were more regularly invited to participate in their seminars on various topics and were given the opportunity to attend faculty meetings and to participate in their deliberations. ... Being thus accepted as full members of the University of Frankfurt we had the opportunity to interpret American institutions and attitudes in the context of natural academic relationships. Moreover, the Germans came to consider our presence in Frankfurt as a symbol of friendship and understanding inspired by no other purpose than good will.11

After 1951 the program became more formally bilateral, concentrating on jointly- agreed-upon themes for interdisciplinary seminars attended by faculty and graduate students. The seminars were held at both universities, with fall and winter being organized by the Chicago faculty, and summer at Frankfurt in particular and in Germany in general for American scholarship and for the University of Chicago Center in Paris. The numbers of faculty participating in the seminars continued to be somewhat lopsided in Chicago’s favor, but most of the participating Chicago faculty believed that the University was providing far more than formal learning experiences to the German students. Louis Gottschalk noted in 1950 that “a new and more mature community of interests” generated by scholars on both sides of the Atlantic.12

The numbers of faculty participating in the seminars continued to be somewhat lopsided in Chicago’s favor, but most of the participating Chicago faculty believed that the University was providing far more than formal learning experiences to the German students. Louis Gottschalk noted in 1950 that “a new and more mature community of interests” generated by scholars on both sides of the Atlantic.12

In some respects, Bettelheim’s and Hart- nemann’s comments reveal a fascinating coming full circle of the collective institutional experience of the University of Chicago between 1890 and 1960, from a fledgling experience of the University of Chicago to undertake an international education program more than doubled, up on his bold ideas. This situation would change dramatically after 1990. Nationally, with the end of the cold war, the number of U.S. students studying abroad escalated dramatically. (Between 1992 and 2002, the number of U.S. undergraduate students participating in international programs more than doubled, from 71,000 to over 160,000.) In part reacting to these legitimate national trends, our new international study programs and initiatives attached to the Center, is providing still more productive collaborations and scholarly research on fundamental and intellectual traditions at Chicago, in which German refugees and American scholars cooperated to undertake research and scholarship in Paris and other European universities as well. In encouraging us to find other opportunities to link undergraduate and graduate education and faculty teaching and research, the example of the Center in Paris also points the way for our generation to embrace a new style Chicago-Frank- furt exchange—this time located on the left bank of the Seine River in the heart of Paris. Because it blends the wonderfully con- tingent, ever-changing culture of academic collaborations and scholarly research on the part of our faculty with the sturdy permanency of undergraduate teaching programs, the University of Chicago Center in Paris represents an example of a bundled internationalism that is especially appropriate to our time. The next stage of the center must therefore involve still more collaborative work with research centers and academic communities in other parts of Europe, and plans are now being developed to use the center as a nexus of collaboration between Chicago faculty and students and scholars and students from other European universities as well.

In encouraging us to find other opportunities to link undergraduate and graduate education and faculty teaching and research, the example of the Center in Paris also points the way for our generation to embrace a new style and substance of internationalism, which is appropriate to our time. The Center in Paris represents an example of a bundled internationalism that is especially appropriate to our time. The next stage of the center must therefore involve still more collaborative work with research centers and academic communities in other parts of Europe, and plans are now being developed to use the center as a nexus of collaboration between Chicago faculty and students and scholars and students from other European universities as well.
important that we encourage our students to learn other languages and to study, to become familiar with, and eventually to engage other cultures. Scientific and humanistic research has become, moreover, irrevocably international. Individual faculty scholars and graduate students can help each other in significant ways, but those exchanges must occur in person and in real time—not just via e-mail, fax machines, and FedEx shipments. We should not seek to become a "borderless university," but we are on the threshold of a genuinely exciting time in international scientific cooperation and humanistic collaboration. We should aim to do our part to help sustain significant collegial contacts and cooperation, but in an uncompromisingly rigorous way. If the world grows smaller, or at least more integrated, then it makes sense that the research universities—reformations that have become the most classic motifs of innovation and creativity in modern postindustrial societies—must lead the way. And, this time around, this process must include undergraduates, as well as graduate students and senior faculty.

Finally, post-cold war America finds itself in a fascinating, but undoubtedly, economically and politically complex equilibrium between the world and Europe and Asia, with the industrial and postindustrial societies on all three continents facing remarkably similar social and cultural challenges. As the "reservoir of expertise and basic knowledge" (Roger Geiger), the American research universities may be among the most efficacious institutions to defend our basic civic values, while encouraging humanistic creativity and scientific progress on an international scale, and to communicate knowledge across diverse cultural borders.219

More than other American universities, the University of Chicago has benefited from the intrinsic internationalism of the higher learning. Engaging the world has been part and parcel of our most basic collective identity over the last century. Our university is more than most others in the United States. For Simson, "It is to learn a universal language. It is to learn a real and deep acquaintance, is a true and real understanding without that isolation. It is to learn a comprehensive and universal language." We are no longer jealous of estimates passed upon us from the Old World scholars than we are of those of our own. We are no longer suspicious of the Old World scholars than we are of those of our own. We should strive to participate in the spirit of the students. Whatever may be the definition of the future, it is done here. Whatever may be the place of honor—but a citizenship in which we continue to articulate our pride and basic knowledge" (Roger Geiger), the University of Chicago has been part and parcel of our most basic collective identity. As the "reservoir of expertise and basic knowledge" (Roger Geiger), the American research universities may be among the most efficacious institutions to defend our basic civic values, while encouraging humanistic creativity and scientific progress on an international scale, and to communicate knowledge across diverse cultural borders.219

More than other American universities, the University of Chicago has benefited from the intrinsic internationalism of the higher learning. Engaging the world has been part and parcel of our most basic collective identity over the last century. Our university is more than most others in the United States. For Simson, "It is to learn a universal language. It is to learn a real and deep acquaintance, is a true and real understanding without that isolation. It is to learn a comprehensive and universal language." We are no longer jealous of estimates passed upon us from the Old World scholars than we are of those of our own. We are no longer suspicious of the Old World scholars than we are of those of our own. We should strive to participate in the spirit of the students. Whatever may be the definition of the future, it is done here. Whatever may be the place of honor—but a citizenship in which we continue to articulate our pride and basic knowledge" (Roger Geiger), the University of Chicago has been part and parcel of our most basic collective identity. As the "reservoir of expertise and basic knowledge" (Roger Geiger), the American research universities may be among the most efficacious institutions to defend our basic civic values, while encouraging humanistic creativity and scientific progress on an international scale, and to communicate knowledge across diverse cultural borders.219

Writing to Robert Hutchins at the end of a visit to the University of Chicago in June 1939, Scott Ingraham Groves related the day’s included a discussion of the significance of the work of world cultures that he faced as Dean of the Division of the Social Sciences in the late 1930s and 1940s.220 It was the key cultural concepts with which we have endowed our institutional distinctiveness and with which we must continue to articulate our pride in Chicago as a special academic community: are deeply anchored in the structural interactions and personal interconnections with European scholars and scholarship that occurred between 1890 and 1914 and 1932 and 1950. Yet during the same decades the University also developed remarkably open, nonhierarchical systems of teaching and learning, treating our students as partners rather than subordinates or automatons. This more open and democratic style of teaching and learning became and remains a remarkably attractive form of education that should be of continued interest to the world, and that, in a reciprocal sense, will continue to draw credibility and authenticity as it encounters and tests itself in the world. As the refugee scholar Otto von Simson put it in 1949, writing to Robert Hutchins about his teaching experiences in the Frankfurt program and how they meshed with the revolutionary ideas about undergraduate education articulated by Hutchins in Hyde Park, “I have never experienced the possibilities and responsibilities of education, so often outlined by you, as vividly as I have over here [in Frankfurt].”221 For Simson, in a modest way and in an unlikely environment, the borders separating different styles of education between Europe and America had collapsed, and a kind of transnational citizenship of learning had now assumed a more public and personal dimension, allowing uniquely American educational ideals and deeply democratic educational practices now gained renewed authenticity and value. Our challenge is to continue to undertake an internationalism appropriate to our time, in the hopes that like Otto von Simson we will see everything by the preconceptions of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (1800–1945). Cambridge, 2004), pp. 163–97.
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The 492nd Convocation
Address: “The Unpredictable and the Unassailable”

By James L. Madara

When I promised to give this address some time ago, an image immediately came to mind that, under most circumstances, one wouldn’t ordinarily associate with the CEO of an academic medical center. It’s a scene from the cover of Rolling Stone magazine. In it, the character played by William Hurt is lying on a couch, filming himself with his video camera. In a moment of deep introspection, no doubt inspired by his use of inappropriate pharmaceuticals, Hurt pondered the absurdity of his job as a West Coast radio psychologist. “Here I am,” he confesses to the camera, “talking to these people as if...”

As physicians, this certainly makes us feel as though we’ve accomplished something. But zooming out, we see this same patient as one member of a much larger population. From this vantage point, we immediately see that we have not dealt with the real problem—that the patient does not have readily accessible, convenient primary care in their neighborhood. At this distance, we recognize that the patient lacks the regular care that can lead to better disease control long term.

Looked at another way, the patient is born a vessel filled to the brim with physiological capital. A chronic disease might slowly deplete the capital. But if disease is allowed to have acute extreme manifestations—that is, lack of regular care, large amounts of physiological capital spill, and the patient’s health is compromised.

By participating only in the acute event in front of us but not addressing the root cause, we physicians could unwittingly collaborate in the erosion of our community’s physiological capital. So once in possession of both a “zoom-in” and “zoom-out” perspective, our next task is to evaluate the role, assets, and opportunities as a health care and research institution.

In doing so, we observe the following.

Historically, our hospital has provided the largest amount of unreimbursed care of any private hospital in the state of Illinois and one of the highest nationally. We’re rightfully proud of this, and we view it as part of being a good neighbor. However, while being a good neighbor is important, it is surely not enough. What I mean by looking at a single point from multiple angles, distances, and perspectives. After all, things look a lot different at a hundred feet than they do from a mile overhead.

So what has this got to do with the “important something” I wish to speak with you about today? This Google Earth is a visual manifestation of the way you have been taught to think as University of Chicago students. This “Chicago style” has trained you to pose and explore first-order questions in order to articulate higher-order questions and issues.

No matter what area of study is inked upon the diploma you will receive today, your well-honed ability to approach problems and challenges from multiple perspectives will serve you well as you leave us here and move into the marvelous disorder and unpredictability that is life and career.

Now that you’ve been reassured that I’m going to spiral into platitudinous convocation drivel, allow me, in true Chicago-style, to examine and support today’s theme. Google Earth is viewed from two perspectives: one institutional, and one personal.

The institutional example is in the realm of what is called “system resilience.” It addresses how professionals zoom in to the individual patient in front of us as we take on the roles of healers and physicians and then zoom out and think of the entire population, we see the health care system in a very different light.

It was simply zooming out from the patient with uncontrolled diabetes and thinking of the problem in a bigger way, rather than zooming in, that led to the methods that every one of you graduates has learned of identifying questions and examining them from differing perspectives.

My second example of the relevance of Google Earth theory is a personal one, and, beginning tomorrow, it will, in all likelihood, become your experience as well.

Rabbi Abraham Heschel (1907–72), one of the most significant Jewish theologians of the twentieth century, once said, “The course of life is unpredictable; no one can write his autobiography in advance.”

Although you have prepared for your careers via diligent study of a thoughtfully considered curriculum, Heschel was right: there is an undeniable unpredictability to what you are about to do.

But zooming in and out, or applying Chicago-style questioning, is a terrific way to leverage the unpredictability of your career into a life-enriching asset. It will allow you to look at events in your career from differing perspectives, to test your own assumptions, and, ultimately, to enjoy yourself more.

And that has certainly been the case with me.

As a biomedical scientist, I zoom in. I deal with biology at the molecular level to understand the molecular underpinnings of health and the corresponding deficiencies in disease.

But to really appreciate the implications of what I see through the microscope, I have to place that detailed information in the context of larger, more complex biological systems; I have to zoom out.

Similarly, in my administrative capacity at the University of Chicago, while it’s certainly my job to understand the close-in perspective of the cells and how events move in zoom-out mode in order to comprehend the macro view of our biomedical enterprise—its interface with the rest of the University, Argonne National Laboratory, and the surrounding community.

This all sounds well and tidy, but I can assure you that the road to where I am today was full of chance events and dramatic twists—in other words, it’s been completely and thoroughly unpredictable.

I began my career interested in cancer medicine, but felt a weakness in my training and—most importantly—what I most commonly hear from another cancer doctor was that you are about to do.

So off to Atlanta I went for five years. Later, when we were more open to moving, that person offered me the chance to move to Atlanta.

Certainly, none of us could ever have written our autobiographies in advance! At every turn, however, the methods of isolating and examining questions from different perspectives—just as was done in the example of the Urban Health Initiative—put confidence in my step as I walked such an irregularly determined path.

For me, these methods have been an unassailable way of dealing with the unpredictable nature of the path we have found ourselves on. And while I acquired these methods over time during my own career, institutionally I have found them to be repurposed in countless ways at this university. As recipients of these unassailable skills, you are fortunate indeed.

Friedrich Nietzsche said, “You need chaos in your soul to give birth to a dancing star.” As you leave here today, I exhort you to embrace chaos and chance. Let go of our vision of how things ought to be, and welcome unpredictability as a most trusted companion. Step boldly and with confidence. You are much better equipped than I was.

Because regardless of your chosen field, each of you leaves this university with the ability to zoom in and out as you seek to make sense of the wonderful twists and turns of the life unfolding before you. When you look back and write your autobiography, you will smile to see how the pieces fall together.

I have no doubt that dancing stars lie ahead for each one of you.

James L. Madara, M.D., is the Sara and Harold Lincoln Thompson Distinguished Service Professor in the Department of Divinity and Religious Studies; University Vice-President for Medical Affairs; and Chief Executive Officer of the University of Chicago Medical Center.

Summary

The 492nd convocation was held on Friday, December 7, 2007, in Rockefeller Memorial Chapel. Robert J. Zimmer, President of the...
A total of 392 degrees were awarded: 47 Bachelor of Arts in the College, 2 Bachelor of Science in the College and the Division of the Physical Sciences, 7 Master of Science in the Division of the Biological Sciences and the Pritzker School of Medicine, 24 Master of Arts in the Division of the Humanities, 27 Master of Science in the Division of the Physical Sciences, 58 Master of Arts in the Division of the Social Sciences, 124 Master of Business Administration in the Graduate School of Business, 9 Master of Arts in the Divinity School, 5 Master of Liberal Arts in the William B. and Catherine V. Graham School of General Studies, 6 Master of Arts in the School of Social Service Administration, 14 Doctor of Philosophy in the Division of the Biological Sciences and the Pritzker School of Medicine, 11 Doctor of Philosophy in the Division of the Humanities, 14 Doctor of Philosophy in the Division of the Physical Sciences, 32 Doctor of Philosophy in the Division of the Social Sciences, 2 Doctor of Philosophy in the Graduate School of Business, 2 Doctor of Philosophy in the Divinity School, 2 Doctor of Philosophy in the School of Social Service Administration, 1 Doctor of Jurisprudence in the Law School, and 5 Doctor of Law in the Law School.

The convocation address was delivered by James L. Madara, M.D., the Sara and Harold Lincoln Thompson Distinguished Service Professor; Dean of the Division of Biological Sciences and Pritzker School of Medicine; University Vice-President for Medical Affairs; and Chief Executive Officer of the University of Chicago Medical Center. It was entitled “The Unpredictable and the Unassailable.”