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   Summary
Sixthly, it is the will and command of God that (since the coming of his Sonne the Lord Jesus) a permission of the most pagnaon, Jewish, Turkish, or antichristian consciences and worships, bee granted to all men in all Nations and Countries.—Roger Williams, The Bloody Tenent of Persecution (1644)2

Your Selves praetebite libertie of Conscience, but alas, it is but selie (the great God Sefe) only to Your Selves.—Roger Williams, letter to the governors of Massachusetts and Connecticut (1670)

Life was tough for the settlers of seventeenth century New England. They responded to hardship by trying to gain God’s favor for their colonies—which required, as they saw it, establishing and strenently enforcing a religious orthodoxy. By punishing, or banishing, those who disobeyed in word or deed, they hoped to create a world where stop we until infinite mercy stop us.”2

In his remarkable Key into the Language of America, a study of Indian life and languages, Williams ponders the Indians’ ability to coexist with impermanence and constant vulnerability in “this wild and howling land.” Astonishingly, the Indians do not mind picking up and moving on to a new place, whenever climate, or insects, or sheer inclination moves them. “I once in travel lodged at a house, at which in my returne Hoped to have lodged againe there the next night, but the house was gone in that interim, and I was glad to lodge under a tree.”2

The Europeans of Massachusetts reacted to insecurity by enforcing orthodoxy of religious belief and practice. John Cotton, pastor of the First Church of Boston, one of Massachusetts’s most influential religious leaders and Roger Williams’s lifelong intellectual adversary, wrote copiously in defense of religious persecution, arguing that it was necessary for civil order. It was also God’s will, he said, in order to separate the diseased element of society from the healthy elements. Heretics and dissidents are like Satan in our midst. Even if they behave peaceably, they are enticements to sin. “They are not to be suffered to stink, or cast off. By punishment to be restrained, and by other harsh penalties for the unorthodox. Such reactions to insecurity are sadly familiar in America’s history. In situations
insecurity, we are all too ready to project the causes of instability onto other people, grabbing hold of John Cotton’s seductive metaphors as if they were our mustard that must be removed if we are to resist corruption. What makes Roger Williams of particular interest to us is not just the high quality of his philosophical work. It is also the way in which he offers an alternative to the paranoid response to uncertainty, urging on his readers attitudes of mercy, gentleness, reasonableness, and civility, words all of which recur with obsessive frequency throughout his two great two philosophical dialogues.

To ship my selfe all alone in a poore Canowle: Williams’s Rhode Island

My aim is to study Williams’s ideas. But since he was a political leader as well as a thinker, his work must be assessed in the context of his career.

Williams was born in England in 1603, to a prosperous merchant family. He grew up in London, near the Smithfield plain, where religious dissenters were sometimes burned at the stake. As a young man, he attracted the attention of the eminent jurist Sir Edward Coke, Chief Justice of the King’s Bench. Coke arranged for the young man’s education at Sutton’s Hospital, the future Charterhouse School, and then at Pembroke Hall in Cambridge University, where Williams received his A.B. in 1627, after a classical education that focused on natural law theories based on ancient Greek and Roman Stoicism, which suffuse Coke’s work, and which were much in vogue at the time. Williams quickly impressed by his remarkable flair for languages, mastering Latin, Greek, Hebrew, French, and Dutch. In this way he made John Milton’s friendship—teaching Milton Hebrew, Latin, French, Dutch, and Hebrew—less of a chore than perhaps he intended. On graduation, Williams took orders in the Church of England and, in 1628, accepted a chaplaincy at Oxford in Essex, the manor house of Sir William Masham—grandfather of the Sir Francis Masham who was Locke’s host at Otes in the Rhode Island colony.

In 1630, a leading Puritan reformer was placed in the pillory. One of his ears was cut off. For good measure, the other ear was cut off. For good measure, the other side of his nose was split and his face branded with the letters SS, for “Sower of Sedition.” Later, and he was branded on the face with the name Williams agreed to withdraw the pamphlet.

In 1643 Williams set sail for England to secure a charter for the new colony. During the voyage he wrote his book about Indian languages. While in England, he wrote The Bloody Tenent of Persecution. A democratic charter was obtained, and liberty of conscience made official. In 1632, Rhode Island passed the first law in North America making slaver illegal. Meanwhile, John Cotton’s angry reply to The Bloody Tenent, published in 1647, led Williams to produce another work about a hundred pages longer than the first one, refuting all of Cotton’s arguments. Published in 1652 in London, it bears the unwieldy title, The Bloody Tenent Yet More Bloody: By Mr Cottons endeavour to wash it white in the Blood of the Lambe; or, a constant Zealous desire to set the Blood of his Servants; and Of the Blood of Millions split in former and later Wars for Conscience sake, that Most Bloody Tenent of Persecution for cause of Conscience, upon a second Tryal, is found now more apparently and more notoriously guilty. In his book, Williams set sail for England.

As Williams arrived at a new world, his dealings with the Indians had long prepared the way for a fruitful relationship. Chiefs Massasoit and Canonico welcomed him like an old friend, because he had befriended them before he needed them. He continued to do so. One of the key provisions of the Charter of Rhode Island was that “it shall not bee lawfull to or For the rest of the Colonies to invade or molest the native Indians . . .”, a provision that Williams particularly sought and, when granted, applauded, noting that hostility to the Indians “hath hither to beene . . . practiced to our Continuall and great grievance and disturbance.” Throughout his life, Williams continued these friendships. As he wrote to the Governor of Massachusetts Bay, explaining his refusal to return, “I feel safer downe than I did in the wise minds of the Christian judges along Narragansett Bay than I do among the savage Christians of Massachusetts Bay Colony.” Williams was not speaking of conversion: he never tried to convert the Indians. He was speaking of moral decency. He is fond of noting examples of Indian decency and honesty, contradicting their behavior with that of his white neighbors. This experience of finding integrity and goodness outside the orbit of orthodoxy surely shaped his evolving views of political principles. And there was already something antagonism about Williams, something that led him to those friendships in the first place, a respectful curiosity about the varieties of humanity that is the paradigm of something valuable in our history as a nation of strangers and immigrants, though this value is now under great stress.

Williams immediately provided for widespread religious liberty in the new colony. Rhode Island became a haven for people who were “trouble elsewhere. Baptists, Quakers, and other dissidents joined the Puritan dissenters. In 1658 fifteen Portuguese Jewish families arrived in Newport. They enjoyed the same religious liberty granted others—an astonishing fact, given that Jews in Britain gained full civil rights only in 1858. In 1643 Williams set sail for England to secure a charter for the new colony. During the voyage he wrote his book about Indian languages. While in England, he wrote The Bloody Tenent of Persecution. A democratic charter was obtained, and liberty of conscience made official. In 1632, Rhode Island passed the first law in North America making slaver illegal. Meanwhile, John Cotton’s angry reply to The Bloody Tenent, published in 1647, led Williams to produce another work about a hundred pages longer than the first one, refuting all of Cotton’s arguments. Published in 1652 in London, it bears the unwieldy title, The Bloody Tenent Yet More Bloody: By Mr Cottons endeavour to wash it white in the Blood of the Lambe; or, a constant Zealous desire to set the Blood of his Servants; and Of the Blood of Millions split in former and later Wars for Conscience sake, that Most Bloody Tenent of Persecution for cause of Conscience, upon a second Tryal, is found now more apparently and more notoriously guilty. In his book, Williams was bent on continuing his dive into the Natives Language,” and he spoke no English) broke a stick ten times that strikingly anticipates very recent litigation over aboriginal land claims in Australia. Linguist that he was, he reports having, at this period, a “Constant Zealous desire to dive into the Natives Language,” and he learned several of the languages by actually living with Indians for long periods of time. When Williams arrived as a refugee, then, his dealings with the Indians had long prepared the way for a fruitful relationship. Chiefs Massasoit and Canonico welcomed him like an old friend, because he had befriended them before he needed them. He continued to do so. One of the key provisions of the Charter of Rhode Island was that “it shall not bee lawfull to or For the rest of the Colonies to invade or molest the native Indians . . .”, a provision that Williams particularly sought and, when granted, applauded, noting that hostility to the Indians “hath hither to beene . . . practiced to our Continuall and great grievance and disturbance.” Throughout his life, Williams continued these friendships. As he wrote to the Governor of Massachusetts Bay, explaining his refusal to return, “I feel safer downe than I did in the wise minds of the Christian judges along Narragansett Bay than I do among the savage Christians of Massachusetts Bay Colony.” Williams was not speaking of conversion: he never tried to convert the Indians. He was speaking of moral decency. He is fond of noting examples of Indian
Williams has his own intense religious beliefs, and they entail that most people around him are wrong. Error, however, does not mean that they do not have the precious faculty of conscience: “This Conscience is found in all mankind... in Jews, Turks, Papists, Protestants, Pagans, etc.” And although truth is important, truth is not the basis of respect: what he reverses is the faculty itself, the capacity for searching and choosing. Like the ancient Stoics, he holds that his faculty exists in people of all religions. He is fond of lists, and usually includes Jews, Muslims, Catholics, pagans (prominently including the Indians), and even atheists, whom he calls Antichristians. He insists that all consciences deserve not just respect, but equal respect.

So: everyone has inside him or herself something infinitely precious, something that demands respect from us all, and something that is more equally basic to us all. Williams now argues that this precious something needs extensive space to unfold itself, to pursue its own way. To respect human beings is therefore to accord that sort of space to each and every one of them. He expresses indignation that something so important can be ignored or reduced to nothing, however, and yet so little respect, mercy, or pity to the like conscientious persuasions of other Men. Are all the thousands of millions of consciences, at home and abroad, fuel only for a prison, for a whip, for a stake, for a Gallows? Are there no consciences to breathe the air, and respect? The air is a precious thing, comparing persecution repeatedly to “spiritual and soul rape.” And it is “sole.”

Williams thinks that having respect is a matter of whether he thinks someone respect to either belief or practice (so long as he is not violating civil laws or harming others): “I acknowledge that to molest any person, Jew or Gentile, for either professing the doctrine, or practicing worship merely religious or spiritual, it is to persecute him, and such a person (whatever his doctrine or practice be true or false) suffereth persecution for conscience.”

To be more precise, Williams has two distinct images for persecution, rape and imprisonment; corresponding to different types of damage to conscience. Persecution is like imprisonment, in that people whose faculty of conscience is undamaged within still need breathing space to act on their conscience’s promptings, searching for meaning through whatever forms of prayer, worship, or speech they select. But persecution is also like rape: it goes into a person’s depths and does terrible damage. Williams thinks that having respect is a matter of whether you do not believe can harm the soul in its very capacity to strive, deforming and weakening it (though it never destroys the basis of equal respect, because it never extinguishes the capacity for striving).

Some what is needed is, first, protection for conscience so that it can grow unfettered, and, second, protection of a space around it so that it can venture out into the world and conduct its search.

Persecution is therefore a terrible error, one of the worst there can be. Williams explicitly says that it is a worse error than being a heretic. Indeed, persecution takes “the world... even unchristensible, no Adultery, Incest, Sodomy, or Bestiality can equal, this ravishing and forcing of... the very Soules and Consciences of all the Nations and Inhabitants of the World.” Williams does not believe that the offenses to which he appeals are an exception, and no one can say that he is inclined to favor the death penalty for adultery. So we can see how strong his objection to persecution is, if it is worse than these things. Most rulers in all ages, he concludes, have practised “violence to the Souls of Men.” One of Williams’s reasons for hating persecution is instrumental: if you force someone, it hardens their will, and, thus, makes it easier for hate to work on them.

According to Williams, there are two distinct forms of damage to conscience, and two different justifications for them. A slave, they say, is not less free internally for being a slave; so, it would appear, external coercion is not all that important. Stoics themselves would say that this is a difficulty drawing political conclusions from their arguments about human dignity. Williams, by contrast, sees that warping of the soul as the real damage; it can be prevented from acting, and it can also, more deeply, be damaged or defiled by what happens to it. This insight is necessary, I think, for a workable doctrine of political liberty.

Williams has the keenest sensitivity to the unique preciousness of this precious thing, comparing persecution repeatedly to “spiritual and soul rape.” And it is “sole.”

If persecution is worse, the liberty of conscience is, as Williams repeatedly states, a “most precious and invaluable Jewel.” The proponent of liberty does not indulge in special pleading. Even though he believes he is right, he has an even-handed spirit of humanity, and he extends it to all men, grounded in respect for their freedom.

In one remarkable passage Williams states that persecution is not only “to take the being of Christianity out of the World, but to take away all civility, and the world out of the world, and to lay all upon heapes of confusion.” What does he mean by saying that persecution takes “the world out of the world”? I think he is expressing the view that the spirit of love and gentleness, combined with the spirit of fair play, are at the heart of our worldly lives with one another. Take these things away and you can make it nothing but a heap of confusion. Williams is an emotional writer. His style is deeply subjective and passionate. Nonetheless, it is not implausible to find themes in his writings that anticipate some central ideas of Immanuel Kant a century later. At the heart of the thought of both men are two ideas: the duty to respect humanity as an end wherever we find it, and the duty to be fair, not to make an exception for one’s own case. Indeed, respecting humanity entails not making an exception of oneself. Just as Kant asks a person to test the principle of his or her conduct by asking whether it could without contradiction be made a universal law for all human beings, so Williams’s critique of the leaders of Massachusetts and Connecticut is that their idea cannot pass a test of that sort: they love freedom—but only for themselves. They could not will persecution as a universal law, and their selfishness prevents them from willing freedom of conscience (which could pass over them as a universal law) to others. The second test for our ethical principles is one that he calls the Formula of Humanity: he asks us to test our principle by seeing whether it treats humanity as an end, not as a means, and whether it is to act so as to promote one’s own selfish ends. This complaint, too, is a constant theme in Williams’s writings: the conscience is precious, but people use other people’s consciences to serve their own anxious and greedy ends. Kant’s third way of testing principles involves the idea of treating humanity as an end, and asking whether we can view our principle as a law that we could give to others. There is a strange echo of this in Williams, but his insistence on the quest of the individual conscience, and the priceless value of freedom in this quest, is in great sympathy with Kant’s way of thinking. For both, the source of moral principles, and of all moral worth, is ultimately in our own freedom, and that freedom must be respected. For both, doing the right thing because of obedience to a law imposed from outside has no moral worth at all. Finally, Kant speaks of good principles as constituting a “realm of ends,” a virtual society of free beings who respect one another as equals. I believe this is what Williams is after when he says that persecution “takes the world out of the world”: it destroys the basis of human fellowship in respect, freedom, and civility.

Williams, then, lies at the beginning of a tradition of thought about religious fairness that resonates to the present day, and has implications for religious and civil authority. And Williams has an extra dimension of psychological insight, helping us see why persecution is so attractive and why emotional attitudes might be required to resist it.

A “Model of Church and Civil Power”

If Williams had offered only an account of conscience and its fair, impartial treatment, he would already have made a large contribution to our understanding of religious liberty. He accomplished, however, much more, developing an account of the limits of religious and civil authority that anticipates Locke’s more famous account of church-state relations, and that still offers helpful guidance. In this part of his work, Williams is replying to a “model” of church and state proposed by John Cotton. Truth asks Peace what [book] he has there. Peace produces the Cotton manuscript, and reads from it the claim that the Church must hold high authority in the civil realm, and should be superior to all civil magistrates, if the peace is to be preserved. The two hundred pages that follow contain Williams’s alternative “model.”

According to Williams, there are two separate sets of ends and activities in human life; corresponding to these there are two sorts of authority. Civil authority concerns “the bodies and goods of subjects” (exactly the account that Locke later gives). Civil authority must protect people’s property and bodily security, and it may use force to do so. Its foundation lies in the people, and it is they who choose civil magistrates. The Church, however, Williams concludes, has there is peace. Peace produces the Cotton manuscript, and reads from it the claim that the Church must hold high authority in the civil realm, and should be superior to all civil magistrates, if the peace is to be preserved. The two hundred pages that follow contain Williams’s alternative “model.”

According to Williams, there are two separate sets of ends and activities in human life; corresponding to these there are two sorts of authority. Civil authority concerns “the bodies and goods of subjects” (exactly the account that Locke later gives). Civil authority must protect people’s property and bodily security, and it may use force to do so. Its foundation lies in the people, and it is they who choose civil magistrates. The Church, however, Williams concludes, has there is peace. Peace produces the Cotton manuscript, and reads from it the claim that the Church must hold high authority in the civil realm, and should be superior to all civil magistrates, if the peace is to be preserved. The two hundred pages that follow contain Williams’s alternative “model.”
Williams now tells us that there is, of a way in which the civil state needs to make laws "respecting religion": namely, for instance, to prevent the killing of innocent citizens, saying, for example, "that no persons Papists, Jews, Turks, or Indians be delivered over to the spite of any who desire it, as the very Indians abhor to practice toward any."

Such protective laws are not only permitted, they are extremely important, "the Magna Charta of highest liberties."

There is, he continues, another type of law "respecting religion" that is very different: the sort of law that establishes, or forbids, acts of worship, says who can and cannot be a minister, and so on. To say that these should be civil laws is "as far from Reason, as the Commandments of Paul were, civil and earthly constitutions."

John Cotton makes two claims that Williams must answer, if he is to defend his radical position well. First, he makes a claim about peace and stability: people simply cannot live at peace with one another unless some religious orthodoxy is established. In response, Williams invokes both reason and experience on his side. People with false religious views, he says, may build a government around such false claims. We can see this all the time: that people do live together peaceably, so long as they respect one another's conscience-space. (Life with the Indians provides an illustration.) What really breaks the peace is persecution: "Such persons only breake the Cities or Kingdomes peace, who cry out for prison and swords against such who cross their judgement or practice in Religion."

Cotton's second argument concerns competence. He claims that being a good citizen and being a good civil magistrate are inseparable from having the right religion. We simply do not want our public life run by sinners, because they are unable to do justice. We simply do not want our public life much better than the unclear idea of the religions. The state needs to be built on "separation," which might suggest that the idea to think with than the bare idea of "separation," which might suggest that the idea that moral principles are utterly

First, Locke seems to think that equal liberty is compatible with a religious establishment. Williams is keenly aware of the danger of religious establishments as threats to both liberty and equality: to liberty, because a dominant sect will easily slip into curbing the conscience space of minorities; to equality, because the very existence of an orthodoxy makes a statement that citizens are not fully equal. Here Williams anticipates Madison's argument: establishment means that we do not all enter the public square "on equal conditions." At the time of the founding, the central argument against establishments was equality arguments, exactly or not, it was Williams's argument.

Second, Williams gives us, in his discussions of conscience, an account of the moral basis of the political doctrine, telling us what equal respect is all about and why it is so important. There is nothing like this in John Locke's political philosophy.

Third, Locke and Williams have subtly different positions on "accommodation," that is, on the question whether laws applicable to all should contain exceptions for people with special religious requirements. Locke is in favor of the exceptionless rule of law, provided that the laws themselves are neutral. Some laws maliciously target minorities, and those laws must go. For example, if it is legal to speak Latin in a school, it must be legal to speak Latin in a church. If it is legal to barh in water for the sake of health, it must be legal to bathe in water for the sake of baptism. But there Locke draws the line. If there is any non-malicious law that has the incidental effect of burdening minorities, then the state is right to accommodate them, as a due regard for the protection and essential interests of the nation may justify and permit." This is pure Williams, and it is far from what Locke's stricter notion of the rule of law would permit.

The contrast between Williams and Locke is still with us, in the form of divergent standards that have played a role in recent Supreme Court debates. The Williams idea was long a hallmark of free exercise jurisprudence, in the form of what has come to be known as the "Sherbert test," after an important 1963 case that allowed a Seventh-Day Adventist believer for her work on Saturday, and was then denied unemployment compensation on the grounds that she had refused "suitable work." The Court, finding in favor of her, said that government may not impose a "substantial burden on the free exercise of religion without a "compelling state interest." The case had an important equality aspect: the fact that Saturday and not Sunday was the required day put unfair pressure on this minority woman, pressure that the majority did not have to face. This was our legal standard for some years, but in 1990 the Lockean position took control, with Justice Antonin Scalia's controversial opinion in a case involving Native American peyote use. Scalia said that laws must rule exceptionlessly, so long as they were neutral and not discriminatory. Scalia, like Locke, is very interested in legal neutrality: thus, when a Florida community ordered a dead animal sacrifice he struck down a "sanctuary for the underprivileged" on a person's property allowed animals to be slaughtered in all sorts of other ways showed that they were simply targeting Santeria worshippers. Scalia, like Locke, was not willing to go beyond what the fine.

Williams, as we have seen, is distinctly liberal. He allows that laws for conscience's sake, up to the point where the person's conduct would threaten peace and public safety. In holding, he anticipates a norm that became general by the time of the Founding: all the state constiutions had free exercise clauses, and about half of them totally or partially or substantially overrode. (Madison actually favored an even more protective standard: no burden on conscience, even if a clear and present danger is in jeopardy.) The practices of the colonies involved granting such conscience-based exemptions without legal penalty: Jews did not have to testify on Saturday; sects that objected to oaths did not have to swear; Quakers and Mennonites were exempt from military conscription. Most remarkably, and only in Rhode Island, Jews were exempted from the inexact law if they wanted to contract uncle-niece marriages on religious grounds. The laws remained valid; religious minorities did not have to obey them. In the early days of the Republic, George Washington writes a letter to the Quakers explaining his stance as its first President, concerning their conscientious refusal of military service: "I assure you very explicitly, that in my opinion the conscientious scruples of all men should be treated with great delicacy and tenderness: and it is my wish and desire, that the laws may always be as extensively accommodated to them, as a due regard for the protection and essential interests of the nation may justify and permit." This is pure Williams, and it is far from what Locke's stricter notion of the rule of law would permit.
is really about is the equality of minorities in a majority world. Rules about workdays, drugs, and a host of other matters favors the majority so alcohol is legal and peyote is not. Sunday is the usual day of rest and Saturday is not. Williams understood the vulnerability of minority conscience in a world of majority rule, and his more protective standard should, I believe, be restored.

Fourth, Locke argues from Protestant premises most of the time. He seems uninterested in finding arguments for toleration that all citizens can share. Williams alludes to Christian norms at times, but he tries hard to develop an independent ethical argument for his political principles, based on the dignity and vulnerability of conscience, the equal worth of all consciences, and the needs of consciences for ample space. Williams was used to arguing with people who did not share his religious views; so he finds ways of arguing that do not presuppose the correctness of his position.

The fifth difference between Locke and Williams lies in the way in which they conceive the space of the political. Locke speaks in terms of separation of jurisdictions. For him, religion and politics don’t overlap at all. For Williams the different religious doctrines meet, and overlap, in a shared moral space. Each religious person will connect this moral overlap, in a shared moral space. Each
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**Truth and Peace, Their Meetings and Selfish Partiality.** They have, however, often (they observe) they meet up lovingly, don’t actually spend much time together. So Tenent, easily or quickly. At the end of expect that this goal would be attained Seldome and Short” 14 “Truth and Peace, Their Meetings
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Report of the Campus Safety and Security Committee

Introduction
In the aftermath of the tragic murder of Amadou Cisse on November 19, 2007, President Moore convened the Campus Safety and Security Committee and charged it “to conduct a careful examination of the University’s current policies, procedures, and initiatives in place to maximize personal safety and security on campus and in areas adjacent to the campus.” The committee met weekly throughout Winter Quarter 2008, and this report summarizes its findings and recommendations.

The University is committed to safety and security. Efforts—including the important partnerships with City of Chicago officials, local elected officials, community leaders, and residents, and the extensive programs involving education, housing, healthcare, jobs, and other initiatives supporting community development—have made the campus and neighborhoods surrounding it significantly safer and more secure. The University of Chicago Police Department (UCPD), in particular, merits credit for the quality of its ongoing service.

At the same time, administrative functions and strategies that directly impact safety and security can be significantly improved and better coordinated. Feedback from community members and members of community concerned documented in letters to the President and other senior administrators, as well as comments at various open forums, the committee identified four central components of safety and security for focused and expedited review: (1) emergency and crime communication, (2) transportation services, (3) safety education and outreach, and (4) capital investments.

In its work, the committee has tried to understand enough detail of current efforts and plans underway in each of these areas. However, the goals of our work is not to recommend detailed implementation plans but to define the set of broad priorities and key operational issues that need to be changed or improved to enhance campus safety and security. The committee discussed student, faculty, and staff suggestions; it met with University administrators responsible for each area; and it evaluated best practices at peer institutions. The committee did not review or assess specific strategy issues related to the UCPD. We did, however, meet with a representative of The Bratton Group who shared the general tenor and direction of its work reviewing UCPD operations.

Each of the committee’s four central components of safety and security is addressed in a separate section below. In addition, the report briefly describes the committee’s recommendations about two key overarching implementation issues: the balance of future investment in central campus and neighborhood security, and the much-needed coordination of an overall strategy for security and safety.

First, this report provides a series of recommendations that will need to be implemented in order to be effective. The University should adopt best practice by establishing central coordination and oversight for implementation of the recommendations.

Second, a major issue concerns the balance of the University’s efforts in safety and security with regard to the University campus, the neighborhoods into which the campus extends, and the community composed of the neighborhoods of Woodlawn, Hyde Park, and Kenwood. This issue is a complex matter. Several observations seem particularly important:

- The UCPD’s current area of coverage is quite broad (39th Street to the north, 64th Street to the south, Cottage Grove Avenue to the west, and Lake Shore Drive to the east).
- Broader police coverage needs to be complemented by enhanced attention and visible presence of security on the immediate campus. Our report attempts to address this need with reference to transportation (better bus service, escorts, possibly foot patrols by police), as well as technical improvements in lighting on campus and enhanced building security.

Because of the expansion of the University’s South Campus, off-campus student housing clusters, and our charter school campuses, what constitutes the immediate campus may have shifted in the eyes of our current campus community.

For purposes of our review, we have assumed that the core campus consists of the area between 65th and Halsted, and Drexel Avenues, and 55th and 61st Streets. This issue merits future administrative review and should be considered a priority focus on security-enhancing improvements.

In the report below, the committee’s recommendations are structured around the following four themes.

1. Improve Emergency and Crime Communication
2. Expand Transportation Services
3. Improve Safety Education and Outreach
4. Make Capital Investments to Improve Campus Safety

In the section below, the committee presents the University’s current transportation system is oriented toward most efficiently meeting the needs of riders. The committee recommends that safety considerations and ridership growth opportunities carry greater weight in planning equations.

1. Improve Emergency and Crime Communication

We propose clear guidelines delineating levels of “when,” “what,” and “how” security information is shared.

- The cAlert Emergency Notification System (utilizing all available communicate outlets) should be used for events when immediate behavior change of University affiliates is required. Additional efforts at increasing participant rates should be undertaken.

- Security alerts (all email, selected cAlert) should be used to notify University affiliates and community members who have signed up for a criminal incident or incident that could impact safety. Guidelines for decision makers issuing such alerts are proposed.

- The University should develop a reliable and useable web-based system for collecting and sharing all criminal activity and aggregate crime data from our campus and neighboring community areas.

2. Expand Transportation Services

On balance, the University’s current transportation system is oriented toward most efficiently meeting the needs of riders. The committee recommends that safety considerations and ridership growth opportunities carry greater weight in planning equations.

• Create a new shuttle bus system to loop around campus (55th to 60th Streets, Cottage Grove to Stony Island Avenues).

• Provide walking escort service staffed by UCPD police or security personnel.

• Integrate these new services with existing ones, including an improved SafeRide Program (formerly Late Night Van Service) to create a comprehensive, accessible, and reliable system for safe late-night travel.

• Establish new CTA bus services for Woodlawn.

3. Improve Safety Education and Outreach

New strategies and tactics are needed for better reaching students, faculty, and staff with messages that promote safety.

• Create an integrated marketing plan to generate compelling advertising and media that increase personnel and property safety on campus.

• Increase campus interactions with UCPD personnel, including regularly scheduled safety education workshops for students, faculty, and staff.

• Better utilize video and other tools developed for employee orientation on an ongoing basis, perhaps integrate them with a new University website and incorporate them into faculty/department meetings.

• Promote transportation resources, especially late at night, and deliver on promises for service.

4. Make Capital Investments to Improve Campus Safety

Attention to three areas of the University’s physical plant could significantly enhance campus safety.

- Lighting. Investments in lighting on-campus and in the immediate environs should continue with all due speed, with a particular focus on security-enhancing placements and upgrades that provide more consistent lighting to walkways while limiting light pollution and glare.

- Cameras. Planning for expanded use of cameras should continue. It is crucial to coordinate these efforts with the City and also with the community, both to ensure their most strategic deployment and to address privacy concerns.

- Building Security. The University should establish a baseline level of security for all campus buildings and should be responsible for its maintenance.

Discussion
1. Improve Emergency and Crime Communication

The shootings on November 19, 2007, raised many logistical and policy questions about the University’s emergency and crime notification systems. The committee reviewed the notification system used on November 19, the feedback received during the campus safety awareness event, and an interim policy developed by several senior administrators in response to notification concerns. The committee also reviewed and discussed a report submitted to the President and the Provost prior to the November 19 incidents by the University’s Safety Awareness Committee (a subcommittee of the Committee on Crime Prevention and Security on Campus and now the University’s Safety and Security Advisory Committee—Amadou Cisse and Roseangela). This report provided a set of recommendations on ways the University could improve the effectiveness of safety notifications and alerts. Finally, the committee met with NSIT administrators, Duel Richardson, and Julie Peterson to more fully understand the notification system and related communication challenges.

Key questions brought to the committee’s attention and discussed through this process included:

- What are the objectives, policies, and procedures for issuing an emergency or crime/security alert?
- How can all the available methods and media for communication be utilized to improve the immediate and overall effectiveness of emergency and crime notifications?
- Is the effectiveness of the security alert enhanced by the physical and mental force associated with high frequency of use? Do recipients pay attention?
- How can we better aggregate and communicate information on crime trends and long-term data to allow individuals to better evaluate and understand crime trends and threats in our community?
- What are the policies and procedures surrounding decision making on emergency and crime notifications? Can they be streamlined?
- How will the information needs of families of students at the University and the Laboratory Schools be integrated into the emergency communication system(s)?

Recommendations
The committee concurs with the campus communication experts and advisory groups who believe the ultimate purpose of both emergency and security alerts should be to help individuals prevent injury or harm. This must be done by providing appropriate and accurate information delivered in the most timely way possible. Best practices used at other institutions and changing government guidelines should influence future policy enhancements in this area. We hope the recommendations outlined below help the University to achieve this goal.

The committee’s recommendations are organized into three categories, detailed below. A key recommendation, made in accordance with the report of the Safety Awareness Committee, is to limit the number of email security alerts and instead create a web-based system for collecting and sharing crime information. The committee believes the University, in implementing this recommendation, must remain diligent in collecting all criminal activity and aggregate crime data and sharing it in a reliable, useable, and accessible way to allow all members of the campus and broader community to be fully informed. The success of these systems will require careful coordination among the offices of community affairs, communications, and NSIT. An oversight...
body, perhaps a reconfigured Committee on Crime Prevention and Security, should exist to provide ongoing campus input and feedback to the system.

- Update, expand, and promote the emergency notification system.

The cAlert Emergency Notification System will be used for an event that poses a serious threat to persons or property, to address the need to alleviate panic, and/or to notify University affiliates of the closing of all or parts of campus because of an unplanned event. The system is used to disseminate information along with all-campus bulk email. A community sign-up list can be created to take the place of the former “security alert” list and be incorporated into this information distribution system. The committee recommends an update to the Emergency Management Plan to incorporate new University organizational structures, policies, and communication needs of affiliates, including both Laboratory Schools families and parents of students in the College. In addition, student participation in the cAlert System should be mandatory.

- Implement a new security alert email system.

The committee is in agreement with the interim Guidelines for Immediate Security Alerts (produced 2-16-08 and summarized below) and recommends that they be formally adopted. The delivery and dissemination plan, which includes selected cAlert mechanisms, the use of all-campus bulk email, and a community sign-up list, was also discussed and met with approval by the committee. The committee recommends that the decision-making process for issuing alerts be streamlined, with one or two administrators working together with the Chief of Police and Security Services (or designee) to issue an alert. We also strongly encourage the addition of a public information officer to UCPD staff to support the enhanced communications needs of the campus.

Category 1: An alert is sent when:

- a gun is fired in the direction of a person or another weapon is used to injure another person on campus or in the immediate contiguous areas;¹
- an individual is killed due to violence in the UCPD service area;²
- an individual reports a sexual assault or battery by a stranger, and the incident occurred recently on campus or in the immediate contiguous areas; and/or

- there is any pattern of violent crime on campus that is observed to have occurred over a short period of time.

Category 2: Campus notification might be sent when the UCPD and Emergency Management Team believe broad awareness of the following types of crime is important.

- Any violent crime on or in the immediate vicinity of campus or University-owned property
- Any pattern of violent crimes in the UCPD patrol district, whether that pattern occurs in a single day or over an extended period of time
- Any incident of violent crime in the UCPD service area that is especially concerning, including crime near schools, heavily populated areas, hate crimes, etc.

- Build a new web-based system for crime information.

A reliable and accessible web-based system for collecting and sharing all criminal activity and aggregate crime data from our campus and neighboring community areas should be established as soon as possible. Information in the system should include day-to-day listings of crime on campus and within UCPD patrol boundaries, and crime trend information on campus (in accordance with the Clery Act), within UCPD patrol boundaries, and in broader community areas as requested and available. Links to independent sources of information (City of Chicago, Block-by-Block, etc.) should be incorporated as appropriate.

2. Expand Transportation Services

In our conversations as a committee and in our discussions with members of the campus community (including the student effected, us, who have been struck continually by the importance of the utter reliability of transportation services and by the need to think more broadly than has perhaps been the case about its users both actual and potential. These services are at least as important to staff, students, and faculty as they are to students, and the needs are diverse and run the gamut of the twenty-four hour of the day and the seven days of the week. On balance, the University’s transportation system has been oriented toward efficiently meeting the demands of most riders. Safety considerations need to have more weight in this equation.

Specific suggestions we have heard from campus constituents who contacted administrators and individual committee members directly include:

- Improve the predictability and wait time for University-sponsored bus services, especially SafeRide.
- Increase after-dark services.
- Expand shuttle bus services, especially south of the Midway.
- Work with College of Education, students, faculty, and staff who work in BSD and PSD laboratories throughout the night.
- Improve and better coordinate University and Medical/Center shuttle services between buildings and parking garages.
- Incorporate safety considerations into the future transportation planning and budgets.
- Improve the marketing and communication of transportation services to increase ridership.
- For off campus: Continue using the newly expanded SafeRide service for point-to-point trips within the UCPD patrol boundaries. Technological and phone system improvements to this system, including GPS tracking capabilities and vehicle tracking, will be considered. More vans should also be considered as necessary. As the SafeRide Program continues to grow (and is enhanced with walking escorts), better methods for tracking and dispatch will be needed to ensure effective, and hence better utilized, service delivery.

- Establish a new CTA bus route that serves Woodlawn.

Expanded bus service is needed as the South Campus and Woodlawn community continue to develop. Currently over 1,200 University affiliates live in Woodlawn. New CTA bus service will address current needs of both University and community residents, will support the growing desirability of Woodlawn as an affordable and convenient place to live, and it will create an additional traffic presence that may deter criminal activity.

3. Improve Safety Education and Outreach

The purpose of the committee’s discussion on education and outreach was to assess what more we could be doing as an institution to encourage personal responsibility for safety. This is a complex issue, as communication and outreach efforts need to acknowledge the precautionary reality inherent in city living without creating undue fear of the community.

The committee met with Martina Munsters, Sgt. JoCathy Roberts, Belinda Cross, Audrey Heyden, and Ingrid Gould to discuss safety education efforts for students, faculty, and staff. An analysis of safety education programs used at other colleges and universities was also presented. The University of Pennsylvania was highlighted as an outstanding model for improving ridership and safe travel, and the need for wider implementation of such efforts was noted. The need for increased ridership and safe travel was acknowledged as a priority in extending our efforts to improve ridership and safe travel.

Recommendations

- Create a new campus circularity shuttle system.

At the University is currently lacking a circulatory shuttle system—common on many campuses across the country—that would allow affiliated commuters to travel more efficiently and safely around the campus. The committee expects a new shuttle system would improve travel from area parking garages, better serve students and employees living on or near campus (including the medical district), and provide a needed addition to late-night transportation options. The expectation is that these services would be frequent and predictable, and run all day and into the night.

- Create a walking escort service and integrate it with late-night transportation options.

The committee believes the University can more effectively meet the diverse, late-night transportation needs of employees and students by developing a multifaceted, integrated, geographic-based transportation improvement strategy. Currently, UCPD’s Umbrella Service (a UCPD patrol car following a pedestrian as he or she walks to destination) supports late-night travel needs. The committee expects a new shuttle system would travel from area parking garages, better serve students and employees living on or near campus (including the medical district), and provide a needed addition to late-night transportation options. The expectation is that these services would be frequent and predictable, and run all day and into the night.

- Expand walking escort services, especially south of the Midway.

- Work with College of Education, students, faculty, and staff who work in BSD and PSD laboratories throughout the night.

- Improve and better coordinate University and Medical/Center shuttle services between buildings and parking garages.

- Incorporate safety considerations into the future transportation planning and budgets.

- For the core campus: Implement a walking escort system (similar to those at Harvard and Brown Universities), where professional escorts managed by UCPD transport students to or from University-related events on campus and nearby destinations.

- Around campus: Utilize the new campus circularity shuttle system described above.

¹ Defined as an area in or around a University-owned or managed building where there is a concentration of University students, faculty and/or staff.

² 39th to 64th Streets and Cottage Grove Avenue to Lake Shore Drive.
in whom she meets with and how often. In addition, Sgt. Roberts has worked with Student Government to organize on-campus beat meetings for students.

Based on these conversations, the committee suggests the following actions and strategies be implemented to encourage greater awareness, understanding, and responsibility for personal and property safety.

Recommendations

• Develop a comprehensive marketing and advertising plan to raise awareness, change behavior, and encourage utilization of resources (i.e., late-night transportation services). NSTP’s laptop campaign is a good example of an effective outreach program. Involving students from the Graduate School of Business to lead the planning effort.

• Integrate and streamline all information regarding University safety resources onto one accessible website. The committee was particularly impressed by the website maintained by the University of Pennsylvania.

• Evaluate the effectiveness of the safety “tips” that are now being sent via email. Incorporate them into a more integrated communication strategy.

• Develop an aggressive agenda of consistent, prescheduled safety education workshops throughout the year for students, faculty, and staff.

• Expand the number of officers responsible for campus outreach.

• Enhance interaction between UCPD officers and students through interactive and purposeful programming that is educational and builds trust.

• Partner with academic deans and department chairs to develop strategies to support safety awareness programs within the academic units and the broader community, both on and off campus.

• Strategies should include the development of a sustained and interactive relationship between the UCPD and each academic unit.

4. Make Capital Investments to Improve Campus Safety

The campus community provided many suggestions for improving safety that focused on three aspects of the University’s physical plant. The committee was continually reminded in its work of the twin facts that while such efforts have long been recognized and even addressed, none of them has achieved completion. So long as this condition remains, the University faces a double problem: first, neighborhood safety is at least indirectly compromised; and, second, some members of the community perceive that the University is not addressing safety issues adequately.

Recommendations

• Lighting. The committee received a status report on campus installations and current status of lighting on campus and in the surrounding neighborhoods from Richard Buistead and Abby Zanarini. The light intensity during the summer months, etc. The review of baseline needs should include an assessment of if, when, and how cameras are used in buildings owned by the University or occupied by University affiliates (i.e., charter schools).

Implementation Considerations

Central Coordination

While the committee distinguishes four areas of focus in its report, the recommendations and follow-up are all interrelated. As such, the committee recommends that coordination of the recommendations described above, in addition to other safety and security responsibilities, should be centralized. Most campus and, in some cases, the police departments have already begun coordinating efforts. The committee was specifically impressed with the work of the University of Pennsylvania in this regard.

Therefore, the committee strongly recommends that the University appoint an administrator with focused responsibility for coordinating the following. The appointment should be a new position and not an addition to someone’s current role. In addition, it is recommended that the work of the UCPD is coordinated with the work of Campus Transportation and Parking, and that both of these entities in regular contact with the University’s officials responsible for communication, for information technology, for community relations, and for student life. Ongoing oversight and coordination of these components of safety and security are essential.

Balance

It is important to consider the question of balance between services to campus versus those to the wider community, given the University’s commitment to being a good neighbor and investment partner in community development versus our recent core-campus safety concerns.

Under the guidance of Shirley Newsome and Sonya Malunda, some committee members toured the UCPD’s coverage area (39th Street to the north, 64th Street to the south, Cottage Grove Avenue to the west, and Lake Shore Drive to the east), paying particular attention to the neighborhoods and schools and streets where the UCPD is most actively involved. During the tour, Ms. Malunda explained the UCPD’s expansion into North Kenwood/Oakland (NKO), which includes (a) the presence of the NKO and Donohue Campuses of the University of Chicago Charter School, (b) the growing number of University affiliates moving into NKO, and (c) support for the transformation of NKO into a community of choice for local and University affiliates alike. The UCPD’s Woodlawn expansion was primarily related to the high crime rate, the growing number of University affiliates moving into the area, and Grove Parc’s issues.

It is clear that it is very important to maintain the University’s commitment to supporting crime prevention in area neighborhoods and specifically at K-12 educational facilities. Safety experts all agree that the most effective way to reduce crime is to foster community development. Community development is fueled in large part by an active crime prevention strategy and police presence. We can see the success of these interrelated strategies at work in North Kenwood/Oakland, where crime has decreased dramatically and there is a growing population of University affiliates living in the area. With the increase of University affiliates living in the neighborhoods surrounding the University, the concept of what constitutes the core campus has shifted over time to include more of the immediate environs. Some of these neighborhoods (i.e., Woodlawn) continue to have such very high crime rates that it is difficult to foster community development where there is much need for support and where the majority of our campus buildings are located.

Operationally, UCPD has tended to focus—as do the Chicago Police—more resources on higher crime areas and on crime prevention and investigation activities. Crime on campus is fairly low and traditionally has received fewer resources as a result. But crime on campus, however, low, appears to have a greater impact on feelings of safety for the University community.

It seems clear to the committee that the University should enhance services supporting the immediate core campus and not unduly impacting services that support the larger South Side community and its sustained and future development. Special attention also needs to be given to the serious building security concerns at our charter school campuses. Ultimately the overall balance of resources will need to be determined in light of the recommendations coming from the Bratton Group and ongoing University discussions.

Conclusion

Tragedy begets reflection and reaction. Our deliberations have been informed by the reactions of the manifold constituencies that constitute our community, and our recommendations range broadly in scope and detail. The most important conclusion that has emerged from our work, however, is sharp and unambiguous: the safety and security of our community, broadly construed, is not just a function of more intense policing, better communication, or enhanced transportation, but rather of a unified, centrally organized and administered program that synthesizes these other important factors into a comprehensive strategy and ongoing administrative policy. It is not our part to weigh priorities or to suggest allocative weights, but rather to emphasize that the whole must necessarily be greater than the sum of its parts, and that the parts must be carefully coordinated if the enterprise is to be as effective as we all agree it should and must be.
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President’s Message on Campus Safety and Security

By Robert J. Zimmer

To: The University Community

I am writing to bring you up to date regarding our additional plans to address campus safety.

Earlier this year, I wrote to you outlining a number of actions including a significant increase in the number of police deployed in our coverage area, the addition of a police substation at 61st and Drexel, an increase in the resources and hours of the late-night van service, and further improvements in lighting. At that time, I indicated that we would be convening a Campus Safety and Security Committee, chaired by Dean Richard Rosengarten and Vice President Kimberly Goff-Crews, to conduct a thorough review of the University’s policies, procedures, and initiatives related to safety and to seek the input of the broad University community. We also engaged the Bratton Group, an external security consulting firm, to review the University’s allocation of police resources and to make recommendations to improve the effectiveness of our overall policing efforts.

I want to thank the Campus Safety and Security Committee, comprised of students, faculty, staff, and community members, for its thoughtful work. The committee’s report, which was derived from extensive discussions with members of the University community and an assessment of best practices at other institutions, is available at uchicago.edu/safety. The recommendations of the committee are complemented by those made by our external consultants. The insights and recommendations of both groups provide the rationale and context for a set of immediate steps, outlined below, designed to provide increased leadership and coordination of safety efforts, increase the visibility of police on campus, strengthen transportation services, improve communication and crime reporting, expand safety education, and better utilize technology to prevent and track incidents of crime.

Leadership Structure

A key finding of the security assessments was the need to increase the level of expertise and coordination of safety issues at the highest levels of the University. As a result of the committee’s recommendations, we plan to create the position of Associate Vice President for Safety and Security. The new AVP will report to the Vice President for Community and Civic Affairs and will have responsibility for the University of Chicago Police Department (UCPD), which will continue to benefit from the excellent leadership of Rudy Nimocks, Chief of Police; the Office of Transportation and Parking; and a new department of physical security that will be responsible for setting and implementing standards for building access control and related technology across the University. A search will be launched immediately to fill this position.

The standing Committee on Crime Prevention and Security on Campus and in the Neighborhood, chaired by Dean Richard Rosengarten and made up of students, staff, and faculty, will continue to serve in an important advisory role.

Police Deployment and Staffing

It was also clear from these reviews and from comments we have heard from many in the community that we must increase the visibility of our police and security forces in the area around campus. We will be implementing a new deployment effort to achieve this increased visibility, including a greater use of foot and bicycle patrols. Over time we expect to increase the proportion of our campus police force that is staffed by full-time officers. In addition, we will be committing new resources to significantly increase our capacity for crime analysis and investigation.

Technology

The University will invest in proven technology to improve the physical safety of our environment. This includes the use of security cameras, which will continue to be installed in key outdoor locations in the coming weeks and months. We will further improve lighting on campus, and we will continue to work closely with the community and with elected officials to address lighting needs in the immediate surrounding areas. We will begin planning for a University-wide electronic security system that will allow for greater control over access to key buildings and areas.

In addition, we will implement technology upgrades within UCPD, including updated computer dispatch and crime analysis software.

Transportation

We will establish a new shuttle bus system with regular, frequent service around campus; and we will develop a walking escort service for students, faculty, and staff who would like accompaniment to locations in and around campus after dark. It will be important to coordinate all of our late-night transportation services so the experience is as seamless as possible for students, staff, and faculty. We also will work with elected officials and community leaders to advocate for more bus service operated by the Chicago Transit Authority into Woodlawn.

Communication and Incident Reporting

Within the next few weeks we will expand our Community Safety website (uchicago.edu/safety) to include comprehensive daily reports of crime incidents reported to UCPD. The website also will include aggregate crime data, identification of trends, and safety education materials. At the same time, we also will fully implement new guidelines for emergency and crime notification.

Safety Education and Outreach

UCPD will increase its interactions with groups and departments on campus, including regularly scheduled safety education workshops for students, faculty, and staff. In addition, we will create a coordinated set of safety education materials and disseminate them widely in order to promote safe behavior. This will include developing video- and web-based tools to educate our community about good safety practices.

Quality of Life and Community Development

These changes represent a significant commitment of University resources to improve campus and community safety. However, we know that creating a safe environment will also require our continued engagement in many issues that broadly affect our community. We will continue to work in partnership with the City, local elected officials, and our neighbors to improve the quality of local schools, provide community residents with access to training and jobs, bring more amenities to the South Side, and understand how we can work together to prevent violence.

The actions described above will be part of an ongoing program of improvements to enhance safety and security. As these and new efforts are developed, we will post updates to our Community Safety website at uchicago.edu/safety. We welcome your thoughts about additional improvements that can be made to enhance the safety of our environment. Safety ideas and questions may be sent to communityaffairs@uchicago.edu.

The full text of this report, including appendices, is available online at uchicago.edu/safety.
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Death comes, and alters us completely. Death comes, and the world is changed irrevocably. Someone we love is gone. They are not here, with us; and suddenly the next moment, he or she is somehow gone. We can't grasp it; and we certainly can't prepare ourselves.

Death comes as a profound shock. It takes us by surprise, even though we've known about it all our lives. Even when we've seen it coming, even when we've been at a bedside for weeks and months, we are shocked by death. It plunges us into what seems to be another world: an alien wasteland of grief, where everything seems strange and uncommon. Our inner landscape and our outer landscape are no longer the same as they were.

The death of a loved one seems to be something we just can't prepare ourselves for. For the most everyday events become suddenly unfamiliar by the absence of the person who until so recently was always a part of them. Utopias of grief overcome us at unexpected moments: one minute we are looking out the window, the next moment we are weeping uncontrollably. We wake up startled by the absence beside us. We come home saddened by the loss of part of the very fabric of our being. We are shocked by death. It plunges us and alters us completely.

And this is not merely a metaphor. For not only are our social and intimate lives bound up tightly with those we love; but the stuff of our inner lives, too, is made up of what we internalize from our most important relationships. That we are social animals means that we are intrinsically relational: from the very beginning we have been constituted through our relationships with others. The very fabric of our being, then, has been woven out of our interactions with those we love. Death robs us of someone we love. In so doing, it robs us of part of the very fabric of our being. When we lose someone we love, then, in a very real way, we lose a part of ourselves. We are no longer the same. And being no longer the same, our experience of the world is changed irrevocably.

Death shocks us because we can't wrap our minds around this central paradox: the loss of someone whom we truly care about, and therefore feel so very present; and yet he or she is dead, and thus is, irrevocably, gone.

How do we go living in such an altered world, in a world where we are no longer ourselves? Our society moves fast and expects us to, as well. We've given just a few days before we're expected to be back to business as usual. We know that we are supposed to “get over it.” But grief and mourning have their own rhythms and take their own time, rhythms and times that are not of our choosing and that we cannot rush.

We would like to hope, we would like to have faith. But death is the time where both hope and faith are most likely to elude us. All we may be able to do is endure, and wait, and take what comfort we can find in each other's company. And sooner or later, we can begin to embark upon what Freud referred to as the “work of mourning.” Mourning is the long, drawn-out process of coming to terms with death. In order for the work of mourning to take place, each and every event that we ever shared with our loved one needs to be relived in the light of his or her absence. This says to me that the work of mourning takes at least a year. At first, as each new hour of the day approaches, it approaches without the person with whom it used to be shared. We wake up startled by the absence beside us in the bed; we come home saddened by the emptiness of the house that greets us. And then, as each season approaches, it approaches for the first time without the person who used to share it with us. The leaves turn color, and the deceased is not there any longer with us. The first snowfall, the first crocuses of spring push up out of the ground, and the deceased is not there to see them with me. Harder still are those holidays whose very meaning has to do with the gathering of family and friends: birthdays, Thanksgivings, the New Year. Coming with each new season becomes an occasion for renewed grief and renewed mourning. And as we do this work of mourning, we slowly become familiar with this strange new landscape we are in; we slowly find out what it means to come to terms with death.

What can we do in the meanwhile? What can we do is what we are doing right now, right here: we can gather together and take comfort in each other's presence. We can realize that not only working together and sometimes celebrating together, but grieving together, too, makes us a community. We can recognize in each other's grief the strangely altered world that death has brought to us. We can learn from our grief what others feel when death visits them. And in this strangely altered world, we can honor the lives of those who have passed on and we can honor their contributions to this community and beyond.

The work of mourning does not mean that we eventually forget our loved ones. We continue to cherish them in our memories, and in our love, and in the works they’ve left behind. Mourning does, however, eventually make possible our renewed involvement in and commitment to the world. When this happens, we can then honor the deceased not only by acts of remembrance but also by living in the spirit that we admired in them and by striving to realize the ideals they represented for us. As Franz Fanon wrote on his deathbed: “... death is always with us... the important thing is not to know how to avoid it but to make sure we do our utmost for the ideas we believe in.”

Celia Brickman, PhD '00, is a clinical and faculty member of the Center for Religion and Psychotherapy and is also the co-director of the Education Program. In 2005–06, she was a senior fellow at the Martin Marty Center for the Study of the University of Chicago's Divinity School.
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lillian Anna Thomson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>William N. Tomaras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>William W. Tongue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John P. Trebellas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Darrell M. Tucker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>James H. Turner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert D. Turtle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vi Fogle Uretz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Milton J. Vanderbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Henricus A. “Harrie” Vanderstappen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Delores K. Vaughan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Norman Venger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Henry F. Vollmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kurt Vonnegut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Edwin A. Wahlen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Verner S. Waite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cheves T. Walking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frederick Champion Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert H. Weaver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T. Stewart Webster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert V. Weclaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alvin M. Weinberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Edward I. Weinselbaum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adolph Weisnack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel Jacob Weiser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clarke Dewey Wells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percival A. Wesche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Carlotta C. Wettach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gilbert F. White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Andrew Hunter Whiteford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ross B. Whitney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>James L. Whittenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arthur H. Wilkins</td>
<td>Eugene M. Wilkins</td>
<td>Bernadine B. Williams</td>
<td>George P. Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joyce Iona Williams</td>
<td>Donn B. Wilson</td>
<td>Edward C. Wilson</td>
<td>Harold S. Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Margaret G. Wilson</td>
<td>William G. Wing</td>
<td>Robert W. Wisler</td>
<td>Richard Earl Witte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lorraine K. Wolf</td>
<td>William J. Wolfe</td>
<td>Kenneth E. Womack</td>
<td>James M. Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wesley T. Wooley</td>
<td>James M. Worthington</td>
<td>Marian Wozencraft</td>
<td>Theresa B. Yancey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oskar R. Zahorsky</td>
<td>Arthur W. Zarlenko</td>
<td>Leon Zolondek</td>
<td>Ruth Johnson Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arthur W. Zarlengo</td>
<td>Edward C. Wilson</td>
<td>Miriam Zvolner</td>
<td>Norman Venger</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty Appointments and Promotions

Appointments
January 2, 2007, through January 1, 2008

Professor
Stephen Archer, Medicine
Dan A. Black, Irving B. Harris Graduate School of Public Policy Studies
Alain Bresson, Classics and the College
Lee A. Fennell, Law School
Leela Gandhi, English Language & Literature and the College
Lenore Grenoble, Slavic Languages & Literatures, Linguistics, and the College
Ramón Gutiérrez, History and the College
Holly Humphrey, Medicine
Jens O. Ludwig, School of Social Service Administration
Richard M. Adams, Law School
Bruce D. May, Research & Cellular Oncology
Pierramaria J. Oddone, Physics and the College
Willemien Otten, Divinity School
Charles M. Payne, School of Social Service Administration
Andrey Rzhetsky, Medicine

Assistant Professor
Christine Mehring, Art History and the College
Adam Green, History and the College
Ethan Bueno de Mesquita, Irving B. Harris Graduate School of Public Policy Studies
Mark Bradley, History and the College
Gary Tubb, South Asian Languages & Civilizations and the College

Associate Professor
Mark Bradley, History and the College
Ethan Bueno de Mesquita, Irving B. Harris Graduate School of Public Policy Studies
Adam Green, History and the College
Christine Mehring, Art History and the College
Sankar Murthychidambaram, Political Science and the College
Jon C. Pevehouse, Irving B. Harris Graduate School of Public Policy Studies
Jennifer Pitts, Political Science and the College
Stephan X. Sapek, Pediatrics

Assistant Professor
Shaheen A. Akhter, Surgery
Fredrik Albritton Jonsson, History and the College
Tania Brugga, Visual Arts and the College
Eugene M. Caruso, Graduate School of Business
Carlos M. Carvalho, Graduate School of Business
Julia Chauzy, Computer Science and the College
Kenneth S. Cohen, Medicine
Joel Collier, Surgery
Albert S. Colman, Geophysical Sciences and the College
Julie Cooper, Political Science and the College
Julien Dubédat, Mathematics
Gregory S. Engel, Chemistry and the College
Curtis J. Evans, Divinity School
Jacob Eyerther, East Asian Languages & Civilizations and the College
Margarita L. Gardel, Physics and the College
Noah Jordan Goldstein, Graduate School of Business
Kathleen H. Goss, Surgery
Fortini Gounari, Medicine
Prabhjot Harsh, Computer Science and the College
Kevin W. Hector, Divinity School
Nina Singh Hartwich, Statistics and the College
Haochu Huang, Medicine
Paola Loenneke, East Asian Languages & Civilizations and the College
Rachel Jean-Baptiste, History and the College
Stephen J. Kahl, Graduate School of Business
Aiden Welles Kummer, Art History and the College
Marcus M. Marcet, Ophthalmology & Visual Science
Nadine Moeller, Oriental Institute
Debashis Mondal, Statistics and the College
Michael J. Morowitz, Surgery
A. Adair Morse, Graduate School of Business
Elisabeth J. Moyer, Geophysical Sciences
Valeri Nikolaev, Graduate School of Business
Emily Lynn Osborn, History and the College
Emily Oster, Economics and the College
Jong Hee Park, Political Science and the College

Instructor
Christine Babcock, Medicine
Eugene A. Choi, Surgery
Robert C. Doebele, Medicine
Angela Celio Doyle, Psychiatry & Behavioral Neuroscience

Student
Junji Yoshida, East Asian Languages & Civilizations

Promotions
January 1, 2007, through January 1, 2008

To Professor
Douglas K. Bishop, Research & Cellular Oncology

To Associate Professor
Tung T. To, Mathematics and the College

To Collegiate Assistant Professor
Craig Carson, College
Dorith Geva, College
Judith E. Goldman, College
Elizabeth A. Heath, College
Aron Johnson, College
Reha Kadakal, College
Mogens Laerke, College
Sin-Yan Hedy Law, College

To Instructor
Christine Babcock, Medicine
Dmitriy Boyarchenko, Mathematics and the College

To Assistant Professor
Andrew Arzt, Medicine
Melanie Brown, Pediatrics
Ronald R. Espinal, Pediatrics
Joseph J. Giambarba, Graduate School of Business
Laura Harrell, Medicine

To Assistant Professor
John D. Lantos, Pediatrics
Orlanda Magg, Romance Languages & Literatures and the College
John F. Padgett, Political Science and the College
Jai Raman, Surgery
Susan B. Schauff, Economics and the College
Tobin R. Sosnick, Biochemistry & Molecular Biology
Lior J. Sharlievitz, Law
Wei-Jun Tang, Beng May Department for Cancer Research

To Associate Professor
Kathleen E. Angeli, School of Social Service Administration
Matthew J. Brady, Medicine
Christian Broda, Graduate School of Business
Kathleen A. Cagney, Health Studies
Lawrence P. Casalino, Health Studies
Fausto Cattaneo, Astronomy & Astrophysics and the College
Phillip Cluzel, Physics and the College
Ronald N. Cohen, Medicine
Bradin Cormack, English Language & Literature and the College
Jeanette M. DeCara, Medicine
James D. Dignam, Health Studies
Darby English, Art History and the College
Chris Cory Hall, Physical Education & Athletics and the College
John P. Kress, Medicine
Aparna Labroo, Graduate School of Business
Gabriel Richardson Lear, Philosophy and the College
Maciej S. Lesniak, Surgery
Hendry Freitas Lopes, Graduate School of Business
Karen A. Miller, Human Genetics
John Mark Miller, English Language & Literature and the College
Dan Liviu Niculae, Medicine
Ada Holly Nix, Near Eastern Languages & Civilizations and the College

To Instructor
Rustem F. Ismagilov, Chemistry and the College
John D. Lantos, Pediatrics
Orlanda Magg, Romance Languages & Literatures and the College
John F. Padgett, Political Science and the College
Jai Raman, Surgery
Susan B. Schauff, Economics and the College
Tobin R. Sosnick, Biochemistry & Molecular Biology
Lior J. Sharlievitz, Law
Wei-Jun Tang, Beng May Department for Cancer Research

To Assistant Professor
Andrew Arzt, Medicine
Melanie Brown, Pediatrics
Ronald R. Espinal, Pediatrics
Joseph J. Giambarba, Graduate School of Business
Laura Harrell, Medicine
Deborah Lang, Medicine

To Assistant Professor
Kathleen E. Angeli, School of Social Service Administration
Matthew J. Brady, Medicine
Christian Broda, Graduate School of Business
Kathleen A. Cagney, Health Studies
Lawrence P. Casalino, Health Studies
Fausto Cattaneo, Astronomy & Astrophysics and the College
Phillip Cluzel, Physics and the College
Ronald N. Cohen, Medicine
Bradin Cormack, English Language & Literature and the College
Jeanette M. DeCara, Medicine
James D. Dignam, Health Studies
Darby English, Art History and the College
Chris Cory Hall, Physical Education & Athletics and the College
John P. Kress, Medicine
Aparna Labroo, Graduate School of Business
Gabriel Richardson Lear, Philosophy and the College
Maciej S. Lesniak, Surgery
Hendry Freitas Lopes, Graduate School of Business
Karen A. Miller, Human Genetics
John Mark Miller, English Language & Literature and the College
Dan Liviu Niculae, Medicine
Ada Holly Nix, Near Eastern Languages & Civilizations and the College

To Instructor
Rustem F. Ismagilov, Chemistry and the College
John D. Lantos, Pediatrics
Orlanda Magg, Romance Languages & Literatures and the College
John F. Padgett, Political Science and the College
Jai Raman, Surgery
Susan B. Schauff, Economics and the College
Tobin R. Sosnick, Biochemistry & Molecular Biology
Lior J. Sharlievitz, Law
Wei-Jun Tang, Beng May Department for Cancer Research

To Assistant Professor
Andrew Arzt, Medicine
Melanie Brown, Pediatrics
Ronald R. Espinal, Pediatrics
Joseph J. Giambarba, Graduate School of Business
Laura Harrell, Medicine
Deborah Lang, Medicine
Dan Levy, Medicine
Report of the Panel on Unlawful Harassment for 2006–07

February 26, 2008

On February 28, 2006, the Council of the University Senate adopted the Policy on Unlawful Discrimination and Harassment, which requires that an annual report be made to the Council (1) detailing the number of different types of incidents of unlawful harassment brought to the attention of the Complaint Advisors or the Unlawful Harassment Panel, and (2) describing the goals of the University-wide program on unlawful harassment and how those goals were implemented during the year. This is the first annual report under the new policy, and it covers the period July 1, 2006, to June 30, 2007.

Prevention and Education

A new brochure, Unlawful Harassment: A Guide for Faculty, Staff, and Students, was developed as an aid to publicize the University’s commitment to maintaining a place of work and educational programs that are free from unlawful harassment. The definition of unlawful discrimination and the bases on which harassment is prohibited are explained. The pamphlet summarizes the University’s policy, highlights key concepts, provides some examples of the kinds of conduct that could constitute a policy violation, and lists resources for advice and complaint resolution.

The Provost’s Office again updated the Policy on Unlawful Discrimination and Harassment, Sexual Harassment: What We Can Do, which focuses on the special characteristics of sexual harassment. Both brochures list contact information for the new and continuing complaint advisors, as well as a link to the full University policy on unlawful harassment. The brochures were sent together when units requested copies of either pamphlet.

A major goal of the University’s program for unlawful harassment prevention is preparation of Complaint Advisors to informally resolve complaints through advising and mediation. This year former Complaint Advisors were sometimes called upon to address the topic of harassment in their units’ orientation meetings, but current Complaint Advisors were utilized for this purpose. More information is needed to determine how best to ensure that members of the University community regularly receive adequate education on unlawful harassment prevention. Doing so is a key to communicating the University’s expectation that individuals not compromise the integrity of the institution. In addition, when the actions of a particular University employee or student transgress the bounds of lawful conduct, a demonstrated record of anti-harassment education should help limit the liability of the University.

Monthly Complaint Advisor meetings included discussions with representatives from student service offices, including the Office of Multicultural Student Affairs and Student Counseling & Resource Services. Other sessions involved discussions with the Provost, the Associate General Counsel, and a Vice President and Dean of Students representative who works with students with disabilities. Advisors also participated in customized training provided on campus by a representative of United Educators (UE), the University’s risk management provider. UE sponsored a University roundtable, “Best Practices in Harassment Prevention Training,” which Complaint Advisors attended as well. Part of each meeting continues to be reserved for Complaint Advisors to confidentially discuss the handling of each incident, including the way in which the Guide for Complaint Advisor Contacts was implemented. This is an important tool for teaching Advisors who have not been contacted how actual cases are handled.

Update on Four Pending 2005–06 Matters

The sexual harassment lawsuit brought against the University by the employee of an affiliate was settled before going to trial. Inquiries into new reports that in separate instances two faculty members who had been reprimanded in the past had engaged in offensive, sexually related workplace conduct were concluded. In the first instance, the complaints of unwelcome comments, touching, and leering were substantiated. The faculty member was required to attend a three-day program on sexual harassment and other boundary issues. He also was placed on a last-chance agreement and notified that his appointment would end. No further complaints were received. In the second case, the faculty member was prohibited from supervising students.

Last year, an instructor’s complaint against a student who disrupted a class by singing a sexually explicit song about the instructor was advanced to the student disciplinary committee. The student was placed on a two-quarter academic probation and has since graduated.

Incidents Reported during 2006–07

There were eighteen unlawful harassment-related contacts reported by current or former Complaint Advisors and the Coordinating Officer.

Incident outcomes: Six of the incidents were resolved through advising and counseling; three resolutions involved severe reprimands; three of the incidents did not warrant administrative intervention; three were pending resolution as of June 30, 2007; two were resolved through agency mediation or dismissal; and one resolution required the hazing of a former student from campus.

There were nine instances in which assistance was sought from current or former Complaint Advisors or the Coordinating Officer for resolving abuse or harassment not on a protected basis. Examples of inquiries include abuse of information technology, repeated badgering by construction workers, pregnancy discrimination, and workplace yelling and intimidation. One student reported being sexually assaulted by an employee of an affiliated employer and was referred to the appropriate resources.

Members of the Panel on Unlawful Harassment, 2006–07

Fred Donner, Chair
William McDade
Deborah L. Nelson
Aneesah Ali, Associate Provost, ex officio
Sarah Lickfelt, Student Ombudsperson
University Disciplinary Actions: 2006–07

By Kimberly Goff-Crews, Vice President and Dean of Students in the University

January 29, 2008

The Office of the Vice President and Dean of Students in the University has been asked by the Council of the University Senate to report each year on matters pertaining to the University disciplinary legislation enacted by the council on May 23, 1970, and amended on June 8, 1976.

For another year, the All-University Disciplinary Committee did not meet during the 2006–07 academic year.

The Office of the Vice President and Dean of Students in the University also reports to the council on disciplinary matters that have occurred in the academic units during the year. In 2006–07, area disciplinary committees were convened on fifteen occasions to consider allegations brought against eighteen students. Three undergraduate students requested a review of the disciplinary decision.

In the College, ten disciplinary hearings were convened involving thirteen students.

Four students were brought before a disciplinary committee for assaulting another student. The allegation was not sustained against one of the accused students. The other three students were suspended for four quarters and directed to pay the assaulted student’s medical expenses. The three sanctioned students requested a review. The review board sustained the disciplinary committee’s decision.

A student was brought before a disciplinary committee for plagiarism. The student was suspended for four quarters, and one quarter of the suspension was suspended.

A third hearing involved a student accused of cheating on an exam. The student was suspended for four quarters.

Two separate hearings were held for two students accused of academic dishonesty. Both students were placed on disciplinary probation.

A sixth hearing involved a student accused of theft. The student was suspended for eight quarters.

A student called before the disciplinary committee was charged with plagiarism. The student had been disciplined before for plagiarism. The committee decided to expel the student.

Another student was accused of plagiarism and received a sanction of a five-quarter suspension.

The disciplinary committee expelled a student, who had been suspended for an earlier assault, for assaulting another student.

The tenth hearing of the College disciplinary committee involved a student accused of plagiarism. The student was suspended for four quarters.

In the graduate divisions and professional schools, five hearings were convened involving five students.

The Irving B. Harris Graduate School of Public Policy convened two hearings. In the first hearing, a student was accused of intentionally disrupting a class. The committee determined that the student should be placed on probation. In the second hearing, a student was charged with plagiarism. The disciplinary committee recommended that the student receive a final grade of F on the course.

The Graduate School of Business held one disciplinary hearing. A hearing was convened in the Executive MBA Program for a student charged with plagiarism. The student was suspended for one quarter.

The Graham School of General Studies convened one disciplinary committee. The committee hearing involved a student who was accused of sexual assault. Due to insufficient evidence, no sanctions were levied against the student.

The Division of the Physical Sciences convened one disciplinary committee. The committee hearing involved a student who was accused of sexual assault. Due to insufficient evidence, no sanctions were levied against the student.

Students sent before disciplinary committees, 1997–2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>College/ Academic</th>
<th>College/ Other</th>
<th>Graduate/ Academic</th>
<th>Graduate/ Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97–98</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98–99</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99–00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00–01</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01–02</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02–03</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03–04</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04–05</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05–06</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06–07</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**The 493rd Convocation Address**

*Keeping Our Military Compass*

By Yali Amit

_The University of Chicago Record_

Many of you are off to the workplace and in the next few years will be preoccupied with finding an interesting and satisfying, and well-paying job, holding on to it, and advancing in your profession, as well as more mundane things such as marriage, raising children, and saving for their education or your own. But in medical school or residency, that is much more to worry about, and in today's fast-paced, competitive world, and highly uncertain economy, that might be more than enough for a young person to handle. So forgive me if I try to raise one more thing to think about once in a while.

Some of you will find yourselves in a job where your interaction with people is very direct and transparent: doctor and patient, teacher and student, or lawyer and client. But in other cases we find ourselves working in a large organization or institution, and our contact with the people affected by the institution is very indirect. In a financial firm handling pension funds, you will never meet the people whose funds you are managing but you may have a large effect on their lives. Or you may work in a corporation that supplies power for millions of people on one hand, but on the other hand pollutes the environment of the residents living near its power plants.

In our society, organizations and institutions interact with individuals, wielding more and more power. Through our work in these places, we are indirectly interacting and affecting the lives of large numbers of people. So once in a while it may be a good idea to stop and think about these effects and do our personal soul-searching for the institution as a whole.

In our interaction with family, friends, and coworkers—people we know personally—we are constantly performing such soul-searching. It may be that part of our everyday life to think and rethink our behavior towards a friend or family member. In contrast, as members of an institution our interactions are indirect and are mediated by the organization as a whole. So could we do such soul-searching in this case? Indeed, our behavior seems to be a personal responsibility. But to some extent it is. Even though we may be simply performing our job as required and trying to do it well, we do bear some responsibility even if we are not part of the top decision-making circle.

Consider as an example the former AT&T technician Mark Klein, who wrote a document in 2004 detailing the mechanism whereby AT&T was assisting the NSA, who claimed the agency may have intercepted millions of telephone calls seeking key information on the content of the image... So once in a while it may be a good idea to stop and think about these effects and do our personal soul-searching for the institution as a whole.

The 493rd Convocation

*Keeping Our Military Compass*
the period leading up to his resignation, he had started speaking out in public. In an interview with the New York Times he said, “it became very clear to me that working from the inside was not leading to responses at the speed at which responses were needed,” and when dealing with policies “as misguided as I believe these policies were, you have to either speak out or resign.” He went on to say: “In a sense, there was a question of personal and professional integrity. . . . Remaining silent when people were pursuing wrong ideas would have been a form of complicity.”

As I said, there was no personal risk involved here. Stiglitz went on to receive the Nobel Prize in Economic Sciences and is a professor at Columbia University. But his public act has contributed to a change in the public discourse on questions of development, free markets, and the role of government.

In summary, there are many different contexts and different approaches to keeping our moral compass. It may be a public act, or it may be a private act in which we share our concerns with only one other person. But the very fact that we raise these concerns already makes a big difference.

So, I congratulate you all on your graduation, I wish you all an interesting and fulfilling career, and I am confident that if you hold on to your moral compass, and consult with it once in a while, you will all be helping to make this world a better place.

Yali Amit is Professor in the Departments of Statistics and Computer Science, Committee on Computational Neuroscience, and the College.

Summary

The 493rd convocation was held on Friday, March 21, 2008, in Rockefeller Memorial Chapel. Robert J. Zimmer, President of the University, presided.

A total of 554 degrees were awarded: 47 Bachelor of Arts in the College, 1 Bachelor of Science in the College and the Division of the Physical Sciences, 3 Master of Science in the Division of the Biological Sciences and the Pritzker School of Medicine, 7 Master of Arts in the Division of the Humanities, 12 Master of Science in the Division of the Physical Sciences, 44 Master of Arts in the Division of the Social Sciences, 384 Master of Business Administration in the Graduate School of Business, 2 Master of Arts in the Divinity School, 4 Master of Liberal Arts in the William B. and Catherine V. Graham School of General Studies, 3 Master of Arts in the School of Social Service Administration, 1 Master of Arts in the Irving B. Harris Graduate School of Public Policy Studies, 1 Master of Public Policy in the Irving B. Harris Graduate School of Public Policy Studies, 9 Doctor of Philosophy in the Division of the Biological Sciences and the Pritzker School of Medicine, 6 Doctor of Philosophy in the Division of the Humanities, 7 Doctor of Philosophy in the Division of the Physical Sciences, 14 Doctor of Philosophy in the Division of the Social Sciences, 3 Doctor of Philosophy in the Graduate School of Business, 4 Doctor of Philosophy in the Divinity School, 1 Doctor of Philosophy in the School of Social Service Administration, and 1 Doctor of Law in the Law School.

Yali Amit, Professor, Departments of Statistics and Computer Science, Committee on Computational Neuroscience, and the College, delivered the convocation address, “Keeping Our Moral Compass.”