

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO RECORD



Volume 41, Number 1

November 16, 2006

CONTENTS

- 2 The Aims of Education Address**
“Observations concerning the Aims of Education”—*Edward W. Kolb*
- 5 Policy on Unlawful Discrimination and Harassment**
- 7 Annual Report of the Independent Review Committee for the University of Chicago Police Department**
- 9 Report of the Panel on Sexual Harassment for 2004–05**
- 10 The 485th Convocation**
Address: “Education in the Interrogative Mode”—*James K. Chandler*
Remarks—*Michael R. Bloomberg*
Address: “Seeing the World through the Economic Lens”—*Kevin M. Murphy*
Remarks—*Mary A. Tolan*
Bachelor’s Degree Candidates’ Remarks—*Peter Bartoszek, Min Jung Kim, Yenisey Rodriguez*
Llewellyn John and Harriet Manchester Quantrell Awards for Excellence in Undergraduate Teaching
Faculty Awards for Excellence in Graduate Teaching
Honorary Degrees
Summary
- 18 The 486th Convocation**
Address: “Why People Hate Economists (and Why We Don’t Care)”—*Austan Goolsbee*
Summary

THE UNIVERSITY OF
CHICAGO RECORD
5710 South Woodlawn Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60637

Nonprofit
Organization
U.S. Postage
PAID
Chicago, Illinois
Permit No. 8070

The Aims of Education Address

“Observations concerning the Aims of Education”

By Edward W. Kolb

September 21, 2006

Welcome to the University of Chicago. You have probably heard that phrase at least 137 times this week. You have heard it so often that you probably hope the next person to address you will say something else, anything else. Even “have a nice day” might be a welcome change. “Welcome to Chicago” is often followed by well-meaning advice about how to succeed at the University of Chicago. That you won’t get from me. Instead, after this “welcome,” you will get some advice about advice.

Last year in Chicago, there was a theater festival honoring Chicago-born playwright David Mamet. One evening he spoke about his early years in the theater. In response to an audience question about the importance of a mentor, he said that when you start out doing anything, someone just a little older or more experienced will pull you aside and tell you what you have to do to succeed. Then, Mamet said that the most important thing is to absolutely, positively ignore everything that person tells you.

That, in itself, is beautiful Zen-like advice. “Ignore advice” is, well, advice. It is advice that is impossible to follow, and at the same time impossible not to follow. I guess that is one of the reasons many regard Mamet as a genius.

The Aims of Education Address has been inflicted upon incoming classes at the University of Chicago since the early 1960s.

“The Aims of Education” is a wonderfully vague title. Is it a question, as in “What Are the Aims of Education?” Or is it a simple declarative sentence saying, “Pay attention, because I am about to tell you the aims of education.”

The word “aim” in the title suggests that there is a target for your education, something to shoot at, to aim for. I will take the literal meaning of the word aim. “Aims,” in the plural, suggests multiple targets. Most would agree that there are many targets. Of the many possible, this evening I will suggest one target for this next step in your education, one that may not have occurred to you. I will also talk about one target some feel should be an aim of education, and then I will argue why you should not aim at it.

In preparing these remarks, I looked through a fair number of the last forty years of Aims of Education Addresses. (That’s a very useful phrase, “looked through.” It doesn’t mean “studied.” It doesn’t even mean “read.” When students tell me they “looked through” a reading assignment, it usually means they carried it around in their backpack for a week or so in the expectation that the words and ideas in the book would somehow by osmosis be absorbed through the backpack, jacket, and shirt, eventually finding their way to the brain. When I say I “looked through” previous addresses, I mean that I actually took them out of my backpack and read a few.)

Despite forty years of discourse, some of the sharpest minds in the world (i.e., my University of Chicago faculty colleagues) have failed to come up with a definitive answer to “the aims of education.” In fact, they did not even agree on the meaning of the title. Of course the aims of education have been discussed beyond the boundaries of Hyde Park and even further back in time than forty years ago. The world’s greatest

thinkers and philosophers, from Aristotle to Alfred North Whitehead to Dr. Phil, have discoursed on the aims of education.

Aims of Education Addresses have been presented by an anthropologist, a philosopher, a member of the Committee on Social Thought, a member of the Department of Comparative Human Development, and a member of the Committee on History of Culture . . . and that was just one person!

This year’s version of this peculiar academic tradition will be presented for the first time by a cosmologist. It is rather uncommon for someone in the physical sciences to present this address. I am only the second from the Department of Astronomy and Astrophysics to present it. I didn’t recognize the name of any active faculty on the list of previous presenters from the Departments of Physics or Chemistry or other units in the Division of Physical Sciences.

Why have physical scientists been under-represented? It is out of character for a scientist to think about topics like “the purpose of life,” “the meaning of love,” or “the aims of education.” We usually address questions that can be framed in exact mathematical terms. We present answers (on those rare occasions when we can find them) in the form of graphs, tables, and equations. I am also used to working on problems that people actually expect to be able to answer one day. At the end of a science paper, you can usually tell if that problem has been solved and that it is time to move on to another. I don’t believe anyone expects a definitive answer to the aims of education.

Usually scientists do not write papers without conclusions. We either say we have solved the problem, or we say we haven’t. But this evening, I will not solve anything or present any final conclusions about the aims of education. I will just offer two observations remotely related to the aims of education that I thought about last night while listening to the dishwasher.

It may be appropriate for a cosmologist to address the aims of education; after all, it is a big question. And cosmologists are used to dealing with big questions. Why have cosmologists been strangely silent on the aims of education? We write books and papers about the origin and destiny of the universe, about the nature of space and time, even about a theory of everything. Cosmologists are bold, some might say brazen and reckless. We don’t shy away from big questions. But cosmologists have not addressed the thorny issue of the aims of education—until tonight.

It is a good idea to know something about the background of the person giving an address. You already know I am a cosmologist. Most of you even know what a cosmologist does. At least I hope you know the difference between a cosmologist and a cosmetologist. A cosmetologist deals with the universe of makeup, while a cosmologist deals with the makeup of the universe.

There are also different kinds of cosmologists. Basically, there are three types of cosmologists: those who can count and those who can’t count. Cosmologists can also be separated into observers and theorists. Theoretical cosmologists are expert in starting with very little input and getting a lot of output. Input a few laws of physics, and output the universe. I am proud to be

a theoretical cosmologist, so I am going to input one poem and output an observation concerning the aims of education.

The starting point for my first observation on the aims of education is a poem written by Theodor Geisel. It’s not very long, so I can read the whole thing to you.

My Uncle Terwilliger on the Art of Eating Popovers

My uncle ordered popovers
from the restaurant’s bill of fare.
And, when they were served,
he regarded them
with a penetrating stare . . .
Then he spoke great Words of
Wisdom
as he sat there on that chair:
“To eat these things,”
said my uncle,
“you must exercise great care.
You may swallow down what’s
solid . . .
BUT . . .
you must spit out the air!”

And . . .
as you partake of the world’s bill
of fare,
that’s darned good advice to
follow.
Do a lot of spitting out the hot air.
And be careful what you swallow.

This poem was composed for the ninety-ninth commencement of Lake Forest College and presented on June 4, 1977, by Theodor Geisel, known to most as Dr. Seuss.

Over the next four years you will be served a lot of intellectual popovers. You will be offered a wide variety of treats from the table of intellectual ideas. Some of them will be so outrageous and revolutionary they would make ministers blush, local school board members faint, and parents wonder why they didn’t just send their children to the local community college. So friends, let me propose that an important aim of your education is to learn how to spit out hot air and only swallow what’s solid.

If I were really smart, I would just stop here and sit down, and we could all go back to the dorms and discuss the deeper meaning of Dr. Seuss’s poem. To tell the truth, what I would really like to do is spend the rest of the hour telling you about my latest theory for the dark energy that seems to be driving the basic fabric of cosmic space everywhere in the universe in an ever-increasing expansion.

But one of the rules of the International Union of Professors and Other Useless Professions is to never finish a lecture until you have made every generalization, explored every nuance, and exhausted every subtlety. And if you can’t exhaust each and every subtlety, at least you can exhaust each and every student.

So let me push things a little farther and propose that it is not good enough just to spit out the hot air of whatever intellectual idea you are being fed at the moment, you have to learn to expel the hot air of ideas and beliefs ingested so long ago that you don’t even remember swallowing them. But they are there in the intellectual pit of your

stomach, in the core of your beliefs. You have already swallowed a lot of hot air.

So my first observation concerning the aims of education is that one of the aims is to develop the capacity to question things that you already “know,” uncover your unknown knowns, and expel the hot air.

What do I mean by unknown knowns?

Let me start with the famous words of “The Donald.” Not Trump, but Rumsfeld. In a Department of Defense news briefing on February 12, 2002, Secretary Rumsfeld said:

As we know, there are known knowns. There are things we know we know. We also know there are known unknowns. That is to say, we know there are some things we do not know. But there are also unknown unknowns, the ones we don’t know we don’t know.

Got that? Now for some reason, a lot of comedians have joked about that statement. At first I thought Rumsfeld was just making a little joke, but I could find no evidence that he possesses a sense of humor. Perhaps the secretary of defense should be the one person in the country without a sense of humor. Then I thought about Rumsfeld’s many trips to Afghanistan and figured he was just stimulating the local economy of that poor country by smuggling and using its traditional agricultural cash crop.

But the more I thought about it, the more I realized Rumsfeld was right on. Gradually I came to believe that his statement was just short of brilliant. The only reason it is “short” of brilliant is that Secretary Rumsfeld didn’t go far enough. He should have added,

Finally, there are the unknown knowns, that is to say, there are things we “know” that turn out to be not so.

There is a saying that is variously attributed to Mark Twain, H. L. Mencken, Will Rogers, Winston Churchill, or Harry Truman. But as far as I can tell, it was first published by the somewhat obscure nineteenth-century American writer Charles Farrar Browne, who wrote under the pen name of Artemus Ward. He wrote:

It ain’t so much the things we *don’t* know that get us into trouble. It’s the things we know for sure that just ain’t so.

The fact that you have been admitted to an elite university is evidence that you know a lot. Although you know a lot, hidden among the things you think you know are things that ain’t so. It’s the same for us all. I can’t say what *you* know that ain’t so, anymore than I can say what *I* know that ain’t so. I only know we all have unknown knowns. I’m sorry, we all do.

For example, it was once *known* that Earth is flat, it was once *known* that Earth is the center of our solar system, it was once *known* that the solar system is the center of our galaxy, and it was once *known* that our galaxy is the center of the universe. You

may not believe this, but it wasn't so long ago that everyone *knew* that Pluto was a planet. *Now* we all know those things just ain't so. *Now*, no one believes Earth is flat and is at rest in the center of the universe, at least no one outside of the Kansas State Board of Education.

Let me again suggest that an aim of education is to develop the ability to question all that you know, all that you were ever taught. If the aim of education is to only teach children to read and not to *question* what they read, we will end up with *every* child left behind.

The greatest scientific discoveries have involved overturning unknown knowns. There is no better illustration of spitting out the hot air of unknown knowns than the work of Albert Einstein. Einstein looked at the equations he scribbled while working at his desk in the Swiss Patent Office 101 years ago and expelled the hot air that space and time were absolute and unchanging. Ten years later, as a professor at the University of Berlin, his equations led him to overturn the unknown known that space was flat, rather than curved. Since the time of Euclid, everyone had swallowed the fact that geometry is flat.

Einstein's greatest discoveries came about because he questioned what was known; he reasoned things out for himself, rather than accepting what was known.

Even a genius like Einstein had unknown knowns. In 1917, two years after perfecting his theory of gravity, his equations led him to the almost inescapable conclusion that space should be expanding. Einstein should have predicted the expansion of the universe twelve years before Edwin Hubble, an alumnus of the University of Chicago, looked through a telescope and discovered the expansion. But Einstein didn't. He didn't believe his own equations because he "knew" that space didn't expand. It was only one of Einstein's unknown knowns.

Einstein had other unknown knowns. He just "knew" that quantum mechanics could not be correct. There are always things you "know that ain't so." The greatest scientists throughout history all had them: Copernicus, Kepler, Galileo, and Newton. We have them too.

One of the dangers of unknown knowns is that they lead you to see what you expect to see, not what is really there.

Indeed, some of the greatest scientists have erroneously confirmed the existence of non-existent phenomena. Among the greats who erred in this way were Galen and Leonardo.

During the second century of the Christian era, about the time the Greek astronomer Ptolemy was watching the skies in Alexandria, Clarissimus Galen, a Greek physician living in Rome, was studying human anatomy. A patient and accurate observer of nature, his anatomical investigations were unrivaled in antiquity and hardly surpassed as late as the seventeenth century. For 1,500 years, just as Ptolemy was considered the authority on all things astronomical, Galen was regarded as the authority on matters anatomical. Just as in the case of Ptolemy, Galen's reputation was well deserved. He was responsible for a vast number of discoveries about the human body: For example, he demonstrated that the arteries contain blood and not air,

as popularly believed at the time; he made noteworthy contributions to neurology; and, in an age when most physicians jealously guarded their knowledge lest another physician discover it and steal their patients, Galen published hundreds of papers and books on medicine, along with many on philosophy, comedy, and logic.

In the curious Roman world, where the slaughter of gladiators was considered wholesome family entertainment, the public recoiled with horror at the thought of medical examination of the losers, so most of Galen's information was the result of dissection of apes and other animals. While the bulk of his anatomical observations were true to nature, there were some curious exceptions. Galen believed, as did many physicians of his time, that women had two uterine cavities, one on the right for the male fetus and one on the left for the female fetus. But what concerns us here was his "model" of the human heart.

In *De Usu Partium*, Galen described the anatomy of the human heart and the circulatory system. For well over a thousand years, his was considered the final word on the heart and circulation of the blood. It was not supplanted until William Harvey's great work of 1628. But in Galen's description of the heart, he erroneously reported that the septum was permeated by a multitude of barely perceptible foramina, through which some of the blood exuded from the left ventricle to the right ventricle.

The study of human anatomy in the Western world did not advance much further for a thousand years after Galen, in part because in the equally curious Christian world dissection for the purpose of the acquisition of scientific knowledge was forbidden on the grounds that it was impious to mutilate an image of God (unless the particular image of God was judged to be a witch or a heretic).

Interest in human anatomy was rekindled in the Renaissance. The action and purpose of the human heart could not escape the relentless curiosity of Leonardo da Vinci, who was one of the first of the modern dissectors until Giovanni di Medici, Pope Leo X, banned him from the Roman hospital, calling him "a heretic and cynical dissector of cadavers." Leonardo was well on his way to discovering the principle of the circulatory system, but as in the case of so many of his other investigations, as well as art, he seemed pathologically unable to bring it to a final conclusion. (On another occasion Leo X said of Leonardo, "This man will never finish anything, for he starts by thinking about the end before the work is begun.") Nevertheless, his study of the human heart was without parallel among his contemporaries. Leonardo's red-chalk drawings of the heart show an incredible attention to detail, for the most part rivaling anything to be found in *Gray's Anatomy*, either the book or the television show. In its own way, Leonardo's drawings of the human heart possess the same sublime beauty as the smile of the Mona Lisa.

It is well known that Leonardo was fiercely independent of authority in scientific investigations. He expressed himself in his famous notebooks. He wrote:

I do not understand how to quote from learned authority, but it is

a much greater matter to rely on experience. They scorn me who am a discoverer; yet how much more do they deserve censure that have never found out anything, but only recite and blazon forth other people's works. Those who study only old authors and not the works of nature are stepsons, not sons of nature, who is mother of all good authors.

Yet, despite his declaration that he did not rely on the old authors, when Leonardo drew the human heart he included minute partitions in the septum that were placed there by Galen, not by nature. But Leonardo did not include the partitions because he "trusted" Galen as the supreme authority, but because he thought he actually saw them.

No less an acute observer of nature than Leonardo da Vinci at times saw what he expected to see, not what was really there.

When Leonardo held an open human heart in his hand, he expected to find holes that were just barely large enough to see. And he saw what he expected.

One of the aims of your four years of education here should be to discover your unknown knowns. Challenge yourself! Challenge every sacred idea you have. Nothing is too sacred to challenge. Is there a god? Is there more than one god? Is there an infinite number of gods? (I'm not sure of the answer to that, but the answer to most problems I work on is zero, one, or infinity.) Examine your most deeply held beliefs. Have the courage to face the possibility that something you know just ain't so.

There are many advantages to youth. One of them is that only when you are young do you have the time or inclination to reach down really deep inside and face the unknown knowns. It could be that when we get really old—say, twenty-five years old or so—we are focused on careers, family, graduate school, and other things. Perhaps we become so calcified that the hot air can no longer escape. Maybe it becomes more painful with age to expel the hot air. It seems the longer the hot air stays inside, the harder it is to get it out.

The statement that an aim of education is to discover your unknown knowns is different than the statement that an aim of education is to learn how to think. You already know how to think. You would not have been admitted to an elite university if you didn't already know how to think. I'm not sure education teaches you to think. Anyone who believes that education teaches you to think has never been to a faculty meeting!

The suggestion of a target is the first (and longest) of two points in this address, "Observations concerning the Aims of Education."

Now let me suggest something that should not be a target at which to aim. About the only thing speakers who delivered the last forty Aims of Education Addresses agreed on is this: You are not here to learn job skills. Universities, and certainly not the University of Chicago, are not centers for job training.

Perhaps a better use of your energy is to learn things that will not be part of your future occupation. I say that for two reasons.

The first is that much of *what* you learn over the next four years probably won't be very useful for your occupation. Not only that, but many of you will end up in a different profession than you now foresee.

Most of you may believe you already know what you will do, but let me convince you that may not be so. I've learned that it is easier to convince people by quoting statistics. So let me convince you with some statistics I fabricated last night.

Twenty percent of mathematics majors will end up in software development (that is not too surprising), 14 percent will end up as college professors (presumably in mathematics), but 10 percent will end up in banking or finance, and the remaining 66 percent will be spread over a variety of professions. So, only 14 percent of mathematics majors will end up filling in "mathematician" on their annual IRS 1040 form. Even including software developers as mathematicians, 66 percent of you majoring in mathematics will do something else.

The same is true of majors in the social sciences. Twenty-four percent of history majors will become lawyers. Twenty percent of those in psychology will end up in the business world, and so on. The same trend applies in the humanities as well: of philosophers, 30 percent will become lawyers and 18 percent will end up in software development.

Now, I didn't really make up those statistics, but they must be true because I got them from the Internet. No, actually they were in the 2002 Aims of Education Address delivered by Andrew Abbott. They do agree with my experiences meeting alumni. Of my own students from physics and astronomy, some are in the biological sciences, some are on Wall Street, and some are in various other professions. Only about half are doing physics or astronomy research.

I don't know how relevant the study of the Philosophy of German Idealism is to passing the bar exam, or how useful Fermat's last theorem will be on Wall Street.

Even if you are in the minority who will eventually be a member of a profession directly related to your major, not much of what you learn over the next four years will be used in your daily work. My own experience is that what I learned in physics courses as an undergraduate made it easier to learn the material in graduate classes, which made it easier eventually to learn what I had to learn to do physics research.

The second reason not to aim your education toward your profession is to prevent a life-threatening disease. When I was a child, my grandmother used to worry about something she called "hardening of the arteries." I suspect that is no longer a proper medical diagnosis. Otherwise I would have seen television advertisements featuring smiling people riding bicycles or doing some other activity illustrating the wonderful life that can be yours only if you take some expensive medication to soften your arteries.

The academic equivalent to hardening of the arteries is something that has been referred to as "hardening of the categories."

It is premature for you to allow your categories to harden. Just because you are a history major doesn't mean that you should not study mathematics or physics or cosmology. Some of you are not looking forward to science courses, but you should!

History majors should know of the accomplishments of Einstein, Newton, Darwin, Copernicus, and Galileo. Theirs were some of the greatest intellectual achievements in history. The next four years may be your last opportunity to learn in a classroom setting of the scientific ideas that changed the world and shaped the modern mind. We live in a scientific age. It is surprising to note that in the index of the 1946 abridged (if over seven hundred pages can be considered abridged) version of Arnold Toynbee's 1934–61 classic *A Study of History* (the abridged volume compiled by D. C. Somervell), the names Copernicus, Kepler, Galileo, and Newton do not appear. In Toynbee's complete ten volumes, there are only three brief references to Copernicus, two to Galileo, and three to Newton—all as asides.

In the past century, even in the last year, we have made remarkable advances in our understanding of the composition and origin of the universe, the origin of space and time, the structure of matter, and the first microseconds of the universe.

These ideas, these accomplishments, are today truly understood by at most a few hundred scientists, but everyone can appreciate them.

Some of you may have read a book titled *Stephen Hawking's Universe*. I have great respect and admiration for Hawking; he is a friend and colleague. Perhaps no one knows more about the universe than Stephen. But it's not *his* universe. It's *your* universe too!

You should know that the universe is expanding, and why. It won't help you get into law school, medical school, or business school, but it will help prevent hardening of the categories.

Science majors are also at risk for hardening of the categories. Given the choice between taking yet another physics course or electing a course in eighteenth-century French literature, don't turn your back on the humanities!

My own college education included more than the usual amount of humanities for someone majoring in physics. As a result, when I started graduate school I started slightly behind others who had completed more technical courses. But in a month or so, I caught up. If I had it to do over again, I would have taken a few more history courses and a few less mathematics and physics courses. The technical stuff you can pick up on the streets, or at least in graduate school.

Here at the University of Chicago, you are lucky in this regard. With a traditional strength in a common core, faculty members in the sciences, humanities, and arts link arms together for a common purpose: to fight the great Satans of modern society, the economists. Actually I have great respect for my colleagues in the Economics Department.

Let me conclude by observing that I have suggested only a good target and a bad target for your aims of education. The good target is to develop the ability to swallow only the truly solid and spit out the hot air of ideas, and to expel the hot air of your unknown knowns. The bad target is to view education as development of some set of job skills.

But I have not yet given you any advice on how to hit any target in your own aims of education.

Maybe the best way to be on target in your own aims of education is to follow the procedure of the archer who represented the Greek city of Abdera in the Olympics of ancient Greece. The Olympic team from Abdera was always getting kicked around by Athens and Sparta. They never won—they were perennial losers; they were a joke; they were the Chicago Cubs of ancient Greece.

The king of Abdera was not a great king. Although his name was Alexander,

he was not Alexander the Great. In fact, he is known to historians as Alexander the Adequate. This Alexander finally found a way for Abdera to win an Olympic gold medal when one day he noticed that on the barn of a local farmer was a row of twenty-seven arrows in the dead center of the bull's-eye. He convinced the farmer to represent Abdera in the Olympic archery competition. But it didn't work; the farmer returned to Abdera having finished dead last in the archery competition. Alexander the Adequate couldn't understand how the farmer lost, so he asked him to demonstrate his archery skills. The farmer carefully took aim, let the arrow fly, and then took out his red paint and methodically painted a bull's-eye around where the arrow hit.

So I've suggested one target for your aims of education. You will find your own. You may start your education aiming to be a poet, but end up as a publisher. You are each talented, and you are a student at a great institution. Let your arrows fly with the certainty that they will hit a target, no matter what your aims of education. You can always paint the bull's-eye later.

Edward W. Kolb is Professor in the Department of Astronomy & Astrophysics, Enrico Fermi Institute, and the College; and Chairman, Department of Astronomy & Astrophysics.

Policy on Unlawful Discrimination and Harassment

February 28, 2006

Adopted by the Council of the University Senate, February 28, 2006

SECTION I

Introduction

The University of Chicago is a community of scholars dedicated to research, academic excellence, and the pursuit and cultivation of learning. Members of the University community cannot thrive unless each is accepted as an autonomous individual and is treated without regard to characteristics irrelevant to participation in the life of the University. Freedom of expression is vital to our shared goal of the pursuit of knowledge and should not be restricted by a multitude of rules. At the same time, unlawful discrimination, including harassment, compromises the integrity of the University. It is the intention of the University to take necessary action to prevent, correct, and, where indicated, discipline unlawful harassment.

SECTION II

Unlawful Discrimination and Harassment

This policy is the basis for the University's commitment to conform with the law in regard to nondiscrimination and maintaining a workplace free from sexual harassment and other unlawful forms of harassment.

Discrimination based on factors irrelevant to admission, employment, or program participation violates the University's principles. In keeping with its long-standing traditions and policies, the University of Chicago considers students, employees, applicants for admission or employment, and those seeking access to programs on the basis of individual merit. The University does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, gender, sexual orientation, gender identity, national or ethnic origin, age, disability, veteran status, or other protected classes under the law. Such discrimination is unlawful.

Unlawful harassment based on one of the factors listed above is verbal or physical conduct that is so severe or pervasive that it has the purpose or effect of unreasonably interfering with an individual's work performance or educational program participation, or that creates an intimidating, hostile, or offensive work or educational environment.

A person's subjective belief that behavior is offensive, intimidating, or hostile does not make that behavior unlawful harassment. The behavior must be objectively unreasonable. Expression occurring in an academic, educational, or research context is considered as a special case and is broadly protected by academic freedom. Such expression will not constitute unlawful harassment unless (in addition to satisfying the above definition) it is targeted at a specific person or persons, is abusive, and serves no bona fide academic purpose.

Unlawful harassment includes same-sex harassment and peer harassment among students, staff, or faculty. Unlawful harassment by a faculty member, instructor, or teaching assistant of a student over whom he or she has authority, or by a supervisor of a subordinate, is particularly serious.

Additional Characteristics of Sexual Harassment

Sexual harassment deserves special mention. Sexual harassment encompasses a range of conduct, from sexual assault (a criminal act), to conduct such as unwanted touching or persistent unwelcome comments, e-mails, or pictures of an insulting or degrading sexual nature, which may constitute unlawful harassment, depending upon the specific circumstances and context in which the conduct occurs. For example, sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, or sexually-directed remarks or behavior constitute sexual harassment when (1) submission to or rejection of such conduct is made, explicitly or implicitly, a basis for an academic or employment decision, or a term or condition of either; or (2) such conduct directed against an individual persists despite its rejection.

Romantic relationships that might be appropriate in other contexts may, within a university, create the appearance or fact of an abuse of power or of undue advantage. Moreover, even when both parties have consented at the outset to a romantic involvement, such consent does not preclude a subsequent charge of sexual harassment against the instructor or supervisor. Because of its relevance to sexual harassment, the University's policy on consensual relations in cases where one person has educational or supervisory authority over another is reproduced under section V, "Policy on Consensual Relations between Faculty and Students and between Supervisors and Employees," below.

SECTION III

Procedures for the Resolution of Harassment Complaints

The University's procedures for handling incidents of unlawful harassment place a strong emphasis on resolving complaints informally. The procedures include advising and mediation. It is important to note that the procedures do not preempt other formal or informal channels available within the University.

Persons who believe that their educational or work experience may be compromised by unlawful harassment should feel free to discuss the problem with a faculty member, Dean, or supervisor and, if desired, to request that faculty member, Dean, or supervisor to speak informally to the person complained about. If this does not resolve the matter, or if the individual prefers, the concerned party may make use of any or all of the following three avenues for resolution. No one at the University may reprimand or discriminate against an individual for having initiated an inquiry or complaint in good faith.

A. Advising

An individual who feels he or she has been unlawfully harassed may bring the matter to a complaint advisor whose role is to discuss with the complainant available options on how to proceed (a list of current advisors appears in the *Student Information Manual* and in the *University of Chicago Directory*). The advising is intended to provide a forum for free and open discussion between the complainant and the advisor. Consequently, no record

will be kept of the advising conversation other than an incident report that will not contain the names of either the complainant or the accused and that will be used only to keep a yearly record of the number of different types of reported incidents. Every attempt will be made to protect the privacy of the individuals involved in an advising conversation about unlawful harassment. If the advisor learns of allegations that are so serious they obligate the University to act, then, upon the recommendation of the coordinating officer or Provost, there will be an administrative response, which may include a formal investigation and will include notifying germane administrative or managerial personnel (e.g., Department Chairperson and/or Dean in matters involving faculty members and other academic personnel, and supervisors, managers, and/or directors in matters involving staff employees).

Complaint advisors will be selected and supervised by the coordinating officer (a position filled by a member of the Provost's office) for a two-year term and will be drawn from a variety of different areas throughout the University. (For example, they may be resident heads, Deans of Students, the ombudsperson, or faculty members). The number of advisors should be sufficiently large that individuals from all areas in the University are able to have access to the advisors. Advisors will be required to participate in a program designed to make them familiar with the issues involved in dealing with unlawful harassment cases.

B. Mediation

When a complaint is brought to the complaint advisor, the complainant may ask for a mediated meeting with the accused. The goal of the mediation procedure is to provide a forum where the complainant and the accused can, with the aid of a third party, come to a mutually agreed upon resolution. Consequently, mediation will occur only if both the complainant and the accused are willing to participate in the process. The complaint advisor may serve as mediator or suggest a third party such as the coordinating officer or a faculty member of the Unlawful Harassment Panel (see below) to act as mediator.

C. Formal Investigation

Any person who wishes to discuss a possible complaint of unlawful harassment may use the informal advising and mediation avenues described above. But either the complainant or the accused may at any time ask that the matter under discussion be handled formally rather than informally. The appropriate procedure for a formal complaint depends on who is being accused of harassment.

If the person accused of harassment is a student, a formal complaint should be addressed within the procedures for student discipline described in the *Student Information Manual*.

If the person accused of harassment is a staff employee of the University, a staff member from University Human Resources Management will guide the employee through the appropriate formal review process. Both parties must be informed of the outcome.

If the person accused of harassment is a faculty member or other member of the

academic staff (such as a research associate, lecturer, or librarian), the formal complaint procedures described below apply.

D. Procedures for Faculty and Other Academic Personnel

Once a formal investigation has been requested, the Unlawful Harassment Panel will move to comply as quickly as possible. The panel consists of three faculty members appointed by the Provost for three-year terms (with the possibility of reappointment) and the ombudsperson (as a nonvoting student member). The coordinating officer will sit with the panel ex officio, but does not vote. A list of the current members of the Unlawful Harassment Panel can be found in the *University of Chicago Directory*.

It is the task of the panel to determine the facts. At any time in its proceedings, the panel may decide that the complaint should be rejected as clearly unfounded. The panel will be provided with written statements from the complainant and the accused, and if necessary, will interview persons with knowledge bearing on the matter, including the complainant and the accused. The proceedings will be kept confidential.

If the complaint is found to have merit, the panel will relay its findings to the Provost who will take appropriate action (for example, a reprimand, leave of absence without pay, or invocation of statutory procedures for termination). If the complaint is found to have no merit (or if the facts cannot be established), the complaint will be dismissed. Both parties must be informed of the outcome.

A report of a justified complaint, including the Provost's action, is placed in the accused's official file in the Office of the Provost.

SECTION IV

Yearly Report on Unlawful Harassment to the Council of the University Senate

A yearly report will be made to the Council of the University Senate (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. The report will be prepared by the coordinating officer and reviewed and approved by the Unlawful Harassment Panel whose Chair will present it to the council.

SECTION V

Policy on Consensual Relations between Faculty and Students and between Supervisors and Employees

Because those who teach are entrusted with guiding students, judging their work, giving grades for papers and courses, and recommending students to colleagues, instructors are in a delicate relationship of trust and power. This relationship must not be jeopardized by possible doubt of intent or of fairness of professional judgment, or by the appearance to other students of favoritism. Supervisory employment relations involve similar obligations of fairness and seeming

fairness in the management and evaluation of employees.

One of the tenets of our policy and our commitment to a climate free from sexual harassment has been the view that it is unwise and inappropriate for faculty or other instructors who have romantic relations with students to teach such students in a class, supervise them in research or graduate work, or recommend them for fellowships, awards, or employment, or for employees who have romantic relations with employees under their supervision to maintain their supervisory status.

Such romantic relationships may sometimes develop. Prudence and the best interest of students and employees dictate that in such circumstances of romantic involvement, the faculty member, instructor, or supervisor should promptly report the relationship to the appropriate Chair, Dean,

or supervisor, who will then help find other instructional or supervisory arrangements in a way that safeguards the welfare of the student or subordinate. Such alternatives may include, for example, ceasing to have the student take courses with the instructor or moving the subordinate employee to a different reporting relationship. Faculty and supervisors should keep in mind that initial consent to a romantic relationship does not preclude a charge of sexual harassment in the future.

SECTION VI

Compliance and Locating This Policy

A. Regulations Prohibiting Unlawful Discrimination

The University's policy is consistent with federal, state, and local regulations gov-

erning nondiscrimination and unlawful harassment including: the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, the Americans with Disabilities Act, the Civil Rights Acts of 1964 and 1991, Executive Order 11246, the Equal Pay Act of 1963, the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (as amended), Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, the Illinois Human Rights Act, the City of Chicago Human Rights Ordinance, and the Cook County Human Rights Ordinance.

B. Access to Information on Discrimination and Harassment

The University's policy on unlawful discrimination and harassment can be found in the *Student Manual of University Policies and Regulations* (<http://www.uchicago.edu/docs/studentmanual/>) and on University Human Resources Management's Web site (<http://www.hr.uchicago.edu/policy/>).

The complete text of the University's unlawful harassment policy can also be found in *The University of Chicago Record*, vol.41,no.1 (<http://www.uchicago.edu/docs/education/record/>).

Annual Report of the Independent Review Committee for the University of Chicago Police Department

May 2006

In the spring of 2005, the long-standing Committee on University Security was reconstituted as the Independent Review Committee for the University of Chicago Police Department (UCPD). This report describes the committee's work and sets forth its observations and recommendations regarding complaints against the University of Chicago Police Department (UCPD) and related procedural issues for the 2004–05 academic year.

I. Committee Reconstituted

Under the leadership of Randolph Stone, Clinical Professor of Law, a new committee was created to more actively review complaints against UCPD and related policy and procedural issues. Initial work focused on discussing suggestions made by committees working on the Provost's Initiative on Minority Issues, as well as suggestions made by related student groups and forums. The committee created a new charge document (Appendix I) that added the following directives to the original responsibilities of the Committee on University Security:

- In response to expanded police boundaries and constituent suggestions, community members will be represented on the committee.
- The ability to review UCPD's complaint-related policies and procedures, in addition to complaints themselves, is now part of the committee's responsibility.

In summary, the charge of the reconstituted Independent Review Committee is to review and comment on complaints against the UCPD involving charges of excessive force, violation of rights, and abusive language. The committee can share opinions and make recommendations to the President of the University of Chicago and Vice-President for Community and Government Affairs regarding the actions and procedures of the UCPD, but it cannot revise any action the department has taken on a complaint determination.

II. Campus and Community Communication

One of the committee's first tasks was to provide input and oversight on communication plans developed by the Office of Community Affairs to expand awareness of UCPD services in general and complaint procedures and policies in particular. UCPD posters were distributed on campus and in the community during the fall of 2005, UCPD officers received new business cards and information sheets for use in the community, and a new Web site (<http://oca.uchicago.edu-safety-police/>) was developed that has greatly improved campus and community access to UCPD information and the complaint process.

III. Complaint Summaries and Review

There were nineteen complaints filed against the UCPD in the 2004–05 academic year. (See Figure 1.) Five did not involve charges of excessive force, violation of rights, and/or abusive language; two cases are pending; and three involve internal complaints that do not require committee review. The remaining nine complaints involving charges of excessive force, violation of rights, and/or

abusive language were reviewed carefully by the committee.

In terms of process, an initial investigation by the UCPD places the complaint into one of the following categories:

Unfounded. The allegations are not factually accurate; the alleged conduct did not occur.

Exonerated. The conduct did occur, but was justified under the circumstances.

Sustained. The alleged conduct did occur, and was not justified under the circumstances.

Not Sustained. The written record of the investigation does not permit a determination of whether the alleged conduct occurred. A classification of "Not Sustained" is used whenever a case involves conflicting stories that are not clearly resolvable on the basis of the testimony of disinterested witnesses or there are material internal contradictions in the complainant's account. A "Not Sustained" classification does not imply, directly or indirectly, any finding of fault on the part of the accused officer.

IV. Committee Case Reviews

The committee agrees with the findings of UCPD investigations in the vast majority of cases. Certain procedures and processes used in the complaint management and investigative process, however, did raise some committee concerns. See Section V below for a summary of these general concerns and committee recommendations.

The committee respectfully submits its disagreement with two UCPD complaint determinations. These two cases and committee comments are summarized below.

CR 5-3-06

Case Summary

The complainant was observed inside a locked building, Blaine Hall (which is part of the University of Chicago Laboratory Schools), after a silent alarm was tripped. When the complainant saw officers, he ran out the door. An officer apprehended the complainant on the Midway Plaisance; he was placed in custody and transferred to the District 21 Police Station. The complainant alleges that the officer struck him with a

nightstick when he was lying on the ground during the arrest.

Committee Concerns and Position

1. No statements exist in the case file from the accused officer or other officers who were on the scene.

2. Based on the information the committee has available, we believe the determination should be "Not Sustained"; the written record of the investigation does not permit a determination of whether the alleged conduct occurred. The "Unfounded" determination submitted by UCPD assumes the allegations are not factually accurate and that the alleged conduct did not occur. The committee finds no written records to support this determination.

CR 4-11-10

Case Summary

The case concerns the November 2, 2004, encounter between UCPD officers and the complainant. The officers responded to a call regarding a "suspicious person" in the lobby of the Mott Building. The complain-

Figure 1. Complaint Cases Reviewed by the Independent Review Committee Filed July 2004 through June 2005

CR Number	Date of Filing	Complainant		Allegation	Date Decision Rendered	UCPD Disposition	Notes
		Race	Gender				
04-06-06	7-1-04	Black	Male	Excessive force	7-30-04	Unfounded (complaint withdrawn)	Complainant withdrew complaint after being informed about UCPD policies.
4-9-07	9-12-04	Black	Female	Excessive force	9-22-04	Unfounded	
4-10-08	10-19-04	Other	Male	Abusive language of van driver	9-22-04	Unfounded (complaint withdrawn)	Investigation terminated after complainant could not be located; van driver resigned before investigation began.
4-10-09	10-26-04	Black	Male	Excessive force	11-28-04	Unfounded (complaint withdrawn)	Complaint withdrawn because complainant could not be reached for a statement.
4-11-10	11-4-04	Black	Male	Excessive force and abusive language	12-7-04	Not sustained	See Section IV for committee comment.
5-3-06	4-1-05	White	Male	Excessive force	5-18-05	Unfounded	See Section IV for committee comment.
5-4-08		White	Female	Excessive force	8-23-05	Not sustained	Officer resigned.
5-4-09	4-20-05	Black	Male	Threats of force	9-8-05	Two charges: Exonerated; not sustained	
5-5-11	5-10-05	White	Female	Officer entered residence without authorization	8-23-05	Sustained	Officer resigned.

ant—a University employee who is an African American—alleged that during the encounter the officers harassed him, made inappropriate comments to him, yanked his arm, and handcuffed him.

Committee Concerns and Position

The committee believes the incident itself was handled less than optimally. The committee believes the officers on site during the initial contact with the complainant and those involved in the investigation at the UCPD Station had ample opportunity to de-escalate the situation, but this opportunity was not taken. Verifying the complainant's employment status, the committee believes, could have been expedited. After learning that the complainant was indeed an employee and receiving applicable information from the Chicago Police Department, the complainant should have been promptly released.

Regarding the investigation process, the committee questions how, given the same set of facts, investigating officers and administrators came up with different case dispositions and recommendations for punitive action against the officers. The following summarizes the investigation process:

- The first investigating officer concluded that the complainant, a University employee, was unnecessarily detained, was harassed, and was a victim of racial profiling. Recommends officer termination.
- A lieutenant agrees with first investigating officer's findings. Recommends suspension for both officers.
- The UCPD assistant director determines all allegations "Not Sustained." Recommends reprimand for charged officer for failing to wear a proper uniform.
- UCPD director upholds the assistant director's determination and concludes in writing to the complainant that there was no evidence that supports allegations that the officers acted improperly under the circumstances.
- Notes from the investigation indicate that the investigating officer had to speak with both the director and one of the assistant directors regarding the lack of cooperation of senior department personnel during the investigation.

The Independent Review Committee's position on case 4-11-10 is as follows:

- Most committee members agree with the initial findings of the first investigating officer.
- The committee takes no position on disciplinary judgments.
- The committee disagrees with how decisions on this case were made.
- The committee disagrees with the resolution of the case.

The committee recommends improvements be made in procedures and standards for overturning determinations by initial complaint investigators, especially when senior officers are directly involved in the case. In order for the investigation process to function, all involved must be cooperative and forthcoming. In a hierarchical system such as the UCPD, it is particularly important for this message to be sent, in both words and actions, from the top down. This did not seem to be occurring in this case.

V. Recommendations

From our work over the past year, which included discussions of CR 4-11-10 and other cases outlined above, the committee would like to make the following general recommendations for University and UCPD consideration:

1. Develop Detailed Internal Policies

Governing UCPD Stops

The committee understands that UCPD General Orders follow standard "Stop and Frisk" procedures (i.e., a person is not "stopped" or detained by police in a public place unless there are specific facts leading a police officer to believe a crime might be occurring). However, in light of CR 4-11-10 and other complaints, the committee would like to explore the feasibility of developing a set of policies that can better guide "stops" and "encounters" by UCPD officers that occur either on and off campus.

The committee believes that it is important for the UCPD to protect and serve residents of the greater University community and their property in situations that do not fall into the typical crime investigation model—situations that are commonly referred to as "community caretaking." Community caretaking denotes a wide range of everyday police activities undertaken to aid those in danger of physical harm, preserve property, or create and maintain a feeling of security in the community. For example, when a person is stranded at night by the side of the road outside her disabled car, we would expect a passing UCPD officer to investigate the situation and offer assistance. In a college campus setting, there is an increased need for police to provide such help.

In addition to and outside of community caretaking, there are instances in which an officer's interest in a person or a situation warrants further investigation even when the circumstances do *not* establish reasonable suspicion for an investigative stop. Here we are talking about traditional law enforcement investigatory functions. When an officer reasonably believes that investigation is warranted, the officer can and should investigate the situation. Consider the CR 04-11-10 case described above. While a report of a "suspicious person" on University property may not create a reasonable suspicion to justify a stop or seizure, everyone on the committee agrees that it was not only appropriate but desirable for the UCPD officers to approach the complainant and ask him certain questions to investigate the circumstances of his presence. Indeed, we would be troubled if UCPD officers did not try to investigate the situation after receiving such a report.

We believe it is appropriate and desirable for officers in these situations to initiate consensual encounters. We emphasize the term "consensual." When an officer approaches an individual in such a circumstance, the law is clear that the person is free to decline to answer any questions posed by the officer or talk with the officer. Further, the officer may not detain the person in the absence of reasonable individualized suspicion.

We recommend that the UCPD develop guidelines for consensual encounters. Consistent with existing UCPD practices, the UCPD should emphasize courteous behavior and other methods of ensuring that the

citizen encountered is treated respectfully.

Because of the inherent discretion involved in these encounters and the potential for bias (real or perceived), the UCPD should consider requiring its officers to articulate and record the basis for each investigative consensual encounter (e.g., in the form of a contact card).

2. Expand Commitment to Sensitivity and Diversity Training and Retraining

Police image is a vital ingredient in obtaining the public trust. It must be earned daily by demonstrating the highest standards of professionalism and personal integrity. The actions of one rogue cop can tarnish the image of an entire department. High-profile allegations of racial and ethnic insensitivity against just one member of a department can put an entire department under suspicion.

The UCPD should expand its training programs by using new education initiatives and models in addition to those offered to Chicago Police Department officers. The committee believes increased departmental attention to training will serve to prevent questionable behavior and hopefully enhance skills needed for effective campus- and community-oriented policing.

A departmental code of ethics should be devised that sets forth goals for and responsibilities of each officer and the department in general regarding integrity. Although we recognize that many UCPD officers are highly trained members of the Chicago Police Department, we argue that training standards for the UCPD should be even higher. Officers should be instructed in what is expected of them as street ambassadors and in how to properly exercise their authority, achieve a proper attitude in dealing with campus and community citizens and suspects, be skilled in ways to de-escalate confrontations, and have a high-level of awareness and sensitivity to diverse cultural lifestyles in the multicultural community that the UCPD serves.

3. Ensure That a Standard Case File System Is Used for Record Keeping

Case information must be compiled with care and provided to the committee in a consistent format. Every case file should contain a case summary and a checklist of other documents included. Testimony and investigative conversations with officers need to be documented even if complaints are eventually withdrawn.

4. Provide Sufficient Staff Support for Processing

The committee believes the implementation of the above recommendations and ongoing improvements to the complaint process can be achieved only by having the support of top administrative UCPD officials and the dedicated attention of a senior officer or staff member. The committee itself could also benefit from additional UCPD support to ensure the timely and organized flow of data and information.

VI. Conclusion

The committee commends the UCPD for its cooperation and its dedication to enhancing public safety, both on our campus and in our neighborhood communities. The number of complaints recorded represents a tiny fraction of the thousands of police

contacts with members of the University community over this past academic year. We believe the UCPD is committed to providing effective law enforcement that reduces crime, protects individual rights, and builds community trust.

We hope our recommendations regarding improvements to policies relating to the investigation process, community caretaking, sensitivity training, and administrative and staffing issues will be strongly considered.

Members of the Committee

Committee Chair

Randolph Stone, *Clinical Professor, Law School*

Faculty and Staff Representatives

Craig Futterman, *Clinical Associate Professor, Law School*

Amy Kim, *Former Associate General Counsel, Office of Legal Counsel*

Tracey Meares, *Professor and Director, Center for Studies in Criminal Justice*

Sheila Yarbrough, *Associate Dean of Students, Student Affairs, Office of the Vice-President and Dean of Students in the University*

Student Representatives

Ryan Kaminski

Remy Morrison

Bex Palkovics

Community Representatives

Brad Jonas (Hyde Park)

Melvin Lewis (North Kenwood)

Joe Strickland (Woodlawn)

Committee Staff

Michelle Olson, *Director of External and Government Affairs, Office of Community and Government Affairs, 773-834-8006, molson@uchicago.edu*

Report of the Panel on Sexual Harassment for 2004–05

January 24, 2006

The Policy and Procedures concerning Sexual Harassment (adopted by the Council of the University Senate, May 8, 1990, and revised on February 12, 2002) require that an annual report be made to the council (1) describing the University's program to prevent sexual harassment and (2) reviewing the incidents brought to the attention of the sexual harassment complaint advisors or the Panel on Sexual Harassment. This is the report for 2004–05.

Prevention and Education

Sexual Harassment: A Guide to Support Services was updated to indicate the latest contact information for complaint advisors and other resource personnel. An announcement about the availability of the revised brochures was sent electronically to Deans, Chairs, and other University leaders urging them to post the brochure and request copies for students, faculty, and staff in their areas. A new companion brochure, *Support Services in Case of Sexual Assault or Sexual Abuse*, also was distributed to units requesting sexual harassment brochures this year.

Fall orientation programs continue to be popular for sexual harassment presentations, with graduate students, tutors, and teaching assistants being the primary audiences. Presentations to employee groups during the year are more *ad hoc*. Audiences show particular interest in the definition of sexual harassment and how complaints can be resolved. This year unit-sponsored presentations helped individuals with concerns feel comfortable raising issues that needed to be addressed. Efforts to provide more presentations will continue.

Regular meetings of complaint advisors involved group processing of "cases" and discussing their handling in a way that protected the privacy of all parties involved. Complaint advisors also reviewed materials produced by Perspectives, the University's employee assistance program;

the American Medical Association; United Educators; and administrative agencies, such as the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. Discussion continued of how the benefits of our well-designed and largely successful process for addressing complaints of sexual harassment could be extended to include other complaints of unlawful harassment.

Representatives of central student services and human resources offices met with complaint advisors, as did University counsel. Discussions centered on support services, conflict resolution skills, and recent trends in case law. A guide for handling complaint interviews was created and distributed to complaint advisors.

Lawsuits Resulting from 2003–04 Complaints

Two of last year's complaints resulted in lawsuits. The case involving two staff employees complaining of sexual harassment from coworkers is still pending. The charge made against a University academic staff member by an employee of an affiliated employer progressed to a lawsuit in 2004–05 and is pending.

New Complaints

There are no formal and six informal complaints of sexual harassment to report for 2004–05.

One student shared in a public manner a report that a faculty member had made a sexually related comment. The faculty member, who had been warned in the past about his breach of professionalism and the way his comments had been perceived by others, admitted making the comment but denied any intention to offend. In a meeting with a unit administrator and the Associate Provost, the faculty member was reminded of the seriousness of the described behavior and the University's expectation that such conduct not be repeated.

A student contacted a complaint advisor about a faculty member's conduct, which

the student considered to be retaliatory in response to the ending of a consensual relationship. The Associate Provost met with the faculty member, who acknowledged the behavior and agreed to discontinue it. The individuals were from different departments, and the student has had no further complaints.

A staff member complained that the academic staff unit head had left on their shared computer a document containing violent, sexually explicit personal material. After interviewing the unit head and consulting with the Office of Legal Counsel, the Associate Provost and the Dean met with the unit head. The unit head then resigned. The complainant was satisfied with the resolution.

One complaint advisor was contacted by an administrator who had received complaints from staff and others that an academic staff member made frequent sexually suggestive gestures and comments. The Chair determined that the reports were reliable. In a meeting with the academic staff member and Associate Provost, the academic staff member acknowledged the conduct and was warned that confirmed reports of similar behavior in the future could result in discharge. There have been no other complaints.

A staff employee reported to the departmental administrator that a supervisor had expressed his sexual attraction. The employee was given information about the University's resources for handling sexual harassment complaints. The employee failed to contact a complaint advisor or the Associate Provost and filed a sexual harassment charge with a fair employment practice agency. The charge was investigated, and the agency dismissed it.

A student complained to a complaint advisor of another student's repeated unwanted, sexually related, threatening behavior. After a second incident, an investigation identified the accused and determined that he was not a University

of Chicago student. A trespass letter was issued, and a police report was filed.

Questions and Related Matters

Thirteen inquiries were received.

Students and administrators contacted complaint advisors and the Associate Provost about other matters. Such conversations often help the individual examine the situation, weigh the alternatives, and decide on a course of action that brings the problem to a satisfactory resolution. Further assistance from the complaint advisors and the University is always available if a problem persists or resumes.

Of the thirteen notable contacts, three were from students who had safety concerns for themselves or another student. Two contacts were from students or groups of students seeking assistance with managing their academic progress in a unit where a faculty member repeatedly made offensive personal comments and consistently disrespected professional boundaries. Two individuals discussed issues related to former consensual relationships. The remaining contacts involved advising on sexual assault resources, harassment due to sexual orientation, an administrative response to inappropriate behavior by someone other than a University student or employee, and problematic electronic communications.

Note: Sexual harassment complaints handled through the University House System are not included in this report.

Members of the Panel on Sexual Harassment, 2004–05

Kathleen Conzen, *Chair*

Marsha Rosner

Michael Stein

Victor Muñoz-Fraticelli, *Student*

Ombudsperson, *ex officio*

Aneesah Ali, *Associate Provost,*
ex officio

The 485th Convocation

Address: "Education in the Interrogative Mode"

By James K. Chandler

June 9 and 10, 2006

You happy graduates, along with your families and friends, have my heartiest congratulations. Of course, you will have been here long enough by now to sense that the institution that will be conferring your degree today is a little peculiar. It is often said in these precincts that this university is distinguished from most others because it has so powerful an idea of itself. I once thought this sort of talk was just the stuff of local legend, but I've learned better since. It is in fact a view of the place that is widely shared in higher education, well beyond these walls. But just what is the idea of the University of Chicago?

Each of you, from your experience here, will have your own thoughts on the subject, but you may not have had occasion to put them into words. A few years ago, for a special faculty report, I was asked to do just that. Begging your indulgence, I'd like to read a short passage from what I wrote then, in slightly redacted form:

We at the University take pride in our ability to explain ourselves, to give the reasons why we are investigating what we are investigating, and for the manner and means we are using to do so. The other side of this coin is a conspicuous emphasis on the question as a form of discourse. The University has developed a celebrated—some would say notorious—brand of academic civility. It is a place where one is always in principle allowed to pose the hardest question possible—of a student, a teacher, or a colleague—and feel entitled to expect gratitude rather than resentment for one's effort. This trait is frequently noted (not always approvingly) by scholars from other institutions who visit us. We have a reputation as a testing site for new arguments. When Max Weber wrote about the scholar's obsession with devil's advocacy, he could have been talking about the University of Chicago.

"This dedication to the interrogative mode," I concluded, "is what makes the place so stressful for those who don't share its values and so exhilarating for those who do."

I trust your presence here today means that you do—that you have come to embrace our curious code of civility, and with it, the discipline of overcoming defensiveness in the face of difficult objections, of seeking them rather than fleeing them. If your education here has gone well, indeed, you will by now have acquired what the ancient rhetoricians called the art of *prolepsis*. This is the knack of anticipating possible objections in the course of making your arguments. If your education has gone well, you will have come to believe that the best work—the best argument, theory, or judgment—is work that takes account of the hardest questions that might be posed against it even before they are raised.

I can imagine that you might right now be wanting to object that all this attention to the interrogative mode leaves our style of academic culture vulnerable. You might think it vulnerable, for example, to

the invidious boast of other universities that they produce leaders, not scholars—a distinction that is not only invidious but also false, as I'll try to show in a minute. Perhaps you also worry that our attention to the interrogative mode is vulnerable to a certain kind of ridicule. Even if you don't know Eugene Ionesco's wonderful absurdist drama, *Rhinoceros*, you might be conjuring up a figure like "the Professor." The play's existential protagonist, Berenger, finds that the citizens of his town, one by one, are turning into big, horned beasts with leathery skin. Berenger sends for help from various quarters, including from the local university. As soon as the Professor arrives, he proceeds to hold forth at great length on the species-being of the rhinoceros, offering a detailed inquiry into the difference between the one-horned and two-horned varieties. When he is finally finished, Berenger, points out to the Professor that he doesn't seem to have given them any helpful advice in solving their urgent problem. "No I have not," says the Professor, holding up a finger to the sky as he exits stage right, "but at least now the question is properly posed."

Our bet here is that the quality of your questions matters a lot, that it matters to how you take on the world, and that it matters whether you are an astrophysicist or an Assyriologist. This is the bet on which Steve Levitt wages his considerable intellectual capital in the recent best seller *Freakonomics: A Rogue Economist Explores the Hidden Side of Everything*, where he describes economics as "a science with excellent tools for giving answers but a serious shortage of interesting questions." The modern world is indeed knowable in spite of its confusion, Levitt maintains, so long as "the right questions are asked." But must we not now ask in turn: what makes a question interesting or right? What makes a question good?

A good question, one of my colleagues recently told me, is a question to which you don't know the answer. At first, this elegant answer seemed to settle the matter. But then I thought of Carlo Ginzburg, the great Italian historian, and his two-step working method. Step one is to thrash around in the archives until you have a moment of illumination. Step two, the hard part, is to determine, as precisely as possible, the question to which your insight is the answer. Ginzburg is a brilliant poser of questions—he famously asked: What does it mean that a sixteenth-century Italian miller should imagine the world as a large piece of cheese consumed by worms? But since it turns out he in some sense knows the answers to his questions beforehand, his not knowing them can't be a necessary condition of their being good. Nor is "not knowing the answer" a sufficient condition of a good question. To ask why humans made dinosaurs extinct, rather than the other way around, is to pose a question with so little knowledge of the answer as to be all but worthless.

Suppose we were to say that a good question relates something you know to something you want to find out. The more you know—that is, the better informed your desire for discovery—the better the question. But then how does a good question point the way between what is known and what is yet to be known or known in

a new way? There is an element of reason involved, to be sure, and, like Ionesco's Professor, many of us here assembled pride ourselves on our reasoning powers. But I want to suggest there is another element as well. Let's call it imagination or "negative capability," which is what John Keats called it when he was about the age of most of you.

This is where the poets have something to teach us all—no matter what our field of interest—for poets seem to be completely at home in the interrogative mode. They love, for example, to open their poems with questions:

What happens to a dream deferred?
(Langston Hughes)

What passing-bells for those who
die as cattle?
(Wilfred Owen)

They love to pose questions along the way, as Elizabeth Bishop does in her searching poem, "Questions of Travel":

Should we have stayed at home and
thought of here?
Where should we be today?
Is it right to be watching strangers
in a play
in this strangest of theatres? . . .
Is it lack of imagination that makes
us come
to imagined places, not just stay at
home?

And most of all, poets love to close their poems with questions:

O chestnut-tree, great rooted
blossomer
Are you the leaf, the blossom or the
bole?
O body swayed to music, O
brightening glance,
How can we know the dancer from
the dance?

That's William Butler Yeats in his long poem about education: "Among School Children."

Keats's own exemplar of negative capability was Shakespeare, whom he considered the greatest poet in the language. Can it be a coincidence, I wonder, that Shakespeare begins his own greatest work, *Hamlet*, with the young protagonist's interrogating what he calls the "questionable shape" of his father's ghost? Or that the play sustains its intensity with questions like the one Hamlet posed of the actor he auditions for his mousetrap ("What's Hecuba to him, or he to Hecuba, that he should weep for her?")? Or that that most celebrated of questions—to be or not to be—lies at the very heart of the matter? Hamlet, you might object, was a bit of a dreamer. But here it is crucial to recall that his questions were not only about the other world. He intuited that his father's ghost, rightly questioned, would tell him much about what was rotten in the state of Denmark. And he famously admonished his friend Horatio that there were more things in heaven and earth than were dreamt of in his philosophy. Hamlet's questions, you see, helped him to negotiate both worlds. And though they did not save

his life, they did help to release the poison from the system, and they ensured that not only would his story be told by those who survived him, but also that it would be an ennobling story.

In the end, the key thing to understand about good questions is that they open us to the world even as they focus the mind at the same time, which is why the antithesis of scholarship and leadership is so misleading. Last month, at a national humanities meeting in Philadelphia, I heard an address by an Iowa congressman—a Republican, as it happens—who made a similar point with a pointed question about questions. "Is it not likely," he asked, "that our national leaders would have asked better questions—and thus made better decisions—about Iraq, for instance, if they had seriously pondered the intricate exchanges of the Melian dialogue in Thucydides' *History of the Peloponnesian War*?"

Here, where Thucydides' book is still widely read and debated, I suspect many of us will agree with the congressman, though perhaps not without a further question or two. The greatest scholars and the greatest leaders alike must be responsive to the best and toughest questions, and they can do this only if they know how to pose them. It is not enough to have an insight or an intuition. You must be able to say what question it answers, and why, and what questions it leaves yet to be resolved. With this unquestionably sound wisdom in mind, then, I encourage you—whatever your discipline, whatever your plans—to go forth and practice, with relish and abandon, the supremely important art that you have begun to master within these walls.

James K. Chandler is the Barbara E. and Richard J. Franke Professor in the Department of English Language & Literature; Committees on the History of Culture, Cinema & Media Studies, and Interdisciplinary Studies in the Humanities; and the College.

Remarks

By Michael R. Bloomberg
June 10, 2006

I want to thank you, President Randel, for that kind introduction. You do have a wonderful mayor here in Chicago, Richard Daley, and I can tell you that—you can give him a round of applause. He deserves it. Anybody who can stop the rain just as the procession starts deserves a round of applause.

I do hope Chicago forgives New York for stealing President Randel away. He is actually coming to our city's Mellon Foundation as the flip side to the trade that sent pitcher José Contreras from the Yankees to the White Sox. And if he does half as well as José, the Mellons will be very happy, rest assured.

It's great to be here in Chicago—"Oprahland, U.S.A.," home of "da Bears" and my favorite band, the Blues Brothers! Where is John Belushi now that we need him?

For me also, being on this campus is a dream come true. To join you here in the very place that the movie *Proof* was filmed, to stand where Gwyneth Paltrow once stood, this is the pinnacle. This is why I went into politics!

Let me begin by assuring you, the graduates, of two things:

First, I'm not going to talk about some of the T-shirts I've seen being worn around campus. While your parents are proud you're graduating from this august institution, they don't need to see the one that says that the University of Chicago is "where fun comes to die."

And second, I know some of you got in rather late from hanging out at the Pub, picking up those free shot glasses and other essentials, so I will make this relatively brief. I don't want to be the biggest hurdle between you and your chance to step on that University seal in the Reynolds Club, so we'll move right along.

Before I give you the traditional commencement day speech of advice on how to secure wealth and happiness and spiritual peace for the rest of your lives, and in the spirit of Professor Chandler's earlier speech, let me pose a question. The question is: "How did we get to this day . . . you and I?"

How did we both arrive at this ceremony—on this beautiful quadrangle—surrounded by stunning neo-Gothic limestone architecture—and one pink, purple, yellow, and orange thing I saw some place back there?

Well, in your case, you submitted an application four years ago—you were accepted. Here's a copy of the application. How you did it, I have no idea. There are these infamous University of Chicago essay questions. My favorite is Essay Question Number 3: "What is something you love because it reflects a kind of idiosyncratic beauty? 'A drinking glass with an interesting flaw,' 'the uneven features of a mutt you adopted at the pound,' 'a feather boa you found in a Wal-Mart parking lot.'" I couldn't make this stuff up. When I applied to college, the toughest question I had to answer was, "How do you explain that *D* in eleventh-grade French?"

Okay, well, that's not how you guys do it, but I guess the question is: "How did I get here today?" Well, don't worry. I'm not going to give you my entire life story. If you're curious, it's all in my autobiography, *Bloomberg by Bloomberg*—a magnificently written, *Da Vinci Code*-like page-turner currently ranked number 187,733 on amazon.com.

But humor me a bit, and let me give you the CliffsNotes:

I parked cars to pay my way through college. Then business school. Then Wall Street—rising through the ranks from being a lowly clerk to being a general partner of a large investment banking firm.

As a working-class kid from a small town in Massachusetts, it really was a fifteen-year wonderful ride—full of fun times, and long business trips, and endless jet lag, and lots of encouragement and praise from my bosses—right up until the day they fired me!

Still, even then I remained optimistic. Literally the next morning, I took a chance on something I thought might be even better. I started my own company.

We began with four employees . . . in a one-room office with no product, no customers. And today, twenty years later, that enterprise is, if I can brag a little bit, a reasonably successful global financial

company—one that feeds my daughters and allows me to work for a dollar a year.

Those were my first two careers. But, seriously, what happened after that?

It was interesting. I began to notice friends in public service who had a glint in their eyes. They'd found a satisfaction—the satisfaction of helping others, the satisfaction that I had never experienced. So I made another choice about five years ago: to seek a new career by running for mayor of one of the greatest cities in the world. Every political expert said I had no shot, which was, of course, like waving the proverbial red flag in front of a bull.

And so I went for it because the chance to try something new and important, something that everyone said couldn't be done, was just too exciting to pass up.

Happily, the people gave me that chance, and I've had the opportunity to practice in the public sphere what I did in private business.

On every issue I've faced—from fighting crime to promoting public health, from improving the quality of life to balancing the budget—I've tried to do what you should all do for the rest of your lives: Don't over-engineer it. Don't avoid accepting the challenge. Just set the right priorities and approach each problem with honesty, integrity, and a big dose of common sense. And from the start, I knew the only way to do that was to maintain the one essential attribute: independence.

And that's really what I'd like to talk to you for a few minutes about this morning.

Independence is the bedrock of this country, the conviction behind our nation's founding, and the driving force behind its success. Independence is fundamental to our identity as Americans. It is an essential part of what makes up the world's most successful and egalitarian democracy. And yet if you look around the country today, I see a serious challenge to that spirit of independence—in leadership and in thought—from all sectors of society.

Let me start with leadership—particularly something near and dear to my heart: political leadership.

Our government operates in an environment today so deeply inundated with pandering and partisanship that we've almost become immune to it. Today, it's standard operating procedure when Republicans propose an idea for Democrats to oppose it—and vice versa—just because it's not their idea.

We've come to expect a vocal minority raising a stink—and lots of money—to gather politicians on both sides of the aisle and have them cave in, rather than fight for the greater good.

No one is surprised today that elected officials make decisions based not on facts or conviction but on one criterion only: what can get them into office and what can keep them there.

We watch these leaders repeatedly look to the polls rather than to principles. There's certainly nothing wrong with asking people questions to learn how they feel. But many politicians now use polling to determine not what their constituents stand for but where they stand.

I call it "leading from the back."

It's not leadership, and it's not independence.

Taking chances and making unpopular decisions is a necessary part of getting results. It may be lonely standing up front, it may be dangerous to your career, and occasionally you can be proved wrong, but it is the essence of independence—something, I hope, the public is beginning to understand more and more.

In New York, when we banned smoking in bars and restaurants, ended "social promotion" in the public schools, and raised taxes to avoid drastic budget cuts, I can tell you there was no shortage of people who vocally disagreed.

But in the end, the public saw that our administration was trying to do what we thought was right. And with time, even those who disagreed came to respect the fact that we called 'em as we saw 'em, no matter what the polls and the professional partisans said.

Let me address another aspect of independence—not independent leadership, but independent thinking from elected officials and the public alike.

Sadly, people who raise their voices in opposition to the status quo often find themselves under attack today—in ways not seen in years. I know it's not pleasant opening yourself up to ridicule and condemnation, but it's vitally important. You have to say what you think, or you won't be able to look at yourself in the mirror at night.

We've all been there—and there's nothing worse than knowing you've compromised or lacked courage when tested that day.

Lately, a spirit of intolerance has permeated the political discourse—with people's patriotism being questioned. We all have to get together in this country and stop this right now and stand up to those who would demagogue!

There is nothing—absolutely nothing—wrong with criticizing our government—on any topic—and challenging it to live up to the democratic ideals. It is not unpatriotic. In fact, what could be more patriotic?

The First Amendment was written not so you could safely criticize a movie or your mother-in-law, but to protect people's right to challenge and question our leaders and our laws without being incarcerated or hanged.

Remember—even the Constitution itself was imperfect. Otherwise, we wouldn't have needed a First Amendment—or any other amendments.

Unfortunately, independent thought is being challenged today, not only in government but in the world of science as well. Today, we see people at the highest levels of government manipulating the data to fit their own agendas. You can call this phenomenon true "political science."

You can see it at work in the movement to discredit the theory of global warming, and you can see it with respect to the decision to restrict federal funding for stem cell research or to refute proven methods that stop the scourge of AIDS here and around the world.

We should never stifle scientific investigation or ignore facts for the sake of ideology or short-term economics. It's not only dishonest—it's shortsighted. It jeopardizes our future and the lives of our families.

Now, you want some examples closer

to home?

On some university campuses today, independent thought is not only being criticized—which is necessary and healthy—but it is being stifled or even punished.

How ironic to find professors—many who enjoy the academic freedom afforded by tenure to explore and expand our discourse—spurning others on campus for speaking their minds.

At Oregon State University, some faculty members tried to stop publication of a graduate student's research about logging practices when they feared it would threaten some of the university's revenue streams from the lumber industry.

And at Louisiana State University, administrators urged the deputy director of the university's hurricane center not to discuss his new book about faults in the hurricane protection system of New Orleans, because they didn't want to hurt their relationship with the federal government.

Meanwhile, students and faculty at schools across the nation are often trying to prevent those with opposing views from speaking on their campuses.

You may call me old-fashioned, but I believe that when someone is your guest, even if invited by another member of your family, you welcome them and treat them with respect even if you don't like their views. And since when does simply listening to opinions that we don't agree with—or maybe even strongly disagree with—come to signify tacit approval?

I suppose that's why professional partisans on cable TV are always trying to shout each other down. To me, encountering an opposite view is an opportunity to gain a deeper understanding of the issues at stake . . . and a chance to develop my own point of view.

In any case, I've always thought that not being willing to listen is the ultimate act of cowardice and insecurity.

At Chicago, you have all been fortunate to be part of an institution that has long practiced independent thinking and discovery. And I'm not just talking about T-shirts.

From the University's defense against accusations of communist teaching seventy years ago to its support of Professor Mearsheimer's right to criticize the Israel Lobby's influence on U.S. foreign policy, this has been a place where open debate is encouraged and cherished.

But travel outside the "friendly confines" of this campus, and you'll find objectivity, common sense—and independence—lacking.

And let's be clear: both ends of the political spectrum share the blame. And both seem unwilling to change.

That job is left to others. In fact, that job is left . . . to you.

Yes. Your mission—if you choose to accept it, Class of 2006, whatever career path you may take—is to fight that fight, to maintain a healthy skepticism and an honest integrity, and to never let go of the American spirit of independence.

In a world that will bombard you with analysts, pundits, self-styled "experts"—and relentless advertisers—you must stand tall, because when it comes to protecting speech, thought, and expression you are the next generation of freedom fighters.

And heaven knows—your country needs you now, more than ever.

Now, I anticipated Professor Chandler's speech, because I began the morning by asking a question: "How did we get here?"

Let me conclude with a second question:

"How do we now move on from here?"

The answer, I think—oddly enough—can be found in a third question. And it's the final essay question from your college application four years ago.

This one directed you to "pose an un-

traditional or uncommon question of your own" . . . and then to answer it by displaying "your best qualities as a writer, thinker, visionary, social critic, sage, sensible woman or man, and citizen of the world. . . ."

I can't think of a better question—or

answer—to occupy the rest of your lives.

Good luck in all your endeavors . . . and congratulations on this great day.

Michael R. Bloomberg is mayor of the City of New York.

Address: "Seeing the World through the Economic Lens"

By Kevin M. Murphy

June 11, 2006

It says in the program that I'm supposed to remove my academic cap. So, in keeping with that, I'll take my academic cap off. Those of you who want to see whether I really have hair under here are just going to have to wait, I guess.

Thank you very much for having me here to speak today. I know that the students play a big role in deciding who gets to talk, and I am very honored to speak to the students of the Graduate School of Business. They are really close to my heart. When I teach them, I can see the desire they have to succeed and to learn and to really develop themselves. I think great things will come from this class. I particularly enjoyed teaching these students last year as first-year students and many of them again this year as second-years.

Let me go on to talk, at least for a little bit. You're still students, you know, for a few more minutes at least, so you're going to be subject to one more lecture. I'm going to talk today a little bit about what it is like to see the world through the eyes of an economist. In my classes I discuss the basic principles, and I talk about how far one can go with those few basic principles.

Today I'm going to touch on three principles: one is the principle of equilibrium, the second is the principle that incentives matter, and finally there is the notion of cost-benefit analysis. I'm going to try to relate these concepts to a variety of ways that you see them in business, how you see them in your personal life, and how you see them more generally when you look at the world.

Let me begin with the notion of equilibrium. In the classroom, we talk about equilibrium in terms of supply and demand—the trade-off between risk and reward in financial markets. This is sort of a formal treatment of equilibrium. When economists think about equilibrium more casually, perhaps the best notion goes back to the old line that there is no free lunch. Why do economists say there is no free lunch? The basic idea is simple. If lunches were free in some places and people had to pay in other places, everybody would gravitate toward the place where they were free, bidding up the price until there was no longer a free lunch available.

Now that story is simple, but it does take us a long way. One of the best applications of no free lunch is the use of the efficient markets hypothesis to study

financial markets. Taken literally, the efficient markets hypothesis says that you're going to get equal-risk adjusted returns in all investments.

However, that's not quite right from the point of view of thinking about equilibrium the way economists do. If in fact all investments are equalized in return, what got them there? Why did we get there? If there are no differences, there would be no one searching out differences. So in equilibrium, that won't be quite right. There will be some people who are able to beat the market, but of course they won't be easy to find either. If they were easy to find, then they would become the market and one would no longer be able to beat the market.

So how does it work? The basic idea is simple when applied to financial markets. There will be some people who can beat the market, and there will be a lot of people who claim they can beat the market. So if you go out and just choose randomly among financial advisers or fund managers, guess what? You'll probably actually under-perform the market a little bit. Only by doing some research, or by having some advantage and identifying those who are truly better, would we be able to see a true market equilibrium. So that's the idea that you want to think about in life: that there is a market that tends towards equilibrium. This is not to say that it's perfect. The market can be improved. There are ways to beat the market, but they're not going to be easy to find. You know there's no assurance that you'll be able to just go out and find a superior fund manager. And that's the person who's going to lead the way. Because in a world in which only good managers existed, there would be no incentive to separate the good from the bad. The charlatans would run wild. So there's no way in a financial market that you can have a free lunch.

I'd like to now apply that to something that is probably more mundane but equally important. Many of you are going to go out and get a new job. And when you go out and get a new job, you're going to see things—institutions and practices—that you might think seem silly. You might say, "I can improve upon that idea. I have a better idea. I've been here five minutes. These guys have been here five years. But hey, maybe I'm the smartest person in the world!" With five billion people, there's some chance of that—roughly one in five billion. So keep

in mind the notion of equilibrium. Those institutions and practices evolved because they had advantages. They're probably better than what you could come up with off the cuff.

But just like the financial markets, the idea markets aren't perfect either. There is room for improvement. There is room to develop new ideas that surpass those that are there. But they're not going to be any easier to find than it is to find a scheme that beats the financial markets. Only by hard work, superior intelligence, and superior application of what you've learned here at the University of Chicago will you be able to actually bring that idea to market.

People often talk about thinking outside the box. And indeed, there are many good ideas outside the box. Unfortunately, there are more bad ideas outside the box than there are good ideas. Does that mean you should not pursue them? No! That's the same as not trying to beat the financial markets. Just remember that most of the ideas you come up with are going to be put aside. They're not going to be good ones. But the reward for finding a good idea is still there. And in fact the product of the reward of getting a good idea and the probability of finding it are going to be roughly equal to the cost of finding and developing an idea . . . let alone the market for ideas being in equilibrium as well.

So that's one notion I want you to take with you. The notion that the status quo has value doesn't mean it's perfect. The notion that the market equilibrium model for finance has value doesn't mean it's perfect either. It carries over in an exact way.

The next thing I want to talk about is incentives. One of the ways that economists see things differently than others is the notion that incentives matter. In the classroom we talk about incentives in terms of optimal executive compensation schemes, such as backdating your options and things like that. We don't teach that one here, actually. Someone came up with that one on their own . . . another one of those bad ideas, I think. But we also talk about the economics of crime and punishment, as well as many other things that embody the notion that people respond to incentives.

So let's apply that in different contexts to think about incentives. Let's think about your parents. Now parents do a lot of great things. They raise children. They encourage them to do well. Of course parents have incentives, too. Parents prefer that their kids be happy and successful, as opposed to just happy. Why? Well, then they don't freeloader off of them. So incentives apply in many departments. And to say that incentives matter doesn't mean that people are inherently bad or people are inherently lazy. We only mean that, on the margin, incentives make a difference. So parents are more likely to encourage their kids to be successful than they are to encourage them

simply to be happy by enjoying themselves being lazy on the couch.

Secondly, we can observe that incentives matter in many other contexts. For example, when we look at the world over the last twenty years, one thing we see in the United States is a tremendous increase in the degree of income inequality. We've seen growth in the differentials in the wages between college and high school graduates, with the difference roughly doubling over twenty years. The returns for having a graduate degree—good for you guys!—have increased just as much or more. So the rewards for education have risen.

But it's not just about education. The rewards for being successful in the economy today are far greater than they were in the past. Now when people talk about inequality, they commonly think about it in terms of the consequences . . . we have a wider range of incomes, and isn't this terrible? That may be, but at the same time the rise in returns has been associated with an increase in incentives. The incentive to do well is greater today than it has been in the past. This fact has spurred investments in education, spurred investments in other forms of training, and spurred greater growth in the economy as a whole. And the returns for individual endeavor are greater now than they have been in the past.

So that's what an economist sees. When you look at the world from a newspaper's point of view, maybe you see widening inequality as being all about distribution of income. The economist brings in the part about incentives . . . that part of the growth in income equality is a change in the incentive structure as well. So that's kind of the difference between the way economists approach the world and how somebody in the everyday world might look at things.

The final thing I want to talk about is something that economists talk about relentlessly: cost-benefit analysis. If taken literally, cost-benefit analysis comes down to saying: Let's enumerate all the costs, let's enumerate all the benefits, and let's decide whether the costs exceed the benefits. But that's not where the greatest value lies. The value of cost-benefit analysis is really two-fold: (1) It forces you to define an objective, that is, decide what I am trying to accomplish. After all, if I'm going to calculate the benefits and costs, I have to decide what those benefits consist of. (2) It also forces you to find where the costs are. Sometimes the costs are hidden. So, for example, you might start a public policy where you want to fight poverty, or fight something else, where the cost is being hidden somewhere else. So it forces you to look at the full range of costs and benefits, not just theory.

More importantly, it forces you to focus on the alternatives. And this is absolutely critical. You can't talk about benefits of a policy without addressing what the alterna-

tives are. So, for example, let's take a topic like global warming. The question is not just whether or not we should do something about global warming. The questions are: What is the alternative? Should we do something now versus later? Maybe later is a better alternative than nothing at all or a big effort today. So maybe you might decide it's better to do less today and more in the future, or vice versa. The point is that you have to enumerate the alternatives to think about the costs and benefits.

One common criticism of cost-benefit analysis is that it is kind of cold. It only focuses upon the tangible economic measurable dollars. But that's not correct at all. The same principles apply when thinking about goals, identifying alternatives, and enumerating the costs and benefits. It doesn't matter whether those costs and benefits are psychic, monetary, reputation, or the like. So when economists are presented with a problem, their economic approach is to think about cost-benefit analysis not as a technique but as a method. That is a way of approaching problems and hopefully solving those problems in the process.

So when you leave here, on top of the things you have learned in class, hopefully you can make the jump from thinking about things on the blackboard to thinking about how you use those same principles in practice.

So don't forget the concepts of equilibrium, such as there's no free lunch. And if it looks too good to be true, it probably is. But that doesn't mean you shouldn't push forward. Just be cautious and be humble, because most likely you are going to turn out to be wrong.

On the incentives side, remember that incentives matter. You give people incentives to do good things, and they will do good things. You give people incentives to do bad things, and they will do bad things. And remember incentives apply in all contexts. So, for example, a common response to a public policy problem is to say that the solution is to get the government to do it. But does the government have the incentive to do it right? What incentive do they have? Their incentives often are not to do it right. Their incentive is to do it with a lot of people at a lot of expense, because that's how they define success in their business. So it's not that the people in government are bad or evil but rather that they are subject to the same incentives as you and me. You just have to recognize what those incentives are. And when faced with a problem, use the principles of cost-benefit analysis. Think about the true goals, identify the goals, and, most importantly, identify the options and make comparisons between benefits and costs of one option versus another.

Thank you very much. I enjoyed speaking to you today.

Kevin M. Murphy is the George J. Stigler Distinguished Service Professor of Economics in the Graduate School of Business.

Remarks

By Mary A. Tolan
June 11, 2006

I am honored to be with you today at your commencement from the finest business school in the world.

A Great Affection

I have to confess that I had a great affection for the University of Chicago long before I had the chance to attend the school. I saw the University of Chicago as the place, more than any other, that stood for free markets and free enterprise. It was the intellectual life source for some of the most powerful ideas that, when acted upon, had created the greatest good for the most amount of people ever.

Milton Friedman's work in linking political and economic freedom as the best possible conditions for human endeavor was as powerfully communicated as it was stunning in its essence. His commitment to sharing the ideas with all of us in the form of some of the best books ever written, *Capitalism and Freedom* and *Free to Choose* created the possibility of sweeping impact. His obvious respect and admiration for human free will was, well, just plain lovable.

The Chicago School of Economics was formed by leaders who led not just in their ideas but in their commitment to impact. Not only were they individuals who had the courage of their convictions, but there was an institution that stood behind superb work however controversial or as yet unaccepted.

And so when I had my chance to attend—I seized it. What better place to seek to enhance my business knowledge than in the place that understood markets more than any other, that most clearly understood how markets would value companies and therefore what management teams would need to do to maximize value?

Disproportionate Impact

We had a particularly memorable dinner welcoming us to the GSB and launching us on our way. It was a great evening at the Quadrangle Club, a place of beautiful limestone gothic architecture, a place steeped in history. That night we dined with fires burning in the halls of Friedman, Shultz, Stigler, and Becker. It's fair to say there was quite an expectant atmosphere that night as we got to know our new colleagues, their backgrounds, and their ambitions.

Harry Davis stood up to say a few words. Harry had been the Deputy Dean and a member of the faculty for more than twenty years already. He said something that has stayed with me. Harry shared that from his vantage point of observing over many years that the thing that distinguished those who attend the University of Chicago—the common characteristic—was that they were people who would seek to have disproportionate impact. And as Harry's words washed over us, the goose bumps rolled over the room. I remember thinking, "This guy is a genius . . . he's just flattered the hell out of everyone here . . . is he running for something?" And then it hit me—wait—he also just reached out and grabbed us by our collars: "Now that you're part of the club of Disproportional Impact, we are going to

see what you've got." It was an energizing beginning.

Ultimate Comparative Advantage for a Business School

I did not know before attending, but I would soon learn that the GSB was focused on creating the ultimate comparative advantage for a business school and its students. This comparative advantage was based on the notion that maybe experience is the best teacher . . . that you could give the same experience to different people, and they would harvest the value to variant degrees. For example, you could give five people the same experience. On one end of the spectrum, you may have one who gets all the richness and nuances, who gleans all the insights and even begins to extrapolate the insights forward. On the other end of the spectrum, you may have someone who only got 15 percent of the possible learning.

The GSB was focused on giving its students the critical thinking skills to get the most out of each experience. This was in contrast to popular business school approaches that would seek to give students more vicarious experiences via the case method.

And so, we know two things about you: (1) You know markets, and (2) you harvest your experiences with a critical thinking approach. With these wonderful qualities in mind, let's look forward to the future.

Extended Runway

And the first thought for your consideration is some very good news. You are going to live very, very long and very healthy lives. Unfortunately, of course, I can only say this on average. We know this, but have we really factored it into our thinking? Historically, we have, over generations, established a fairly predictable pattern: a period of education in the early years of life is followed by a robust career period that is finally followed by retirement. The earlier ones' success could secure retirement, the better.

Well, what if things are changing now? What if the most fun and rewarding way for many to approach life, work, and learning will be fundamentally shifting? We may see new patterns emerge with more chapters of productive life interspersed with educational episodes. We may see later career segues into new fields that capitalize on previous experience, are less taxing in terms of hours or stress but nevertheless extremely rewarding.

If this shifting were to occur, it would provide our economy and therefore all of us with the extended contribution of our most experienced people. What if we were no longer driven to be successful and retire early but driven to have successful experiences that may facilitate the next chapter? What would it do to the gross domestic product of the United States for retirement as we know it today to cease to exist, not because of a Social Security shortfall but because that's the way we want it?

My hunch is that many of you are going to be working for a long, long time—not because you have to, but because rewarding, stimulating work is available. Let's say, just for the sake of looking into the crystal ball, we need to be thinking about going eighty-five productive and happy years.

So now that we are thinking about our glorious extended runways, I want to plant two seeds.

Your Entrepreneurial Chapter

First, we would all be better off if many of you make your way to successful entrepreneurial activity.

My journey has led me to the entrepreneurial side of the economy. I have had the great pleasure of founding and building a promising, young company in health care. Our company works in the business end of providing health care, and we have immersed ourselves in the most complex and difficult part, which is the payment systems and flows. We have had the great fortune of partnering with clients who are some of the largest and most progressive provider organizations in the country. The economic results we have achieved together are profound. We are striving together to materially enhance the financial strength and viability of hospitals (85 percent of which are not-for-profit). So we have the luxury of doing well by doing good.

It has been an incredible period of learning, and one of the best insights I have had I can best convey in the following way:

If one of my daughters came to me and said: Mom, I've just graduated from the best business school in the country. I want rapid learning. I want to have as much impact on driving a business as possible. And I want to have the fun of creating and building. And, yes, I would like to have as much economic potential as my impact can earn. What should I do?

I would say: Go straight to where the U.S. economy excels like no other. Go to the entrepreneurial side of the economy. Become part of a founding team that goes on to have entrepreneurial success, or become part of the investing businesses that back such as team.

If you love the direct process of taking ideas into action, if you enjoy assembling the talent and deliberately forming the culture, if you have a passion for the direct creation of value for a customer . . . then do the former.

If you enjoy identifying attractive sectors, assembling the chief executive officer and board, influencing a portfolio of companies, developing expertise on the advantages of different business models . . . then do the latter. And over your many chapters, maybe do both.

I know the Class of 2006 has great interest in entrepreneurial activity. It is the second-largest concentration, and I understand that fully 80 percent of the class envisions entrepreneurial activity for themselves at some time in their career. It's an exciting prediction.

Necessary Ingredients

On reflection and having discussed this topic with others who have been immersed in entrepreneurial activity, some key themes emerge. The first is that it's all about the value. The foundational skill set of successful entrepreneurial effort is the ability to see how new value can be created for a customer or market and the ability to make it happen—actually create the value.

Being deliberate about the experience you are gaining is probably very important. Is the field that you're going to work in

dynamic, attracting top talent, given to diverse experiences? Will you have a broad or deep field of vision from which to spot new value opportunities?

I was very fortunate to spend the first two decades of my career in the leading global consulting and technology firm, Accenture. In fact, I spent almost all my time serving clients to create incremental shareholder value. The range of industries, business processes, and global market knowledge was immense. The immersion in technology and business processes with the ability to observe evolution and adoption rates, as well as failure patterns, was incredibly valuable for me. I had a chance to develop execution know-how by innovating inside a large established firm. I was gaining experience that would enable my next chapter.

Most Opportune Market in the World

And when you find your value proposition, it is exciting to realize that you have the opportunity to play in the most opportune market in the world here in the United States. It has often been said that the entrepreneurial/innovation juggernaut in the United States is the jewel of the global economy. We do have the following formidable advantages:

1. Early-stage capital markets exist here in a way they simply don't elsewhere. It is not just that capital is willingly deployed to high-risk investments—that can be easily duplicated. What is special is the accumulated concentrated know-how on what to invest in and how to de-risk the investments. Some of the best and brightest have been concentrating this knowledge over many business cycles and literally decades.

2. We have a cultural affinity for entrepreneurial activity in our country that is unique. When we hear of persons throwing their hat in the ring, more often than not there is a twinkle in the eye, a respect for their risk taking, a hopeful excitement. Gosh, even parents approve of it. No seriously . . . living and working in a place where the culture embraces the movement of talent into entrepreneurial activity is a great advantage. It means many of the best and brightest will make attempts. The market, after all, has taken care of the incentives, and freedom has always been attractive.

3. And we have the most transparent, free-moving labor market in the world. This significantly reduces risk for everyone. When failures occur, and of course frequently they do, the talent can move forward and reengage quickly. The price that talent pays for entrepreneurial failure in the United States is very, very low.

This point was driven home to me in a conversation I had with Michael Polsky, a fellow alumnus who has sponsored the Center for Entrepreneurship at the GSB. Michael has had a great track record in founding and building companies, and I consulted him when I was considering my own move. He was generous with insights and encouragement, and I remember his words: “You should do it, you will be successful . . . and even if you aren't, you will learn so much you will be successful in the next one.”

And with these words, Michael shared

a powerful insight about the value of learning—and, in the context of learning, obtaining a much lower degree of real risk than is conventionally thought.

Your Public Service Chapter

The second seed I want to plant is another consideration for one of your chapters.

This will at first seem an odd suggestion for a business school class. But here it is: We will all be better off if some of you spend time in public service, specifically high elected or appointed office.

Our economic landscape is heavily influenced either for good or for bad by those who serve in government decision making and leadership roles. We have many strengths in the U.S. economic landscape, but none can be taken for granted.

Often issues that are being debated have significant economic consequences, but how often have you felt that the debate was full of reasoned economic skill? If we look at the ranks of those who serve today, we see a strong—some might say a lopsided—representation of those who have a legal background. We all too often see backgrounds that do not include fundamental knowledge of markets and reasoned economic understanding.

What do you hear in the political discourse here? How would you like to see people who know markets and know critical thinking and have accomplished much in their business careers actually have a chapter of paying forward their good fortune in the form of public service? And so, I eagerly await a chance to vote for you . . . you would grace the political world with your presence.

Finally, William Manchester's book on Churchill, *The Last Lion*, opens with this quote:

The credit belongs to the man who is actually in the arena, whose face is marred by sweat and dust, who knows the great devotions, the great enthusiasms, who if he succeeds knows the thrill of achievement and if he fails, at least fails daring, but who shall never be amongst those cool and timid souls who know neither victory nor defeat.

Congratulations. We look forward to your years of Disproportionate Impact actually in the arena.

Mary A. Tolan, M.B.A.'92, is the chief executive officer of Accretive Health.

Bachelor's Degree Candidates' Remarks

Remarks
By Peter Bartoszek

I spent one quarter here attending courses with titles that could essentially be shortened to the following: War, Love, and Law. These three courses represent the wide array of options available to a student at the University. They also happen to express the relationship that we as undergraduates all had with the institution that celebrates with us today.

War is the feeling that this school has

plotted to overthrow the life of every student who has come through its doors since its inception. It is wondering how the registrar always manages to make sure that every class has a student “Who Truly Believes that He or She Has Deep Insights about Every Possible Topic.” It is sending away for transfer applications to other universities and feeling sneaky about flipping through them in the dining hall. It is the realization that if Organic Chemistry and Econometrics could somehow merge, they could be the evil villain in a B movie about crushing students' spirits. War is waiting for the “drunk van” outside the Reg after writing a twenty-page paper. It is deliberately stepping on the University seal in the Reynolds Club, just to let the school know that you won't go without a fight. War is, in short, the gamut of challenges that each of us went through to get to *this* day.

Love is realizing that even if a final doesn't go that well, the time you spent studying for it with your friends was so filled with laughter that you really won't mind. It is walking through campus on one of the 8.34 beautiful days we get to see each year. It is the last day of finals, every single quarter. Love is running into people you know from school out in the real world and feeling like you're back on campus when you start talking to them. It is spending a night during your first year in the dorms talking about the meaning of life with upperclassmen who seem to have it all figured out, even though you suspect that they probably don't. Love is hearing recruiters tell you not to worry about your GPA because you went to the University of Chicago, and that they understand. Love is all those times you fiercely explain that the University of Chicago is not, in fact, a state school.

Law is about the individual. It is the individuality of our own particular experiences, and the way those experiences contribute to the collective experience. It is the reason that we stopped ordering those transfer applications when we found a group of people that we really clicked with. Law is about the commitment that we all made four years ago to helping one another achieve great things together by way of individual success.

So what do these three courses teach us about the University of Chicago? War teaches us to be proud of the things we have done and to show that pride, because when others see confidence they are more likely to listen to what we have to say. Love teaches us to remember the positive, because that is what defines who we are and what we will become. And finally, law teaches us that each one of us was different when we arrived here, but our individual experiences have joined us together in a way that will be reflected in our future collective success.

Peter Bartoszek received a bachelor of arts degree during the convocation. His major areas of study were Law, Letters & Society and Political Science.

Remarks
By Min Jung Kim

When I first arrived at O'Hare after a thirteen-hour flight from Korea, I was full of excitement. Since I had never lived

in the United States before, I knew I had to practice English as much as I could. I remember talking to the taxi driver all the way to campus. For the first couple of days, I felt as if I was on vacation. Everything was new and exciting. Soon after, however, I was overwhelmed by the many things to take care of: laundry, paying bills, and time management. It did not take long before I started to miss my mom's nagging.

Of course I made a lot of mistakes. I turned a couple of my favorite shirts blue. Late payment was normal on my bills. I proved that the freshman fifteen was not simply a myth. Language was a challenge that took more than two years for me to get over. The University of Chicago, I assure you, provides ample opportunity for rigorous discussion in class. However, most of the time, I remained one of those silent students, missing the right chance to make my point. Being trapped by the language took away my confidence. For the first two years, I tried to disguise myself and pretend to be someone I was not.

In Spring Quarter of my second year, I realized I could not pretend anymore. I wanted to be honest with myself. And I was afraid that my life would never change unless I changed myself. Fortunately, our school is an intellectually and emotionally challenging place where you are constantly motivated to be a better person. In this environment, I learned that my opinion is just as valuable as that of my classmates. I also realized that self-confidence and modesty are two sides of the same coin. Through these realizations, I recovered self-confidence and learned modesty. In due time, I could remain emotionally strong through the support of friends who firmly believed in me. As I gradually regained myself, both my eyes and mind were broadened. I began to try previously unexplored opportunities. I made new friends. I challenged myself to learn new things. I even found myself at Jimmy's one time with one of my teachers and several classmates. It was after the final, and the conversation ranged from the meaning of life to what kinds of beer taste good.

The great novelist Hesse writes, “The bird fights its way out of the egg. The egg is the world. Who would be born must destroy a world.” Our past four years at Chicago have been a long journey of preparation for making one big step forward. Today, each of us will finally destroy the thick layer of eggshell and bravely embrace a bigger world. I salute the Class of 2006 as we embark on a new journey.

Min Jung Kim received a bachelor of arts degree during the convocation. Her major area of study was Economics.

Remarks
By Yenisey Rodriguez

The nature of this celebration, in which degrees will be awarded, inevitably begs the question of responsibility: “What will you do with the great advantage you now possess?”

Before addressing the question, I thought it would be appropriate to actually identify this “great advantage.” In the spirit of the University of Chicago, I thought I would emphasize that the power of intellect is

indeed the great advantage of graduating from this particular institution. In this vein, as this university made clear in class after class, we “are only as good as our last argument.”

Unfortunately, the environment in which we have strengthened the power of our intellect will be in a state of crisis after we leave here today. This is to assume not that our intellectual prowess is in a state of decline, but rather that the environment catering to our intellect most certainly will be. Conversations such as “which book would be more moral, *The Wizard of Oz* or the Bible?” will no longer take center stage during your lunch break. The likelihood of bumping into a soil specialist at the neighborhood pub who carried out flotation techniques for seed retrieval in the excavation of a Mesopotamian historical site will be slim to none.

Yet to focus on our own story of decline is to emphasize the importance of our own needs and privileges. I believe that the world we live in today is in a more dire state of decline than our intellect. Our nation is at war, not with one country, but two: Iraq and Afghanistan—a war with Iran looming just over the horizon. Most, also have not figured out why the racial landscape of those affected by Hurricane Katrina in New Orleans was so very, to quote our nation’s president, “of a monolithic nature.” Our generation has been rated the most inactive in participatory democracy in the last three decades.

Class of 2006, you have been privy to one of the most intense, energetic, and rewarding intellectual communities in the world.

But I do hope that today you recognize that intellect, as Professor Cathy Cohen has stated, “is most powerful when it is mindful of the lives it can change, the people it can empower, the societies it can transform.”

To refine our own philosophy of the life of the mind, you are only as good as your last argument if you have evaluated how that argument impacts both your position and the fate of those who surround you.

The power of intellect—while on its face may seem a trite metaphor and, to a certain extent, insignificant on a day when intellect per capita within these quads is pretty high—has only to be multiplied by the hundreds of graduates sitting before me today . . . multiplied so that the power of intellect may be transformed from an individual accomplishment to a privilege from which the world may also benefit.

We exist in a world desperately begging for your attention and activism. It is necessary to find a cause beyond your own personal achievement on which to fix your intellectual eye. By the successive changes of your activism, I believe we can produce one of the most serious “rumbles” that our generation has ever seen—the basis of participatory democracy, after all, is civic-minded engagement—and after our training here, I don’t believe any other graduating class is better equipped for the task.

Our challenge now is to determine how to use ideas to emancipate, not subordinate. Thank you all, and the best of luck to you in everything.

Yenisey Rodriguez received a bachelor of arts degree during the convocation. Her major area of study was History.

Llewellyn John and Harriet Manchester Quantrell Awards for Excellence in Undergraduate Teaching

The University’s Llewellyn John and Harriet Manchester Quantrell Awards for Excellence in Undergraduate Teaching were presented during the 485th convocation on June 10, 2006.

Upon the recommendation of John W. Boyer, Dean of the College, and Richard P. Saller, Provost, Don Michael Randel, President, designated the following winners.

Helma J. Dik

Associate Professor, Department of Classics and the College

The candidate was presented by Jonathan M. Hall, the Phyllis Fay Horton Professor, Departments of Classics and History, and the College; and Chairman, Department of Classics.

Helma Dik’s internationally recognized expertise in classical Greek linguistics, especially the significance of word order in Greek prose and poetry, gives her a unique perspective on the workings of the Greek language. Yet, far from perplexing her students with the intricacies of grammar, she inspires them with an infectious fervor, making them eager to pursue their studies further.

In addition to initiating students into such mysteries as the “Dead Dog Dative,” Professor Dik’s service as undergraduate chair has seen a doubling in the number of classics majors, an achievement that owes much to her tireless commitment to pedagogic excellence and her personal attention to students from their first year through to their departure for graduate school. She is truly a paradigmatic teacher of teachers.

Citation: Respected classicist and linguist, your enthusiasm and tireless dedication have inspired your students to take up the torch of learning and transmit that learning to future generations. Your commitment to the highest standards of pedagogy illuminates the University’s teaching mission.

Heinrich M. Jaeger

Professor, Department of Physics, James Franck Institute, and the College

The candidate was presented by Sidney R. Nagel, the Stein-Freiler Distinguished Service Professor, Department of Physics, James Franck Institute, Enrico Fermi Institute, and the College.

Heinrich Jaeger is a pioneering physicist who has worked to open up new fields of research. His work on the physics of granular materials has inspired an international audience. Likewise his work on creating patterns at the nanoscale, where quantum effects begin to alter macroscopic reality, has been original and profound. His fervent commitment to bringing together the arts and the sciences has borne fruit across the entire campus. He has also been the conscientious leader of efforts by the Department of Physics to broaden its appeal to underrepresented minorities.

Professor Jaeger has been a mentor to

research students of all ages, and there has hardly been a time when an undergraduate has not been working in his laboratory. He brings his infectious enthusiasm to the classroom, where he seeks to make physics relevant to the lives and careers of all his students.

Citation: Dedicated teacher, your enthusiasm for physics and research has been an inspiration to your students both in the classroom and in the laboratory. You have helped the University transcend disciplinary boundaries many considered impermeable.

Jocelyn Malamy

Associate Professor, Department of Molecular Genetics & Cell Biology and the College

The candidate was presented by Laurens J. Mets, Associate Professor, Department of Molecular Genetics & Cell Biology, Committee on Genetics, and the College; and Chairman, Department of Molecular Genetics & Cell Biology.

Jocelyn Malamy is a passionate scientist and educator. In her laboratory, she studies plant roots: familiar everyday objects with basic developmental processes that are surprisingly obscure. What are the fundamental processes that enable plants to adjust root system growth in search of nutrients? Could understanding of basic developmental mechanisms of roots be directly used to improve the growth of crop plants in poorer soils? Could improvements in root system function help to relieve world hunger? How does one evaluate a complex problem such as the causes of hunger so that solutions can be found? These linked questions not only motivate her research but also appeal to her deeply embedded instinct to teach. Her multidisciplinary course on world hunger is an exciting and challenging component of the Big Problems curriculum. Professor Malamy has also taught hundreds of students the nature and value of genetics and genetic analysis with characteristic enthusiasm, dedication, and concern.

Citation: Passionate scientist and educator, you have transmitted your contagious enthusiasm for your subjects to your students and made the University a better place to learn and the world a better place to live.

Russell H. Tuttle

Professor, Department of Anthropology, Committee on Evolutionary Biology, Morris Fishbein Center for the History of Science & Medicine, and the College

The candidate was presented by John L. Comaroff, the Harold H. Swift Distinguished Service Professor, Departments of Anthropology and Sociology, Committee on African & African-American Studies, and the College.

Russell Tuttle is a scholar of hominoid evolution who has applied highly creative methods to the study of human and nonhuman primate morphology, in particular, to the development of locomotion, bipedalism, and the human hand. In a range of provocative, important publications, he

has succeeded in posing challenging new questions about the history of theories of evolution and about social prejudice in physical anthropology.

Professor Tuttle’s passion for teaching extends beyond the ability to inspire a love of his own subject. He has been an unusually dedicated chair of the undergraduate program in anthropology and has made the integrity of the program his special mission. In addition, he shows unfailing concern for the academic and personal welfare of our students.

Citation: Dedicated scholar and fine teacher of hominoid evolution, you have ensured that a generation of young anthropologists receives an education that is rigorous, encourages tolerance, and nurtures the human spirit.

Faculty Awards for Excellence in Graduate Teaching

Four Faculty Awards for Excellence in Graduate Teaching were presented during the 485th convocation on June 9, 2006. These awards, established in 1986, recognize and honor faculty members for their effective graduate teaching, including leadership in the development of programs and a special ability to encourage, influence, and work with graduate students.

Nominations and recommendations for the Faculty Awards for Excellence in Graduate Teaching are made by faculty and graduate students; selection is by a faculty committee appointed by the Provost.

Shadi Bartsch

The Ann L. and Lawrence B. Bittenwieser Professor, Department of Classics, Committee on History of Culture, and the College

Shadi Bartsch is a leading scholar in the field of classics, thanks to her fresh and thought-provoking approaches to Latin and Greek literature. She is recognized today for bringing out those same qualities in her students. Students know her as an engaged teacher, who, while demanding much of herself and of her students, offers them her support both in and outside the classroom and encourages them to find their own way in the field. In her teaching, she takes care not to tower over her students as she helps them acquire the skills they need to succeed; rather, she thinks with them about their proposed directions of research and helps them find their own distinctive voices as interpreters of classical literature.

Citation: With probing questions and unstinting support, Shadi Bartsch holds students to the highest standards of scholarship and fosters a new generation of classical scholars.

Dain Borges

Associate Professor, Department of History and the College; and Director, Center for Latin American Studies

The candidate was presented by Ralph A. Austen, Professor, Department of History, Committee on Interdisciplinary Studies in the Humanities, and the College.

Dain Borges is a historian of the popular and high intellectual culture of modern Brazil, and his impact as a teacher reaches students from all over the world. In part, this spread of his fan club stems from his enormous erudition and vast knowledge in many areas. His lectures, close analyses of texts, and archival knowledge inspire his students, many of whom feel deep affection for him.

One foreign student wrote that he was particularly moved by Dain's compassionate attention to his unique problems. Another was impressed by Dain's holding walk-in hours for thirty minutes each morning of the week in addition to his regular two-hour weekly commitment. By going beyond the call of duty, Dain establishes respect and trust among graduate student (and scholar) cohorts, which is invaluable to the academic profession as a whole.

Citation: Held in the highest regard for his erudition, his pedagogical commitment, and his compassion for the student, Dain Borges exemplifies the highest ideals of a teacher and scholar.

Victor Ginzburg

Professor, Department of Mathematics and the College

Victor Ginzburg is a mathematician whose work lies at the cutting edge of current research in algebra, geometry, and representation theory. For many years, he has had a profound influence on students working in these areas through the beautiful and carefully crafted courses he has taught and the theses he has directed. Many students can testify to the passion he brings to research mathematics and to his rare ability to lead students to that same passion in themselves. His extraordinary creativity and generosity with ideas convey a grand vision of mathematics to students, a vision that can fuel entire careers in research mathematics.

Citation: An inspiring mathematician, teacher, and advisor, Victor Ginzburg's clarity and generosity with ideas have influenced innumerable students.

Robert L. Kendrick

Professor, Department of Music and the College; and Chairman, Department of Music

The candidate was presented by Thomas Christensen, Professor, Department of Music and the College.

Robert Kendrick is one of the leading music historians of his generation engaged in the research of Italian musical life in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Beyond his groundbreaking research in the field of cultural musicology, he has proven to be a superb teacher for a generation of graduate students at the University of Chicago. Students drawn from across the University who have taken his graduate courses have experienced firsthand how careful empirical analysis and archival research may be leavened with deeply humanistic concerns and critical evaluation. Outside of the classroom, he has also proven to be an energetic and inspirational mentor to graduate students, who have commended

him repeatedly for his uncommon dedication to their growth as scholars and thinkers. In the best Chicago tradition, Robert Kendrick has truly inspired students to engage fully in the life of the mind.

Citation: Inspirational teacher, model scholar, and dedicated mentor, Robert Kendrick—in the best tradition of the University of Chicago—truly engages students in the “life of the mind.”

Honorary Degrees

Doctor of Humane Letters

Richard Middleton

Emeritus Professor of Music, International Centre for Music Studies, School of Arts and Cultures, University of Newcastle upon Tyne, England, United Kingdom

The candidate was presented by Travis A. Jackson, Associate Professor, Department of Music and the College.

Over nearly four decades, Richard Middleton has been an international example of the best that musical scholarship has to offer. Through work that does not isolate music from its contexts of production and reception, he has shown us the value and necessity of understanding it historically, topographically, sonically, socially, and critically with writings on blues and rock, to studies of jazz and concert music, to engagement with race, gender, sexuality, and class. His careful attention to context and detail and thorough engagement with scholarly literatures have led to sophisticated analyses of the relationships between varied musical styles and political and psychic economies, as well as a refiguring of our understandings of the roles, meanings, and functions of repetition in music.

He has provided the equivalent of the Rosetta Stone for studies of popular music and will soon show how music and power are mutually involved in “voicing the popular.” His writings have served as landmarks for scholars wanting to approach popular music. Without him, not only would music scholarship be impoverished but the repertoires of popular music would perhaps not be considered worthy of academic attention.

Citation: Richard Middleton has made the study of music more theoretically sophisticated and richly nuanced, radically altering the landscape of music scholarship and democratizing the field of the permissible.

Doctor of Science

Arthur B. McDonald

Professor, Department of Physics, Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario, Canada; and Project Director, Sudbury Neutrino Observatory

The candidate was presented by James E. Pilcher, Professor, Department of Physics, Enrico Fermi Institute, and the College.

Arthur B. McDonald has made landmark contributions to our understanding of the nature of the neutrino. His work has re-

solved a thirty-year-old problem in which the observed flux of neutrinos from the sun was only a fraction of that expected. He has demonstrated conclusively that the three known forms of neutrinos are not immutable as earlier experiments had indicated but can transform from one type to another as they travel through matter or space.

He has pursued this goal with uncompromising focus over many years. He assembled a team of scientists and the necessary resources to construct a one-thousand-ton detector in a deep mine in Sudbury, Ontario. This was the first detector of its kind able to detect all forms of neutrinos. He led the team through the challenging construction process, the operation of the detector, and subtle analysis of the data to obtain a remarkable and incontrovertible result.

Citation: Arthur McDonald's vision and perseverance have taught us remarkable new properties of the neutrino and have resolved a long-standing and perplexing problem associated with our understanding of processes in the sun.

Marcus E. Raichle

Professor of Radiology and Neurology, School of Medicine, Washington University in St. Louis, Missouri

The candidate was presented by John T. Cacioppo, the Tiffany and Margaret Blake Distinguished Service Professor, Department of Psychology and the College.

Marcus E. Raichle's contributions to neuroimaging and his research on brain-behavior relationships have revolutionized the fields of psychology, psychiatry, and neurology. Over the past three decades, Professor Raichle has pioneered positron emission tomography and functional magnetic resonance imaging in studies of cognition and behavior. He was the first to test empirically the assumption that if one thought harder, the amount of oxygen in relevant brain tissue would increase simply because more glucose was needed to provide the extra energy. To the great surprise of the field, Professor Raichle found that even though blood flow and glucose consumption increased during mentation, the amount of oxygen used did not. This led to an appreciation that localized moment-by-moment changes in the concentration of oxygen within the brain, detectable using a variation on magnetic resonance imaging, could be used to map when, where, and how the brain processed information and implemented cognition, emotion, and behavior.

Citation: Widely and appropriately considered to be one of the founding fathers of cognitive neuroscience, Marcus Raichle, through brilliant scientific insights and research on the brain and cognition, has provided the theory, methods, and findings that form the basis for metabolic brain imaging research as we know it today.

Summary

The 485th convocation was held on Friday, June 9; Saturday, June 10; and Sunday, June 11, 2006, in the Harper Quadrangle. Don

Michael Randel, President of the University, presided.

A total of 2,839 degrees were awarded: 926 Bachelor of Arts in the College, 68 Bachelor of Science in the College and the Division of the Physical Sciences, 6 Master of Science in the Division of the Biological Sciences and the Pritzker School of Medicine, 134 Master of Arts in the Division of the Humanities, 7 Master of Fine Arts in the Division of the Humanities, 85 Master of Science in the Division of the Physical Sciences, 121 Master of Arts in the Division of the Social Sciences, 707 Master of Business Administration in the Graduate School of Business, 2 International Master of Business Administration in the Graduate School of Business, 19 Master of Arts in the Divinity School, 13 Master of Divinity in the Divinity School, 15 Master of Liberal Arts in the William B. and Catherine V. Graham School of General Studies, 166 Master of Arts in the School of Social Service Administration, 6 Master of Arts in the Irving B. Harris Graduate School of Public Policy Studies, 1 Master of Science in the Irving B. Harris Graduate School of Public Policy Studies, 90 Master of Public Policy in the Irving B. Harris Graduate School of Public Policy Studies, 51 Master of Law in the Law School, 105 Doctor of Medicine in the Pritzker School of Medicine, 16 Doctor of Philosophy in the Division of the Biological Sciences and the Pritzker School of Medicine, 20 Doctor of Philosophy in the Division of the Humanities, 29 Doctor of Philosophy in the Division of the Physical Sciences, 44 Doctor of Philosophy in the Division of the Social Sciences, 9 Doctor of Philosophy in the Graduate School of Business, 7 Doctor of Philosophy in the Divinity School, 2 Doctor of Philosophy in the School of Social Service Administration, 1 Doctor of Jurisprudence in the Law School, and 189 Doctor of Law in the Law School.

Three honorary degrees were conferred during the 485th convocation. The recipients of the Doctor of Science were Arthur B. McDonald, Professor, Department of Physics, Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario, Canada, and Project Director, Sudbury Neutrino Observatory; and Marcus E. Raichle, Professor of Radiology and Neurology, School of Medicine, Washington University in St. Louis, Missouri. The recipient of the Doctor of Humane Letters was Richard Middleton, Emeritus Professor of Music, International Centre for Musical Studies, School of Arts and Cultures, University of Newcastle upon Tyne, England, United Kingdom.

Four Llewellyn John and Harriet Manchester Quantrell Awards for Excellence in Undergraduate Teaching were given, to Helma J. Dik, Associate Professor, Department of Classics and the College; Heinrich M. Jaeger, Professor, Department of Physics, James Franck Institute, and the College; Jocelyn Malamy, Associate Professor, Department of Molecular Genetics & Cell Biology and the College; and Russell H. Tuttle, Professor, Department of Anthropology, Committee on Evolutionary Biology, Morris Fishbein Center for the History of Science & Medicine, and the College.

Four Faculty Awards for Excellence in Graduate Teaching were given, to Shadi Bartsch, the Ann L. and Lawrence B. Battenwieser Professor, Department of Clas-

sics, Committee on the History of Culture, and the College; Dain Borges, Associate Professor, Department of History and the College, and Director, Center for Latin American Studies; Victor Ginzburg, Professor, Department of Mathematics and the College; and Robert L. Kendrick, Professor, Department of Music and the College, and Chairman, Department of Music.

James K. Chandler, the Barbara E. and Richard J. Franke Professor, Department of English Language & Literature, Committees on the History of Culture, Cinema & Media Studies, and Interdisciplinary Studies in the Humanities, and the College, delivered the principal convocation address at the first, second, and third sessions, "Education in the Interrogative Mode."

Michael R. Bloomberg, mayor of the City of New York, delivered remarks at the third session.

Kevin M. Murphy, the George J. Stigler Distinguished Service Professor of Economics in the Graduate School of Business, delivered the principal convocation address at the fourth session, "Seeing the World through the Economic Lens."

Mary A. Tolan, M.B.A.'92, chief executive officer of Accretive Health, delivered remarks at the fourth session.

Bachelor's degree candidates Peter Bartoszek, Min Jung Kim, and Yenisey Rodriguez delivered remarks at the third session.

The 486th Convocation

Address: “Why People Hate Economists (and Why We Don’t Care)”

By Austan Goolsbee

August 25, 2006

Congratulations to you graduates. You made it. That’s the good news. The bad news is that it’s extremely hot and I am going to spend the next fifteen minutes telling you about economics.

Let me start, though, by reminding you that we always have a faculty member get up and talk about ideas at our commencements. We have always done it that way. Some people say that it’s because we are a place of ideas and we want the parents to see that you have been a serious person these past several years. Others say we have a hard time getting more famous people to speak. I don’t know why. Perhaps we are afraid that, starting this afternoon, everywhere you go they will assume you know something because you are a Chicago graduate, so we try to stuff in one last thing before you leave. Personally, I think it’s something completely different. I think these commencement speeches are for the faculty. We may get only twelve minutes to talk, but it’s the only time in our Chicago careers we get to stand up and say whatever we want and you aren’t allowed to challenge it. I mean, what are you going to do? Get up and leave?

So today I thought I would talk about why people hate economists and why we don’t care. Nobody likes an economist. In fact, some students who are here today from the Divinity School are thinking that if they have learned anything in school it’s that an economist like me should not be talking from a pulpit like this. It’s almost like the cartoon where the guy is at a party talking to someone and says, “You’re a terrorist? Thank God. I thought you said you were an economist.”

My granddad used to say that 80 percent of the world doesn’t care about your problems and the other 20 percent is glad. In our case, economists know that 20 percent is way too low. People hate economists, and they hate economists from Chicago most of all. But we don’t mind. So in the next twelve minutes, I will give you the lowdown of how the field of economics has changed in the last twenty-five years and of how economists think about the world. I think it will be pretty clear why we aren’t popular.

First, let’s begin with some misconceptions you might have about “the Chicago School of Economics.” If you aren’t one of the students from the Graduate School of Business who are here in the front pews, you probably think that’s just some right-wing thing. You may have visions of a five-foot-tall bald man—Milton Friedman—and something about monetarism. Well, that is so 1950s, dad.

In the last twenty-five years, much of the action of economics has come from major parts of the field turning away from big macro topics like inflation and unemployment, as well as away from the political stuff, toward microeconomic topics like why there has been a rise of income inequality since the 1970s, what leads to technology adoption in developing countries, or how much people value new products like cereal or minivans.

From our turn toward microeconomics, it wasn’t long before we started getting our noses into just about everything—how to stop crime, how to improve our schools, what medical treatments work, how TV af-

fects kids—we could get data on and apply the basic principles of economics. Now you know how people hate that. “What does an economist know about crime?” “You have no business talking about medicine, you don’t even go to the doctor.” You get the idea.

But I would say that although economists are irritating, the new ideas we have brought to these subjects are important. And often they are things the fields themselves would not have come up with on their own. Economists love markets. It’s true. Even when they think about something gruesome like organ donation, they start asking market questions, like whether people being allowed to sell one of their kidneys would eliminate the grim wait lists for transplants. Although there is no public sentiment for an explicit market in organs, it did lead another economist to think about the issue. He figured out that people objecting to the idea of trading organs for money wouldn’t automatically prevent a beneficial market. He showed that if there was one person who had a brother, say, who was willing to donate a kidney but was not a proper match, we could create a donor bank where they could make a “trade” with a mother in some other location who was willing to donate a kidney to her own child but was not a match. Instead each one donates to the bank, which gives their relative a credit at the bank. Such a bank can save the lives of thousands by encouraging more people to be kidney donors and by making it so that your survival doesn’t depend on you finding a match among close relatives. And it’s an idea that comes straight from the principles of economics.

The “new” Chicago School of Economics is not really about politics at all. It’s not right wing or left wing. It’s about a way of thinking about the world. It starts from the basic theory that, for the most part, people try to do better for themselves. If this is true, they will respond to incentives so that, in most cases, competition will drive them to be more efficient. That theory then says: Let’s get the data and think hard about causality, because we don’t have much in the way of controlled experiments. And let’s see how far that will take us.

But that simplicity of purpose is quite a large part of why people hate us. We really don’t deal with the loftiest ideals of humanity. We deal with humans at their most mundane. We aren’t about narratives and inspiration or how people would behave in their finest hours. We are about how people behave in the everyday marketplace. I think we are especially hated because of the nagging fear on the part of idealists that we might be right about people.

Our world view begins with a few of the following points:

First, economists typically ignore what people say and only look at what they do. We pay no attention to what you say in surveys about how much you love the environment, about how you intend to buy a Prius and start taking public transportation to reduce our dependence on foreign oil. Instead we know you are lying because we can see that people continue to buy a lot of gas even when the price goes up. What people say they are going to do and what they do are barely correlated. People say they don’t care about taxes but make sure

to buy books from sellers out of state so they don’t have to pay sales tax. Even in their dating, what they say they want in a partner and the kind of person they actually date are often far apart. Economists have derived ways to use the information about choices you make to infer what your internal “utility function” must be. People hate having their statements ignored and their choices examined.

Another thing they don’t like is having to make choices between imperfect alternatives. Economists are perfectly comfortable in a world of choosing between the lesser of evils. In our world, everything is an evil. Nothing is perfect. As long as we can see the alternatives and compare them, economics is in its element. Nor are we upset about sunk costs—crying over spilled milk. You’ll never see the economists crying over spilled milk. We’re the people getting up and walking out of the crappy movie because we have better things to do with the next two hours of our time. The \$10 you paid for a ticket is a sunk cost. You can’t get it back, so it’s irrelevant. Sunk costs shouldn’t affect your decisions.

Next, economists don’t take anecdotes for answers. And that irritates people. Out of one hundred smokers, fewer than six will get lung cancer and less than 25 percent will die of something related to smoking. That means that there will always be millions of people who smoke all their lives with no health problems and die at age ninety in a car accident or something. But if you conclude from your uncle’s long life that smoking doesn’t harm people, you are no economist. People hate us because we really don’t care about their uncle. We just want the data on everybody.

And that plays into the last thing: We spend lots of time thinking about causality and indirect effects. Economists documented the big increase in income inequality throughout the 1980s. But we didn’t just wring our hands saying, “Look, inequality is up.” We spent the next two decades pushing hard on the data trying to figure out the root causes of rising inequality. We showed that the inequality was highly tied to an increase in the premium for skills—the earnings of college graduates skyrocketed compared to the earnings of high school graduates, for example. We then tried to figure out whether immigration was pushing low-skill wages down, whether the rise of computers at work was driving high-skill wages up, or whether the shift of consumer spending away from actual manufactured things to services could account for the hit to low-skill workers (since manufacturing industries tended to pay good wages to lower-skill employees).

We also look at indirect effects, which are, ironically, often quite easy to predict. I recently saw an exposé on TV about fat in our diets. They noted that education about fat in milk has led to a huge drop in the level of fat we get from milk. But the kicker from the report was that at the same time we have started drinking less high-fat milk, there has been an almost identical increase in the amount of fat we are eating in our cheese! I guess no one talked to an economist for this report. But they should have.

Think about it: Cow’s milk has the same amount of fat no matter what. If people stop buying the high-fat milk, the

farmers are going to put it somewhere. Did you think they were just going to throw it away? Unless it’s going into dog food or something, cutting fat out of your milk is going to mean lower prices for cheese and more people buying cheese. The prices of cheese may change, but the farmers are always going to sell what they have in one form or another.

But that’s the problem with economics. It’s always taking the fun out of everything. As I like to say, economics is frequently hated but seldom wrong. It’s like the guy in the movie *My Cousin Vinny*. Ralph Macchio (the Karate Kid) and his buddy are on their way to college when they mistakenly get arrested for murder in Alabama. They bring in Macchio’s cousin Vinny as their lawyer, but Vinny has only just passed law school and is really an auto mechanic. Macchio’s friend wants to dump Vinny as the lawyer, but Macchio tells him he shouldn’t. He says something like, “You know the birthday party magician Alakazam? Alakazam was at a party doing tricks. Every trick he did, Vinny was like, ‘No, no, wait a second. He’s palming it and the rings are breakable and the card is up his sleeve.’ It was Alakazam’s worst nightmare. But he wasn’t being a jerk. He was just being the quintessential Gambini.” But Macchio wasn’t thinking big enough. Actually Vinny was really just being the quintessential Chicago economist. It’s who we are. We live to argue. How does the world work? Where should we eat lunch? Anything.

We know that everyone hates us. The reason we don’t care is that we are too busy arguing with each other to pay attention. In our world, it doesn’t matter where you got a degree or how old you are or where you are from. It just matters what your ideas are. And that’s how it should be. Ironically, somehow the place that puts no status on being the grand old scholar of the field—the place where the junior faculty are chewing out the Nobel laureates for getting it wrong—is the very place that seems to extend the intellectual lives of its grand old scholars far beyond other universities. Come to a seminar any week of the year in economics, and you will find scholars in the thick of a debate that would long since have been considered “checked out” anywhere else. It’s actually quite thrilling.

After I gave my first talk at Chicago, I went to dinner at the restaurant in the Windermere—Piccolo Mondo—and they had paper tablecloths. Some guys in the audience continued to debate me out of the seminar room and then in the car over there and then in the restaurant. We were writing all over the tablecloths and not ordering. After about twenty minutes, the waiter walked up and said loudly, “Ahem . . . may I get you anything?” The most senior person there looked up and said, “Well yes, we really need some more tablecloths.”

It’s not just Chicago economists, though, and you know it. It’s what Chicago is like. I had the pleasure (and pain) of serving on the search committee that selected our illustrious new President, who is presiding over his first convocation here today. There were faculty from all the divisions on the committee. I really knew only economists before that. Over the course of the search, I came to see that we *all* have that intensity. It’s just who we are. We are the only place in

the world where you go into the classrooms, and not only are the boards full of writing but people have written off the edges and there are chalk marks on the walls.

It's why when you come back here in ten years or fifty years or whenever, you will still find us asking for more tablecloths at Piccolo Mondo and the classroom walls still will have chalk marks on them. As long as there is a seminar room, you will still find the economists in there arguing with each other about how the world works. There are people who think that a place like this cannot succeed—no \$50-billion endowment, no cache of the social elite, no whatever it is. But as long as we have students and alumni with the spirit that you have and a

culture with the intensity that Chicago has, and as long as there is a seminar room that the faculty can meet in . . . I have to tell you—I like those odds.

Austan Goolsbee is the Robert P. Gwinn Professor in the Graduate School of Business.

Summary

The 486th convocation was held on August 25, 2006, in the Harper Quadrangle. Robert J. Zimmer, President of the University, presided.

A total of 468 degrees were awarded: 38 Bachelor of Arts in the College, 1 Bachelor of Science in the College and the Division of

the Physical Sciences, 5 Master of Science in the Division of the Biological Sciences and the Pritzker School of Medicine, 16 Master of Arts in the Division of the Humanities, 49 Master of Science in the Division of the Physical Sciences, 130 Master of Arts in the Division of the Social Sciences, 91 Master of Business Administration in the Graduate School of Business, 2 Master of Arts in the Divinity School, 1 Master of Divinity 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, 2 Master of Public Policy in the

Irving B. Harris Graduate School of Public Policy Studies, 24 Doctor of Philosophy in the Division of the Biological Sciences and the Pritzker School of Medicine, 23 Doctor of Philosophy in the Division of the Humanities, 23 Doctor of Philosophy in the Division of the Physical Sciences, 35 Doctor of Philosophy in the Division of the Social Sciences, 5 Doctor of Philosophy in the Graduate School of Business, 1 Doctor of Philosophy in the Divinity School, and 3 Doctor of Law in the Law School.

Austan Goolsbee, the Robert P. Gwinn Professor in the Graduate School of Business, delivered the convocation address, "Why People Hate Economists (and Why We Don't Care)."

© 2006 The University of Chicago
ISSN 0362-4706
11-06/15M/PRE07622

The University of Chicago Record
5710 South Woodlawn Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60637
773/702-8352

www.uchicago.edu/docs/education/record/