

### McCullough Stated Meeting Draws Largest Audience Ever

The Academy's mission to advance knowledge and service to society was inspired by the ideals of its founder, John Adams. At the Academy's 1856th Stated Meeting, on March 13, 2002, biographer **David McCullough** discussed "**John Adams and the Good Life of the Mind.**" The talk, held at Harvard University's Memorial Church, was the largest Stated Meeting in the Academy's 222-year history. Over 850 Fellows and guests attended the event, which was cosponsored by the Boston Athenaeum.

Honored with the 2002 Pulitzer Prize in Biography, McCullough's *John Adams* has become an international bestseller, prompting a greater appreciation for both Adams's personal character and his goals for the new nation. In his talk, McCullough focused on the importance of education in the life of John Adams, emphasizing that "the idea of rousing up the mind is all through his life and his writings."

Adams authored the oldest written constitution still in use today—the constitution of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. It contains what McCullough calls "a paragraph unlike any that had been written before in any document of its kind, declaring that it is the 'duty' of legislators to ensure that 'wisdom and knowledge, as well as virtue' are diffused among all the people of the commonwealth." The paragraph was drafted in September 1779, only a month after Adams had announced that he would establish a Society of Arts and Sciences in Boston. Adams's overriding concern with education echoes in the Academy's 1780 charter, which states that the "end and design of this institution . . . is to cultivate every art and science which may tend to advance the interest, honor, dignity and happiness of a free, independent and virtuous people."



Biographer David McCullough with Pauline Maier (MIT).

**Louis W. Cabot**, Vice President of the Academy, presided over the Stated Meeting, and **Richard Wendorf**, Stanford Calderwood Director and Librarian of the Boston Athenaeum, presented greetings on behalf of the Athenaeum. Academy Fellow **Pauline Maier**, William R. Kenan, Jr., Professor of History at MIT, introduced McCullough, noting that “he has managed to convince a million and a half people to buy a book of over 600 pages on John Adams, and that can be nothing but a cause for celebration.”

After the Stated Meeting, at a reception held at the House of the Academy, the only known life-size portrait of John Adams was unveiled. Painted by John Singleton Copley in 1783, it depicts Adams during his service as First Minister to the Court of St. James. The Academy is grateful to the Fogg Art Museum for their loan of this painting from the Harvard University Collections.

### **American Academy in the Press and on the Web**

Over the past year, the Academy has received unprecedented press coverage for Stated Meetings held around the country, the relaunch of *Daedalus*, and the publication of a new series of Occasional Papers disseminating the results of Academy projects in a timely manner. The Associated Press report-

ed on the fall Induction Ceremony, along with the *Boston Globe* and other general-circulation newspapers nationwide, as well as campus-based newspapers and corporate newsletters. In conjunction with a New York Stated Meeting last fall, the *New York Times* interviewed speakers Lee Bollinger, then-incoming president of Columbia University, and John Sexton, then-incoming president of New York University. Media outlets covered both of the Stated Meetings held in March 2002—the David McCullough event in Cambridge (see p. 5) and the Washington discussion of “Congress and the Court,” with Senator Charles Schumer of New York and Judge J. Harvie Wilkinson III of the Fourth Circuit.

The *Chicago Tribune*, the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, and the *Nation* published articles on the redesign of *Daedalus*, noting its streamlined format and new features, including fiction, poetry, and a “Notes” section by Academy Fellows. In a *Boston Globe* interview, *Daedalus* editor Jim Miller spoke of the challenges involved in producing “one of the few outlets left for intelligent, reflective writing.”

The first in the Academy’s series of Occasional Papers, *Evaluation and the Academy: Are We Doing The Right Thing?*—a report on grade inflation and inflated letters of recommendation by Henry Rosovsky (Harvard University)—received wide attention in publications ranging from the *Times (London) Higher Education Supplement* to the *Christian Science Monitor* and *Time* magazine. The study prompted editorials in *USA Today* as well as in several campus newspapers.

An essay by Robert Solow (MIT), prepared for the Occasional Paper entitled *Making the Humanities Count: The Importance of Data*, was published in its entirety in the “Chronicle Review” section of the *Chronicle of Higher Education*. A recent column in the *Washington Post* also called attention to the study.

In addition, the content of the Academy's website (*www.amacad.org*) has expanded significantly to include reports on Academy projects, publications, and events. It contains excerpts from *Daedalus*, the *Bulletin*, and the *Newsletter*, as well as the full texts of the Occasional Papers. The Rosovsky report alone has received more than 18,000 hits to date. Other Occasional Papers available online include *Trends in German and American Higher Education* and *Probing Human Origins*. Over the past year, the website has also included a streaming video of the Bollinger-Sexton Stated Meeting, as well as application information for the Visiting Scholars Center. Since March 2001 there has been a 30 percent increase in page requests, which have risen from 14,000 to 46,000.

## **International Criminal Court**

Though published nearly two years ago, the Academy's study of the consequences of the International Criminal Court (ICC) for US national security is receiving renewed attention. On May 6 the United States notified United Nations Secretary General Kofi Annan that it does not intend to become a full party to the treaty establishing the ICC and claimed, accordingly, that it has no legal obligations arising from its December 2000 signature of the treaty. The United States did not seek Senate ratification of the treaty, and the Bush administration's decision to "unsign" it arises from concerns over the ICC's independence and universal jurisdiction.

All of the United States's closest allies are full parties to the treaty, which has now received the 60 ratifications needed to bring it into being. The

ICC will be formally established in July 2002, with a mandate to try individuals accused of genocide, crimes against humanity, and other war crimes. The Academy study, organized by Carl Kaysen and Sarah Sewall under the auspices of the Committee on International Security Studies, brought together eminent legal scholars and military experts to examine in detail the provisions of the treaty to establish the ICC and to assess its risks and benefits for the United States.

Excerpts from the published study and an accompanying report are available on the Academy's website at [www.amacad.org](http://www.amacad.org). An Op-Ed piece by Sewall and Kaysen, titled "Error by Bush on World Court," recently appeared in the *Boston Globe* (May 10, 2002).

### Conversations in the Aftermath of September 11

Drawing upon its diverse and interdisciplinary membership, the Academy has hosted conversations examining the social and cultural factors influencing terrorism, as well as the consequences of the American reaction to the attacks of September 11. The forums reflect the Academy's longstanding interest in exploring how the international community can devise new cooperative structures to promote peace and improve global security.

The first meeting, held in December, presented Judeo-Christian and Islamic perspectives on the ethics of war. Given the predominance of religious rhetoric in justifying actions on all sides in the crisis, the Academy invited two distinguished Fellows, **J. Bryan Hehir** and **Roy Mottahedeh**, to trace the evolution, appropriation, and misappropriation of the concept of a "just war" in Islam and Christianity. Hehir, former head of Harvard Divinity School, is now president and CEO of Catholic Charities USA; Mottahedeh is Gurney Professor of History and chair of the Committee on Islamic Studies at Harvard.

According to Mottahedeh, the September 11 hijackers used methods that are clearly outside of traditional interpretations of Islamic laws of war, which prohibit attacks on women and children.

He explained that in the high scholastic tradition of Islamic law, “there evolved an idea that to attack people suddenly and without warning was wrong, cowardly.” However, Mottahedeh suggested, the US response made it easier for followers of Bin Laden to misappropriate aspects of that tradition to support their cause. He stated that “it would have strengthened our moral position immensely” if “we had announced every day of the war that we would stop the minute they surrendered Osama Bin Laden and the people representing his entourage.”

Hehir maintained that the United States had “just cause” to pursue military action in Afghanistan, even though aspects of the US air campaign raise troubling questions. He explained that the Judeo-Christian ethic allows for a limited use of force in exceptional circumstances: “War is the remedy for sinful action. When everything else fails, you can resort to force in the name of protecting human life, key human values, and a basic order of existence that is necessary for human dignity.” But Hehir emphasized that states may not seek to destroy an entire society, nor may they use force when ends and means are not closely associated, or employ means that are out of proportion with the perceived threat. In his words, “given the nature of America’s highly focused airpower, there will always be troubling questions about proportionality.”



Moderator Alan Berger (*Boston Globe*) with speakers Roy Mottahedeh (Harvard University) and J. Bryan Hehir (Catholic Charities USA) at the discussion on “Just War? Judeo-Christian and Muslim Perspectives.”



Speakers Harold Koh (Yale University), Norman Dorsen (New York University Law School), moderator Carl Kaysen (MIT), and John Deutsch (MIT) at the meeting on "Civil Liberties."

A second conversation, held in February, dealt with the tension between national security concerns and civil liberties since September 11. Academy Fellows who have held leading positions in the Department of State, the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), and the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) offered their views on current policies and debated the consequences of new security practices. **Harold Koh**, former Assistant Secretary of State for Human Rights and currently Gerard C. and Bernice Latrobe Smith Professor of International Law at Yale Law School, expressed deep reservations about the passage of the USA Patriot Act, which provides for sweeping changes in law enforcement powers. He argued that the legislation violates some of the most basic tenets of American legal tradition, including the federal government's prohibition of spying on American citizens; the idea of equal justice for all, citizens and legal aliens alike; and the notion that checks and balances apply to the federal government even in times of war. Most important, Koh spoke of his concern about the lack of dissent directed at the administration's actions: "We have to reaffirm loudly that it's never unpatriotic to question what our government does in our name, particularly in times of war." In his view, the Supreme Court is unlikely to be a legal check to the current administration, and it is thus imperative that the media and the citizenry speak out.

Former ACLU president **Norman Dorsen**, Frederick I. and Grace A. Stokes Professor of Law at New York University School of Law, also expressed alarm over the USA Patriot Act, the military tribunals established under President Bush's executive order, and the detention of over a thousand aliens in the United States: "It is natural and appropriate for the government to combat this danger aggressively," he noted. "But, equally, the government's response to safeguard national security should be no broader than the threat requires." Dorsen acknowledged that the United States is facing complicated circumstances that require aggressive new measures, but he maintained that those techniques should be limited to the specific threat of terrorism.

**John Deutch**, now an Institute Professor at MIT and formerly director of the CIA, maintained that this nation must alter its prevailing assumptions about the respective responsibilities of law enforcement and national security officials. "Old distinctions between foreign and domestic, wartime and peacetime, law enforcement and national security must be redefined," he said. "It is the responsibility of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to bring people to trial, not to protect against future threats." Deutch concurred with the other speakers that the United States is facing a new and dangerous enemy, but he suggested that the country's national security apparatus, rather than its law enforcement agencies, should be responsible for much of the work in the war on terrorism.

The transcripts of both conversations are posted on the Academy's website at [www.amacad.org](http://www.amacad.org) and will be published together in a forthcoming Occasional Paper.

---

Photos © 2001, 2002 by Martha Stewart.