

---

## PROGRESS REPORTS ON ACADEMY PROJECTS



Prior to the National Induction Ceremony on October 5, 2002, the Academy held an orientation session for newly elected members at its House in Cambridge. President **Patricia Meyer Spacks** (University of Virginia), Vice President **Louis W. Cabot** (Cabot-Wellington, LLC), Secretary **Emilio Bizzi** (MIT), and Executive Officer **Leslie C. Berlowitz** welcomed the inductees and provided an overview of the Academy's history and mission. Five project representatives gave progress reports on Academy studies: **John Steinbruner** (University of Maryland), **Francis Oakley** (Williams College), **Robert C. Post** (Boalt Hall School of Law, UC Berkeley), **David Bloom** (Harvard School of Public Health), and historian **James Carroll**. Their remarks are published here, in the order presented.

### Reconsidering the Rules of Space

#### *John Steinbruner*

The Committee on International Security Studies is embarking on a study of space policy—an area we think is likely to be an emerging and major concern in this country and abroad. Let me begin with a fact that is probably familiar to all of you: over the past two decades, with sustained investment in military capability, the United States has acquired a degree of military superiority that is arguably unprecedented in history. The buildup was originally articulated as a balanced response to external threats and was not explicitly intended to provide global superiority. Nonetheless, the American political system as a whole has endorsed a program of military investment that will sustain our military superiority over at least the next twenty years. This raises important questions about how, in what manner, and for what purpose this military capacity is to be used.

Implicit in these questions is the degree to which the United States addresses itself to issues of international security, as distinct from national security,



John Steinbruner (University of Maryland)

and the degree of influence we allow other countries to have over the way we develop and use our military establishment. These issues are now prominently in question in Iraq—but they are not solely, or even primarily, about Iraq. Very significant and unresolved security issues are being played out in relationships that are more enduring than the current situation with Iraq. In the background, and meaningfully affected by our actions toward Iraq, are our relationships with Russia and China.

These latter two countries represent, in some sense, the broader world—certainly, the broader world not formerly involved in US alliances. The Moscow treaty on nuclear weapons, concluded in May, announced, in effect, the end of an era of arms control. The whole process of arms control, from the end of World War II until very recently, has been an attempt to balance the capabilities of opposing military establishments—to make them equitable enough to provide stability. The Moscow Treaty abandons the objective of balancing capability and sets conditions that increasingly legitimize significant US military superiority. Russia, unable to avoid the fundamental fact of US military superiority, has signed on to that inevitability.

Under the circumstances, the prominent question for the Russians, and for the Chinese and others, is whether the United States will use its increasing

capability to intimidate or to reassure. Obviously, countries outside the United States—in particular, those outside our alliance system—strongly need us to, and hope we will, use it to reassure.

The answer to the question of how we will use our capability will depend heavily on rules of activity in space. Space capacity is critical to the particular forms of superiority that the US military establishment has acquired and continues to develop. Space capacity is also exceedingly vulnerable, and therefore, although it is an area of common interest and accommodation, it is also a logical focus for the famous “asymmetric reaction” about which the Pentagon rightly worries. What does a military establishment do when it cannot match US military capability globally? One response is to focus on the vulnerability and the criticality of US space assets as a way of negating a lot of what the United States otherwise can do with its military. This is a major concern that must be taken into account in developing rules of deployment in space.

If you listen carefully to what leading areas of our military establishment are saying, the United States is projecting the capacity to observe everything on Earth, to attack what we do not like, and to deny similar capability to everyone else. Needless to say, that message is received with profound discomfort in many parts of the world, particularly in Beijing. The Chinese, in raising their concerns, are basically saying, “It won’t work out that way,” and they are asking for negotiations to develop rules of accommodation that would ban direct weapons and set other guidelines for mutual protection in space.

For the last decade, the United States has been refusing to negotiate over the whole subject of space policy, saying that it will do as it pleases. The participants in our study feel that the American public needs to be more engaged in determining what our balance of interests should be and what kinds of rules we want, knowing that we carry out more than military activity in space. Important commercial activities and scientific exploration, as well as traditional military support operations, could be placed severely in question if current conditions

persist and if no agreement on rules is negotiated. It is overwhelmingly in our interest to devise and enforce such rules, and it is very foolish to refuse to negotiate about the use of space. We believe that if the majority of US citizens were aware of our nation's position, they would want a more balanced policy—but they are not aware of it. It is our duty to raise questions, pose issues, encourage people to think about them, and suggest constructive answers. That is what the Academy's project on space policy is all about.

## The Humanities Indicators Project

### *Francis Oakley*

In 1998 the Academy launched its Initiative for the Humanities and Culture. Let me start by describing that program in general, and then go on to focus on the aspect of the enterprise in which I am most deeply involved.

The initiative consists of several distinct but inter-related undertakings, all of them responsive to that quintessentially humanist injunction to “know thyself.” First, the Academy is leading a sustained effort to create an improved system for gathering empirical data about the humanities and, with that in view, has created an informal consortium that



Francis Oakley (Williams College)

includes many of the nation's leading organizations in the humanities and in higher education. Second, the Academy is sponsoring a series of research studies about the evolution of the humanities disciplines, the institutional settings that provide support for the humanities, and the influence of cultural diversity on the development of the humanities in the United States. Two volumes are now being prepared: one edited by Academy President Patricia Meyer Spacks (University of Virginia), the other by David Hollinger (UC Berkeley). Third, although it is not formally part of the humanities initiative, the Academy's newly created Visiting Scholars Program has special significance for the humanities because fellowship opportunities for postdoctoral fellows and junior faculty in the humanities are comparatively scarce.

Having been involved in the humanities initiative since its inception, I want now to focus on its response to the lack of reliable sustained data of the sort that can facilitate meaningful comparisons among disciplines, institutional sectors, and moments in time. Stephen Raudenbush (University of Michigan) and I cochair the Academy's leadership group on data development. One of the Academy's greatest strengths is its ability to involve in this effort Fellows who are preeminent social scientists, as well as others from classes with an interest in the humanities. Our working group, the Humanities Indicators Consortium, includes economist Robert Solow (MIT), former US Census Bureau director Kenneth Prewitt, and Columbia University provost Jonathan Cole, as well as representatives from leading scholarly organizations and federal agencies with an interest in data collection, such as the National Science Foundation, the National Endowment for the Humanities, the American Council of Learned Societies (which I currently serve as president), the Association of American Universities, and the National Humanities Alliance. Together, we hope to shape a cost-effective research strategy that will minimize duplication of efforts and bring much-needed coordination to data collection.

Data collection may seem something of a dry topic, perhaps, until one pauses to ask why it is, after all, that those of us in the humanities seem to find it so very hard to convey to others the significance of what we do, its importance for national well-being, or even the status and current condition of the humanistic endeavor to which we bring so passionate a commitment. This problem, in all its complexity, cannot be resolved by any single or simple mode of approach. Part of the problem, I sense, is that we ourselves do not always understand what we do, or why we do it, or why it is as important as we instinctively take it to be. At least part of the reason for that failure of understanding is that even when we try to comprehend what we are doing—by placing it in a larger context, for example, or by viewing it from a broader or a comparative perspective—we find that we lack the supportive and interpretive tools provided by the systematic gathering, organization, analysis, and dissemination of the type of pertinent data long available to those whose task it is to interpret the natural sciences not only to the larger public but also to themselves. In the humanities, such data are either lacking or, if collected, are inconsistently assembled, hard of access, poorly disseminated, inadequately analyzed, unwittingly ignored, and routinely underutilized.

Early in our discussions, a number of Academy Fellows contrasted the lack of reliable empirical data in the humanities with the wealth of resources available in the sciences and engineering. More than a quarter-century ago, some members of the initiative's steering committee had participated in the creation of the *Science and Engineering Indicators (SEI)*, and they proposed that we take its statistical profile of American science as our model. The *SEI* has grown into a robust set of data indeed; updated every two years, its datasets provide information on enrollments, the workforce, and research and development, as well as on regional, racial, and gender differences in educational and career patterns.

It is one of our misfortunes in the humanities that we have nothing at all comparable. We don't even

know if the state of the humanities is better or worse than it was, say, fifty years ago. How could we? We do have gross figures, at least for the years since the late 1960s, about the number of degrees awarded in arts and sciences subjects nationally, but we simply don't know, for example, whether or not there's been a decline in the numbers of undergraduates taking individual courses in humanistic subjects, nor do we really know if there is any truth to claims that colleges and universities are abandoning requirements that students take courses in Western civilization. One targeted study has suggested, surprisingly and counterintuitively, that the overall percentage of institutions requiring students to take a course in the history of Western civilization has risen to almost 50 percent over the past quarter century. We confront, in effect, a situation in which educational policymakers lack crucial information about roughly half of the disciplines that form the core of liberal arts education.

The need for basic empirical data is particularly urgent now, when new economic, curricular, and ideological pressures threaten support for the humanities. In recent years, foundations, scholarly associations, and individuals have issued reports offering often pessimistic assessments of the health of the humanities and the quality of research and teaching in individual disciplines. Not all of those reports rest on secure factual or statistical bases, least of all the more polemical studies that assert a decline in the amount and quality of teaching in the humanities. Neither the critics themselves nor the characteristically wounded (if occasionally truculent) respondents have shown much interest in the pertinent statistical data, even when they are available. Instead we get a species of disheveled anecdotalism, and a free-fire zone is created for eye-catching and sensationalist claims, matched all too often by analytically flaccid and apoplectically sloppy responses. Clearly, this is not good enough. And it is here that the Academy's project on humanities indicators comes into play.

Earlier this year, the Academy issued an Occasional Paper on the problems of databases in the human-

ities. Entitled *Making the Humanities Count: The Importance of Data*, the report includes a detailed examination of existing databases in the humanities, with particular attention to their utility for answering the kinds of questions routinely addressed by the *Science and Engineering Indicators*. In it we concluded that existing humanities data sources are limited in usefulness because of inconsistent measurement techniques, small sample sizes, and a failure to update these materials regularly. In sum, we have found that neither policymakers nor professionals in the humanities are well served by existing data collection efforts. We hope to solve these problems of coordination and planning as part of the Academy's ambitious effort to improve data collection.

This initiative is still in its infancy, but we are already seeing some positive results. The Rockefeller and Hewlett Foundations, among others, have provided support for our work. In addition, membership organizations representing the humanities are beginning to work together to make data collection a platform on which we can build.

It is, I believe, one of the Academy's glories that its purview extends to so broad a range of intellectual endeavor. It embraces the full gamut of disciplines, and its mission, accordingly, is to try to serve all of them. W. E. B. Du Bois once observed (he was talking about the Housatonic River) that we will be judged by what we neglect. By embarking on its humanities initiative, the Academy, with all its manifold obligations, will not be judged for having neglected the humanistic disciplines. I celebrate that fact.

## The Changing Relationship Between Congress and the Court

**Robert C. Post**

The Academy is launching a study of the contemporary relationship between Congress and the federal judiciary. At issue are questions of great importance for the future of democratic governance in this country. The steering committee consists of



Robert C. Post (Boalt Hall School of Law, UC Berkeley)

Jesse Choper (UC Berkeley), Abner Mikva (University of Chicago Law School), Linda Greenhouse (*New York Times*), Nelson Polsby (UC Berkeley), and myself. This diverse committee will, we hope, develop an interdisciplinary approach to analyzing and, hopefully, ameliorating the severe tensions that now afflict the relationship between the legislative and judicial branches of the federal government.

To understand these tensions, I must ask you to remember your high-school civics class, in which you no doubt learned that the government of the United States had only limited powers. The founders of our country created a federal government that had *only* the powers given to it by the Constitution. State governments, by contrast, were believed by the founders to hold plenary power, meaning that state governments could exercise any power except that which had been taken away and given to the federal government. This distinction between federal and state power persisted until the twentieth century. It made a certain amount of sense in the context of a nation that was highly decentralized. But although the federal government left a rather small footprint on the life of the nation in the eighteenth century, its role grew increasingly important as the country grew economically more integrated throughout the nineteenth century. Regulation of the single national market created by the expansion of the great rail-

road lines—a market that far transcended the boundaries of individual states—increasingly came to be seen as a federal responsibility.

Nevertheless, the United States Supreme Court, true to the original understanding of the founders, continued to review congressional statutes to determine whether they were consistent with limited powers granted to the federal government by the Constitution. Even as late as 1918, for example, the Court was prepared to strike down a congressional statute prohibiting the transportation of the products of child labor in interstate commerce. The Court argued that the federal government had not been given the power to regulate local conditions of manufacturing. Only the states could regulate these conditions.

The emergency spawned by the Great Depression smashed this conceptual distinction between federal and state power. The lesson of the Depression was that the nation was a single, integrated economic entity, so that the national dimensions of the crisis could not be addressed unless Congress were free to regulate economic transactions that had previously been deemed to lie within the exclusive domain of state power. At first the Supreme Court sought to maintain the old boundaries between federal and state power, striking down New Deal statutes that regulated manufacturing within the states. This caused a constitutional crisis, in which Franklin Roosevelt threatened to pack the US Supreme Court with new and sympathetic justices. Eventually, the crisis was resolved when Justice Owen Roberts switched his vote, leading to the famous quip by T. R. Powell about “the switch in time that saved nine.” As a result of the crisis, the Supreme Court abandoned its efforts to police the boundaries of federal power. Instead it defined its role as reviewing otherwise valid exercises of federal power to see if they were consistent with constitutional rights.

Because the crisis of the New Deal was resolved in this fashion, most of us have come of age in a world in which the federal government effectively has plenary power to address what it perceives to

be national needs. After 1937 the Supreme Court refused to strike down federal statutes on the grounds that Congress didn't have the power to enact them. This regime of constitutional law, which has been called the New Deal Settlement, came to an abrupt end in 1995, when five justices, appointed by Republican presidents determined to revive the values of federalism, coalesced into a powerful voting bloc capable of determining the direction of the Court. In the 1995 case *United States v. Lopez*, the Court struck down the Gun-Free School Zones Act of 1990, on the ground that the act was beyond the power of Congress. Since that time, the Court has indicated that it is serious about striking down congressional statutes that are beyond the boundaries of federal power. For example, the Court has invalidated important provisions of the Violence Against Women Act, and it has narrowly interpreted the reach of federal criminal and environmental laws in ways that are explicitly designed to sidestep ultimate questions of constitutional power.

From the perspective of those of us who study constitutional law, these decisions constitute a profound revolution of potentially immense significance. They signify that the national legislature no longer has the constitutional power to address what it deems to be national needs. The Court, rather than the Congress, will determine the reach of national authority. This shift is enormously consequential, and it underlies the great tension that now permeates the relationship between Congress and the Supreme Court.

It is not, however, the only source of that tension. I will quickly mention three other causes of the relationship's deterioration. First, there is a growing dispute between the Court and Congress about which branch has authority to interpret the Constitution. Section 5 of the Fourteenth Amendment gives Congress the power "to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article." The provisions of the Fourteenth Amendment that Congress is thus empowered to enforce include the right to due process of law and the

right to equal protection of the law. In a recent series of cases, however, the Supreme Court has invalidated federal legislation enacted pursuant to Section 5, on the ground that Congress's interpretation of these rights conflicts with the interpretations of the Court. The Court has, in effect, asserted a monopoly on the power to interpret the Constitution.

This claim of exclusive interpretive authority is of great significance. It alters over a century of contrary practice. It basically transforms our Constitution into what Franklin Roosevelt once called a "lawyer's contract," as distinct from a "layman's charter" of rights. Acting on this claim of exclusive interpretive authority, the Court has struck down as unconstitutional provisions of numerous statutes, including the Violence Against Women Act, the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, the Americans with Disability Act, and the Patent and Plant Variety Protection Remedy Clarification Act. The Court has found that these statutes violate constitutional principles of separation of powers because they reflect Congress's effort independently to interpret the Constitution, an effort that infringes on the Court's preemptive "duty to say what the law is."

In striking down these statutes, the Court has exercised its power of judicial review, which authorizes the Court to check what it perceives to be congressional actions that overstep constitutional limits. But this check is countered by the many constitutional means given to Congress to check what it regards as judicial overreaching. There are numerous such mechanisms, which range from determining the scope and range of judicial jurisdiction to the setting of judicial salaries. By far the most important avenue of congressional influence, however, is the confirmation process, which is a second additional source of tension in the relationship between Congress and the judicial branch.

The Senate can ultimately control the complexion of the federal judiciary because it must approve the

appointment of all Article III federal judges. Although the appointment process for Supreme Court justices was highly contentious throughout most of the nineteenth century, levels of disputation have reached new heights since the unsuccessful nomination of Robert Bork in 1987. At the heart of these debates are ideological contests about the constitutional identity of the nation. We will see whether competing visions of constitutional structure begin to influence the confirmation process. As of now, however, the Senate seems incapable of conceptualizing its role as monitoring the constitutional ideology of nominees; it has instead displaced these concerns to issues of individual character, or to the question of whether a candidate is within “the mainstream,” whatever that may mean. The rules of engagement in the confirmation process remain highly murky and obscure, despite the increasing importance of that process. Moreover, nominations to the lower federal bench have become infected with the same ideological polarization as have nominations to the Supreme Court. This is a recent development of great significance.

The third source of tension involves the more mundane but ultimately more important process of statutory interpretation. Congress regulates the country by passing laws. These laws are not self-enforcing; they must be interpreted and applied by courts. In the past few years, the basic principles of statutory interpretation have become highly controversial. Some justices contend that courts ought never to review legislative history when seeking to interpret statutes, whereas others deliberately look to all available forms of information that might help a court understand the meaning of legislation. It has therefore become unclear what pieces of information, in addition to the actual text of a statute, will actually count as authoritative indicia of legislative intent and meaning. The smooth cooperation of Court and Congress is correspondingly undermined, and law enforcement throughout the United States is undercut.

So, to put the matter bluntly, the relationship between the Court and Congress has become ex-

tremely problematic in the past decade. This is an unsettling development to anyone who cares about the effective operation of the federal government. Some Fellows of the Academy believe that the Academy, as a nonpartisan witness of recent developments, with a strong independent interest in promoting principles of good governance, might facilitate a constructive dialogue that could reach across the chasm now separating Congress from the federal courts. We have accordingly launched an Academy project addressed to the current tensions between the Court and Congress. We have a two-pronged strategy.

The first prong is to convene groups of justices and judges, on the one hand, and members of Congress, on the other, for off-the-record conversations. We hope that these meetings will serve two purposes. The first is to facilitate communication between Congress and the courts that will reduce the possibility of misunderstanding and to maximize cooperative efforts to confront common problems. We had our first meeting last year in the Library of Congress, and it produced a frank and stimulating discussion. We hope to be able to institutionalize these conversations. The second point of these meetings is to develop an agenda for future scholarly research. If disagreements between Congress and the courts can in any respect be diminished by impartial and interdisciplinary scholarship, the Academy stands ready to sponsor such research.

The second prong of the project's strategy is to produce scholarship relevant to ameliorating the current tension between Congress and the judiciary. We are now pursuing two inquiries. The first concerns the nomination process for the federal appellate courts. The headlines now are full of confirmation battles regarding judges nominated to the US Courts of Appeals, including Michael McConnell and Miguel Estrada. This is a new historical phenomenon. There is a real question, however, as to whether the ideological orientation of Court of Appeals judges can affect the ultimate shape and direction of the law. Appellate court

judges argue that their work is so bound and supervised by the Supreme Court that there is relatively little room for the exercise of judicial discretion. But is this true? Law professors and political scientists tend to think that the composition of intermediate federal courts makes a great deal of difference. Lobbyists and special interest groups clearly believe that this is the case. There is thus disagreement about the empirical facts of the matter. We hope to be able to study the influence of ideology on decision-making in the US Courts of Appeals. The outcome of this work is relevant to the confirmation process of appellate federal judges.

The other scholarly inquiry that we are pursuing concerns the question of statutory interpretation. There are many different, competing theories of how a court should interpret a statute, and often these theories lead to different conclusions about the operative meaning of federal legislation. We intend to identify controversial cases that turn on questions of statutory interpretation and then to examine carefully the history of the relevant statutes. We will compare this history to the assumptions underlying different theories of judicial interpretation. We will, so to speak, put these theories to empirical tests. Although this work will not definitively settle the jurisprudential questions involved in statutory interpretation, because these questions often have strongly normative components, our study should nevertheless illuminate these questions. We hope that it might provide a solid foundation for more efficient cooperation between Congress and the judiciary. We expect that as future meetings occur between members of the judiciary and members of Congress, additional scholarly inquiries will be placed on the Academy's agenda.

## **Universal Basic and Secondary Education**

### ***David Bloom***

Joel Cohen (Columbia and Rockefeller Universities) and I cochair the Academy's project on Uni-



David Bloom (Harvard School of Public Health)

versal Basic and Secondary Education (UBASE), an extremely ambitious undertaking focused on the rationale, means, and consequences of providing quality basic and secondary education to all the world's children.

The starting point for the UBASE project is that huge numbers of school-age children in developing countries are not currently enrolled in school. The deficits, concentrated in South Asia and sub-Saharan Africa, are especially pronounced among girls. Although access to primary school has increased sharply in recent decades, the same cannot be said of secondary school. In addition, the quality of the education offered at both the primary and secondary levels leaves much to be desired, judging by careful examination of a wide range of inputs, outputs, and practices of educational systems throughout most developing countries.

None of these observations is novel. Back in 1990, representatives of 155 countries gathered in Thailand, took note of a qualitatively similar picture, and pledged that they would achieve universal primary education by the year 2000. But today, in 2002, the world is still a long way from achieving that goal. And now the world has graciously given itself a fifteen-year extension for the achievement of universal basic and secondary education, as reflected in the Millennium Development Goals of

the United Nations, which are taking shape as the central imperative and unifying theme of all efforts at international development.

The UBASE project may not be novel in terms of the stylized facts that motivate it, but it is somewhat novel in several other respects. Its novelty has to do with its focus on both primary and secondary education, its attention to educational quality as well as educational access, and its recognition that fresh thinking is needed if we are to pick up the pace of educational development. It also has to do with the future orientation of the project—in other words, the need to plan for tomorrow's world, not yesterday's. Finally, the UBASE project recognizes that the issues under study are inherently complex. The complexity extends beyond the bounds of any single discipline and necessitates disciplinary rigor as well as interdisciplinary cooperation.

Getting one's arms around UBASE is a rather daunting task, if only for the great breadth of the concept. Our project attempts to deal with this issue by adopting an approach that deconstructs the challenge of UBASE into seven main components. The first component focuses on basic education facts, and the nature and quality of the data that underpin these facts. The second looks at the concept of universal education from the standpoint of its intellectual and programmatic history, and also covers its economic, social, political, and ethical rationales. The third component concerns the demographic, social, political, cultural, and economic consequences of achieving universal basic and secondary education. The fourth examines the goals of primary and secondary education in widely different settings and how we assess progress toward attainment of those goals. The fifth component focuses on the harsh realities of the field, on problems of implementation, and on the use of technology in delivering more and better education. The sixth takes up the politics of educational reform, in recognition of the fact that such reform is not simply a technical exercise but also a political challenge. Finally, the seventh component deals with the cost

of UBASE and the distribution of that cost among different possible payers.

Each of these components is built around a study team that comes together periodically for intensive discussion and review of background syntheses crafted by the team's leader(s). In order to promote the overall coherence of the project, Joel Cohen and I, as well as most of the study team leaders, participate in all the meetings of all the study teams. These teams typically consist of eight to ten individuals from North America and beyond, reflecting a range of disciplines and various degrees of research experience in education and international development. The project is still at an early stage, but several dozen scholars have already participated as study team members or as distinguished project advisers. Several dozen more could be described as avid consumers of our products. I would also note that the Academy is proving to be an ideal sponsor for the UBASE project because of its independence, its academic standards, and its extraordinary convening power—not to mention that it offers a superb meeting venue.

All the UBASE project papers and related materials will be accessible on the Academy's website. We intend to publish the papers as a volume, or perhaps as a special issue of *Daedalus*. During the third year of the project, Joel and I plan to craft a monograph on UBASE, using the background reports of the study teams as key building blocks.

The UBASE project is supported by a generous three-year grant from the Hewlett Foundation, along with several grants from individual donors and foundations.

Notwithstanding the breadth and complexity of the UBASE project, we do have some humility with respect to our goals. For example, we are not at this point taking up the deep question of whether the world's limited resources would be better devoted to education or to other aspects and indicators of development, such as improved health, governance, and infrastructure. Nor are we endeavoring to deliver a detailed plan for achieving universal basic

and secondary education. We think there is as much contribution to be made in formulating the right questions as in answering them. We aspire to inform and stimulate the global dialogue on education with some new frameworks, ideas, examples, and evidence. We hope to inspire a new cadre of researchers to focus on this area. Advocacy efforts do not fall within the purview of our project.

We welcome your thoughts on these efforts, as well as your participation in what we hope is a worthy endeavor. As Franklin D. Roosevelt once said, in neat anticipation of the spirit of the UBASE project, “We cannot always build the future for our youth, but we can build our youth for the future.”

## Visiting Scholars Program

### *James Carroll*

As you have gathered from the preceding project reports, the Academy is something of a movable feast. It’s a network that defines itself loosely across the nation and the world, yet there is a strong incarnational center: the House of the Academy in Cambridge. Those of you who are here for the first time, as well as those who visit often, are aware of its



Historian James Carroll

generous hospitality, defined by its commitment to interdisciplinarity, to service, and to intellectual, artistic, and professional distinction. I am privileged to speak about one of the Academy's newest initiatives, its Visiting Scholars Program (VSP), which represents yet another commitment: to foster research by scholars who show promise of becoming leaders in their fields.

As chair of the program, I joined the Academy's Officers in welcoming the inaugural group of seven postdoctoral fellows and junior faculty in September. They were chosen by a distinguished group of Academy Fellows who reviewed over a hundred applications. Already accomplished in their own right, they represent a range of disciplines and are engaged in inquiries that are closely related to the Academy's ongoing projects and studies. To give you a sense of the variety of their topics and approaches, I would like to tell you about their specific research projects.

We have three junior faculty members. Eric Bettinger of Case Western Reserve is examining the impact of school vouchers in Colombia, South America—an investigation that will contribute to the Academy project on universal basic and secondary education. In the area of security studies, Page Fortna of Columbia University is investigating the concrete effects of peacekeeping in international civil wars and exploring what difference peacekeepers make in the aftermath of conflict. In the humanities, a cultural biography of F. O. Matthiessen, the Harvard scholar of American literature, is the research focus of Jay Grossman of Northwestern University.

Among our postdoctoral fellows, historian David Greenberg of Columbia University is examining the role of ideology in the confirmation of Supreme Court justices—a study linked to the Academy project on Congress and the Court. Another historian, Andrew Jewett of the University of California, Berkeley, is analyzing a group of scientists, social scientists, philosophers, and writers who believed that science could strengthen demo-

cratic government in America during the first half of the twentieth century.

Two postdoctoral scholars in twentieth-century literature are also at the Academy this year. In a reinterpretation of American modernism, Joseph Entin of Yale University is considering how writers, artists, journalists, social scientists, and doctors interpreted the lives of immigrants, African Americans, and the underclass. Anne-Marie Mikkelsen of the University of California, Irvine, is carrying out research on a group of American poets whose emphasis on social, political, and economic inequality was a reflection of their own marginal status in society.

Associate scholar Andy Zelleke, a J.D. from Harvard Law School and doctoral candidate at Harvard Business School, is completing a study of governance and leadership structures in British and American business organizations, in association with the Academy's project on corporate responsibility.

In the spring, senior scholar and Academy Fellow David Hollinger of the University of California, Berkeley, will visit the VSP to develop a history of the effects of twentieth-century demographic and social changes on the humanities. My own research on the history of the Pentagon further extends the Academy's studies of American government and business institutions.

Taken together, the participants in the VSP mirror the Academy as a community. Just as our Fellows conduct their independent research and enrich the Academy by their contributions to its program, so the Visiting Scholars carry out their own studies, interact with each other as a closely knit group, and participate in such Academy activities as project conferences and workshops, as well as Stated Meetings and informal gatherings at the House. The VSP is a new embodiment of the Academy's historic mission to foster and advance knowledge.

---

Remarks © 2002 by John Steinbruner, Francis Oakley, Robert C. Post, David Bloom, and James Carroll, respectively.

Photos © 2002 by Martha Stewart.