Bulletin

Summer 2003
Vol. LVI, No. 4

AMERICAN ACADEMY
OF ARTS & SCIENCES

Annual Fund Seeks to Top the $1 Million Plus Mark Again

The Development Committee, cochaired by Louis Cabot and Robert Alberty, continues to meet monthly. It is planning the 2004 Annual Fund Campaign, which begins in the fall, and will seek to surpass the $1 million mark first achieved three years ago. Reporting to the Council at its April meeting, Cabot noted the $1,080,223 raised in 2003 as another record, thanks to increased levels of involvement and generosity on the part of Fellows, Foreign Honorary Members, and friends over the past year. He expressed his appreciation to all who have made this success possible. Alberty emphasized the importance of a strong Annual Fund in helping the Academy accomplish its goals and reported that the Development Committee would be focusing on new and increased gifts in the coming year.

For information about making a gift to the Academy, please contact the Development Office (e-mail: *dev@amacad.org;* phone: 617-576-5057).

ERRATA Two errors appeared in photo captions in the Spring 2003 *Bulletin*. In the caption on page 18, Gerald Early's affiliation should have been listed as Washington University in St. Louis. In the caption on page 33, the correct identification for the second person from the left is Adrienne Rabkin.

THE BULLETIN OF THE AMERICAN ACADEMY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES (ISSN 0002–712X) is published quarterly. *Periodicals rate postage paid at Boston, Massachusetts, and additional mailing offices. Postmaster: Send address changes to the BULLETIN, American Academy of Arts and Sciences, 136 Irving Street, Cambridge MA 02138.*

CALENDAR OF EVENTS

All members of the Academy are cordially invited to participate in any listed event, as space allows. This feature of the *Bulletin* informs all members of upcoming events, not only in their own regions but also in locations they may plan to visit. Special notices are sent to Fellows who reside in areas where specific meetings are held. A list of forthcoming Stated Meetings appears on the back cover.

Saturday, September 13, 2003

Western Center Stated Meeting—Los Angeles

Program at the Los Angeles County Museum of Art

Speakers: **Stephanie Barron,** Los Angeles County Museum of Art, and **Thomas Crow,** Getty Research Institute

The Western Center's fall Stated Meeting will take place at the Los Angeles County Museum of Art (LACMA) on Saturday, September 13, 2003, at 4:30 p.m. The presentations will be followed by a private viewing of major art works from the State Pushkin Museum, Moscow. This is the first time that the collection, including paintings by Picasso, Van Gogh, Gauguin, Matisse, and Cézanne, has been seen outside of Russia. Los Angeles is one of only three cities in the United States where the collection will be on view.

The program will include communications by two distinguished scholars of fine art. **Stephanie Barron,** senior curator of modern and contemporary art and vice president of education and public programs at LACMA, will address the significance of the collection in a talk entitled "Impressionists and Moderns: French Masterworks from the State Pushkin Museum, Moscow: A Study of Collecting." **Thomas Crow,** director of the Getty Research Institute, will discuss the study of collecting in his presentation, "Collecting and Display as Subjects of History."

The day's events will conclude with a reception in the patio area of the museum at 6:30 p.m. and dinner in the Ahmanson Building at 7:30. Fellows and

guests who wish to come in advance of the Stated Meeting and private viewing may tour all of the other exhibits on display as guests of LACMA.

Further information and reservations: 949-824-4553

Saturday, October 11, 2003

National Induction Ceremony—Cambridge

The Induction Ceremony for newly elected Fellows and Foreign Honorary Members will take place at a Stated Meeting to be held on Saturday, October 11, 2003, at Sanders Theater on the Harvard University campus. The event will begin at 3:00 p.m. and conclude with a reception at the House of the Academy at 5:30 p.m. Because Sanders has a large seating capacity, there will be no limitations on attendance. All Fellows and their guests are welcome.

A morning orientation session at the House of the Academy, introducing new members to the Academy's projects, programs, and publications, will precede the ceremony.

Further information and reservations: 617-576-5032

Wednesday, October 29, 2003

North Carolina Stated Meeting—Research Triangle Park

Speaker: **Walter E. Dellinger III,** Duke University

The speaker at this special Stated Meeting, to be held at the National Humanities Center, will be **Walter E. Dellinger III,** the Douglas B. Maggs Professor of Law at Duke University and head of the appellate practice at O'Melveny & Meyers LLP. Throughout his career, Dellinger has combined legal scholarship with distinguished public service. As acting Solicitor General for the 1996–97 term of the Supreme Court, he argued nine cases before the Court, more than any other Solicitor General in over twenty years. The cases dealt with a wide range of issues, from physician-assisted suicide to

the Brady Act and the Religious Freedom Restoration Act.

Before joining the government, Dellinger briefed and argued cases for a variety of clients, including the State of Alaska, hospital associations, and members of Congress. He joined the faculty of Duke Law School in 1969. In early 1993 he became an adviser to President Clinton on constitutional issues; later that year, he was nominated and confirmed as Assistant Attorney General and head of the Office of Legal Counsel, serving until 1996. In 1981–82 and 1998–99 he was a Fellow at the National Humanities Center.

The lecture will begin at 4 p.m., with a reception to follow.

Further information and reservations: 617-576-5032

Saturday, November 1, 2003

Midwest Center Stated Meeting—Chicago

Communication: "The Absurd Universe"

Speaker: **Michael S. Turner,** University of Chicago

Michael S. Turner, the Rauner Distinguished Service Professor at the University of Chicago, will address the fall Stated Meeting of the Midwest Center on Saturday, November 1, 2003, at the Adler Planetarium. One of the country's leading astrophysicists, Turner will present a communication entitled "The Absurd Universe." In his words, "Cosmologists, like the six blind men describing the elephant, have identified the basic features of the Universe: spatial flatness, accelerating expansion, dark matter, early quark soup phase, great clusters of galaxies, and a microwave sky that resembles quantum noise. The challenge is to understand this seemingly absurd combination of features."

At the University of Chicago, Turner chairs the Departments of Astronomy and Astrophysics; he also holds appointments in the Department of Physics and at the Enrico Fermi Institute. His

research focuses on the application of modern ideas in elementary particle theory to cosmology and astrophysics—an approach, he believes, that holds the key to answering the most pressing questions in cosmology.

Further information and reservations: 773-753-8162

Wednesday, November 12, 2003

Cambridge Stated Meeting

Program: "A Tribute to Robert K. Merton"

Speakers: **Robert M. Solow,** MIT, and **Robert C. Merton,** Harvard University Graduate School of Business

The November Stated Meeting will honor the life and work of **Robert K. Merton**, who revolutionized the field of sociology and mass communication during a career that spanned more than fifty years. The first sociologist to be awarded the National Medal of Science, he devoted a lifetime to expanding our understanding of human actions and motives in works that combined analytic rigor, deep historical and psychological insights, and an uncommon interest in all fields of knowledge. His many important works include *Social Theory and Social Structure, The Sociology of Science,* and *On the Shoulders of Giants.* He was a member of the Academy for fifty-three years.

The speakers on this special occasion will be Academy Fellows **Robert M. Solow**, Institute Professor Emeritus at MIT, and **Robert C. Merton**, John and Natty McArthur University Professor at the Harvard University Graduate School of Business. Both are Nobel laureates in economics.

The program will also include the presentation of the 2003 Talcott Parsons Prize in the Social Sciences. The prize was awarded to Robert K. Merton in 1979.

Further information and reservations: 617-576-5032

ADVANCE NOTICE

Wednesday, December 3, 2003

Cambridge Stated Meeting

Program: "Beethoven and His Royal Disciple"

Speaker: **Lewis Lockwood,** Fanny Peabody Professor of Music Emeritus, Harvard University

Performance: **Boston Trio,** Beethoven's "Archduke" Trio

New Academy Officers and Councilors

President Patricia Meyer Spacks

Patricia Meyer Spacks has been elected President of the Academy. For the past two years, she has been filling the unexpired term of James Freedman, who retired because of illness. The Edgar F. Shannon Professor of English at the University of Virginia, Spacks is a literary scholar who is deeply concerned with the future of the humanities in this country. Her primary research interests are in eighteenth-century English literature, and she has written on the poets and novelists of the time in such books as *The Poetry of Vision* and *Desire and Truth: Functions of Plot in Eighteenth-Century English Novels.* In addition, she has authored books and essays on cultural as well as literary subjects, including adolescence, boredom, gossip, privacy, and women writers from the eighteenth century to the present. In spring 2003 the University of Chicago Press issued her new book, *Privacy: Concealing the Eighteenth-Century Self.* Spacks is former chair of the board of directors of the American Council of Learned Societies and is currently a trustee of the National Humanities Center. At the Academy, she cochairs a study of the evolution of humanities disciplines in the twentieth century. She was elected to the Academy in 1994.

Treasurer John S. Reed

John S. Reed is the new Treasurer of the Academy and chair of its Investment Committee. In 2000 he retired as chairman and chief executive officer of Citigroup, Inc., a company founded by the merger of Citicorp and Travelers Group in 1998. In his thirty-five-year career, he was also chairman and

chief executive officer of Citigroup's subsidiaries, Citicorp and Citibank. At Citibank he laid the foundation for the company's leadership in automated corporate and consumer banking services and later had major responsibility for worldwide consumer business and technological development. Mr. Reed serves on the boards of the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, the Spencer Foundation, and the RAND Corporation. Elected to the Academy in 1998, he is also a member of the American Philosophical Society, the MIT Corporation, and Altria Group, Inc. In addition to his other Academy positions, Reed is participating in the project on corporate responsibility and serves on the advisory board for the study on universal basic and secondary education.

Councilors Robert A. Alberty and Charles Haar

Robert A. Alberty, the new representative of Class I on the Council, is a professor of chemistry emeritus at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. His primary research interest is the thermodynamics of biochemical reactions. Alberty received his B.S. and M.S. at the University of Nebraska. He earned his doctorate at the University of Wisconsin, where he taught for twenty years before serving as associate dean of the College of Letters and Science and then as dean of the Graduate School. Subsequently, Alberty moved to MIT, where he was a professor of chemistry as well as dean of the School of Science. He served as director of the Institute for Defense Analyses from 1980 to 1986. Alberty's publications include *Thermodynamics of Biochemical Reactions* and *Physical Chemistry.* He was elected to the

Academy in 1968 and has served as cochair of the Development Committee since 1997.

Charles Haar has been elected to represent Class III on the Council. He is the Louis D. Brandeis Professor at Harvard Law School and Distinguished Visiting Professor at the University of Miami School of Law. Since 1986 he has also served as a consultant to the firm of Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom. From 1982 to 1985 Haar was special master for Boston Harbor. Over the course of his career, he has also been a presidential adviser and chair of governmental task forces dealing with fiscal policy, the environment, manpower, public safety and crime, housing and urban development, health care, and national land policy. His books include *The Wrong Side of the Tracks* and *Suburbs Under Siege*. Haar's research focuses on housing and environmental policies, land reform in developing countries, corporation law, and mergers and acquisitions. He has been a Fellow of the Academy since 1962 and is a member of the Development Committee. Haar chairs a new Academy study on transboundary water management.

Mapping the Humanities: Research Studies

As part of its ongoing Initiative on the Humanities and Culture, the Academy is sponsoring two research studies on the evolution of the humanities in the twenty-first century. Executive Officer **Leslie C. Berlowitz** and Program Officer **Malcolm Richardson** have organized the project. The chairs of the two studies, President **Patricia Meyer Spacks** (University of Virginia) and **David Hollinger** (UC Berkeley), have recruited essayists and are working with them to shape collaborative volumes.

On June 5–6, 2003, Spacks chaired a working meeting in New York City with the contributors to

the first volume, ***Histories of the Humanities***, a study that will encompass at least seven core disciplines in the humanities (other disciplines will be examined in future publications).

Within and outside the university, the question of what has happened in the humanities over the course of the twentieth century remains important. It seems relatively clear that history, literature, and philosophy no longer present the same faces they once showed, but the reasons for the new developments remain obscure. The purpose of the study is to clarify both the causes and consequences of transformations in the humanities over the last century. The volume will not attempt to offer a complete or unitary history; rather, it will suggest directions for multiple histories of the humanistic disciplines. Participants in the project include:

Patricia Meyer Spacks (University of Virginia): Introduction
Steven Marcus (Columbia University): Overview of the Emergence of the Disciplines
Thomas Crow (Getty Research Institute): Art History
Andrew Delbanco (Columbia University): Literary Studies in the United States
Gerald Early (Washington University in St. Louis): African American Studies
Dagfinn Follesdal and **Michael Friedman** (Stanford University): Philosophy
Anthony Grafton (Princeton University): History
Sanford Levinson (University of Texas School of Law, Austin) and **Jack Balkin** (Yale University): Law
Pauline Yu (American Council of Learned Societies): Comparative Literature

In November 2003 David Hollinger will convene an authors' conference for the second study, ***The Humanities and the Dynamics of Inclusion: 1945–1985.*** The participants will examine the role played by the humanities in incorporating diverse cultural and ethnic groups, as well as new ideas, disciplines, and subject matter, into American universities.

Visiting Scholars Program Completes Inaugural Year

In May 2003 the Academy concluded the first year of its Visiting Scholars Program (VSP) at the House in Cambridge. Representing the fields of economics, political science, history, English, and American studies, seven young scholars spent a year in residence, working on a range of academic projects related to the Academy's core programs areas: **Science and Global Security; Social Policy and American Institutions; Humanities and Culture;** and **Education.** The three junior faculty members and four postdoctoral scholars were selected by a distinguished group of Academy Fellows who reviewed more than 125 applications from candidates at private and public universities in 21 states. *(Profiles of the scholars, including overviews of their research, begin on page 20.)* The members of the 2002–03 advisory committee for the VSP were author and historian James Carroll (chair), Academy Executive Officer Leslie C. Berlowitz, R. Howard Bloch (Yale University), Allan Brandt (Harvard University), Neil Harris (University of Chicago), John Steinbruner (University of Maryland), Eugene Skolnikoff (MIT), and Pauline Yu (American Council of Learned Societies).

The VSP is designed to nurture a new generation of thinkers who show promise of becoming leaders in their fields. One of the unique features of the program is its ability to combine individual research with involvement in the Academy's program areas. Visiting Scholars are invited to attend Academy project conferences and contribute their ideas to advance studies on such topics as global security, the feasibility and potential consequences of universal basic and secondary education, the changing relationship of Congress and the federal courts, and

the evolution of the humanities over the past century. As Academy President **Patricia Meyer Spacks** notes, "These young scholars are giving the Academy fresh perspectives. Their contributions to our ongoing studies have already proved to be welcome and thought-provoking."

Executive Officer **Leslie C. Berlowitz** points out that the program offers numerous benefits to assist these scholars in their professional development: "Through the generosity of **Marjorie Garber**, director of Harvard University's Humanities Center, they have access to unparalleled library facilities. They also benefit from the Academy's institutional partnerships with other universities and intellectual centers, including the Boston Public Library and the Boston Athenaeum." According to Berlowitz, "The Academy not only provides an opportunity for reflection and writing; it also recognizes the importance of contact with the broader intellectual community in the Boston area and beyond." At monthly seminars, scholars present their work and respond to comments and questions from their colleagues and interested Academy Fellows. They participate actively in the Academy's Friday Forums, which bring together representatives of the media and members of the surrounding academic, business, and cultural communities for discussions of timely issues. They also attend Academy lectures and seminars, as well as informal gatherings with Fellows in the area.

In addition to the seven postdoctoral scholars and junior faculty members, the 2002–03 program included Associate Scholar **Andy Zelleke**, who received his J.D. from Harvard Law School and his Ph.D. from Harvard Business School. He analyzed the influence of cultural, historical, market, and political forces on the structural leadership and governance of prominent American and British corporations, in association with the Academy's project on corporate responsibility.

David Hollinger, the Preston Hotchkis Professor of American History at the University of California, Berkeley, joined the program as a Senior Scholar in

spring 2003. He is developing a history of the effects of demographic and social changes on the humanities in the past half-century, as one of the research projects under the Academy's Humanities and Culture Initiative.

The program was enthusiastically received by the inaugural group of Visiting Scholars. Historian **Andrew Jewett** found the scholarly community at the Academy to be a rich source of inspiration. "There was considerable overlap between my project and those of two other scholars," he says. "Three of us are studying what could be called 'interwar cultural modernism,' with two of my colleagues looking at it from the perspectives of literature and the visual arts. All of the Visiting Scholars welcomed the opportunity to present their work at our research seminars. In addition, I learned a great deal from Academy project directors and Fellows about the importance of clearly articulating my arguments for a broader audience."

Economist **Eric Bettinger** cites the freedom to write, apart from teaching and other academic responsibilities, as one of the greatest benefits of residence at the Academy. As a result of conversations with his fellow Visiting Scholars, he is developing a paper on the influence of adjunct and part-time faculty teaching on students' success rates. "It was good to be among such a variety of researchers at the Academy," Bettinger says, echoing sentiments expressed by the others. "Just our lunchtime and hallway conversations gave me ideas and perspectives I might never have had."

"And the Academy itself is amazing," notes literary scholar **Jay Grossman**. "It rewards and believes in our work as scholars."

Looking back at the past year, the chair of the VSP, **James Carroll,** observes that the program has proved to be "a mutually rewarding experience for scholars and Academy members who have worked together to make it a success. When these scholars came to the Academy, they were already accomplished in their own right. Many have held teaching posts and written articles for professional jour-

nals. The Academy is making every effort to help them realize their full potential with a program that balances their need for free time with opportunities for interaction and exchange with a broader community." Carroll himself, in addition to serving as VSP chair, spent the year conducting research for a history of the Pentagon.

The Academy's University Affiliates—a group of forty-one colleges and universities from across the country—provide support and guidance in advancing the goals of the VSP. The Annenberg Foundation, the Virginia Wellington Cabot Foundation, and the Esther Haar Scholarly Exchange Program have also awarded grants to fund the VSP. In expressing the Academy's appreciation for the work of those involved, President Spacks said, "We are deeply grateful to these institutions, to all the Fellows of the Academy who have served as advisors and reviewers for the program, and to James Carroll and Leslie Berlowitz for making this new initiative a reality. The presence of these young men and women is a valuable reminder of the importance of nurturing new scholarship at a time when there are few fellowship opportunities available for social scientists and humanists. We are confident that this new initiative we have undertaken will lead to accomplishments that enhance and strengthen the intellectual community and the wider public it serves."

University Affiliates

Boston University—John Silber, President and Chancellor
Brandeis University—Jehuda Reinharz, President
Brown University—Ruth J. Simmons, President
Columbia University—Lee Bollinger, President
Cornell University—Hunter R. Rawlings, President
Dartmouth College—James Wright, President
Duke University—Nannerl O. Keohane, President
George Washington University—Stephen J. Trachtenberg, President
Harvard University—Lawrence H. Summers, President
Indiana University—Adam W. Herbert, President
Johns Hopkins University—William R. Brody, President
Massachusetts Institute of Technology—Charles M. Vest, President

Michigan State University—Peter McPherson, President
New York University—John Sexton, President
Northwestern University—Henry Bienen, President
Ohio State University—Karen Holbrook, President
Pennsylvania State University—Graham Spanier, President
Princeton University—Shirley Tilghman, President
Rice University—Malcolm Gillis, President
Smith College—Carol T. Christ, President
Stanford University—John L. Hennessy, President
Tufts University—Lawrence S. Bacow, President
University of California, Berkeley—Robert M. Berdahl, Chancellor
University of California, Davis—Larry H. Vanderhoef, Chancellor
University of California, Irvine—Ralph J. Cicerone, Chancellor
University of California, Los Angeles—Albert Carnesale, Chancellor
University of Chicago—Don Michael Randel, President
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign—Nancy Cantor, Chancellor
University of Iowa—David J. Shorton, President
University of Maryland—C.D. Mote, Jr., President
University of Michigan—Mary Sue Coleman, President
University of Minnesota—Robert Bruininks, President
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill—James Moeser, President
University of Notre Dame—Edward A. Malloy, President
University of Pennsylvania—Judith Rodin, President
University of Pittsburgh—Mark A. Nordenberg, Chancellor
University of Southern California—Steven B. Sample, President
University of Texas, Austin—Larry R. Faulkner, President
University of Virginia—John T. Casteen III, President
University of Wisconsin, Madison—John D. Wiley, Chancellor
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University—Charles W. Steger, President

Eric Bettinger

An assistant professor of economics at Case Western Reserve University, Eric Bettinger earned his B.A. in economics at Brigham Young University and his doctorate at MIT. During his four months at the Academy, Bettinger examined new evidence on how educational vouchers affect the academic futures of poor high-school students in Bogota, Colombia. His study has wide applicability throughout the developing world and is closely related to the work of the Academy's Universal Basic and Secondary Education (UBASE) Project.

Bettinger is no stranger to Latin America. He has traveled widely throughout Brazil since first studying and working there at the age of nineteen. At MIT he became interested in Colombia's voucher program, focusing on an analysis of the more than 125,000 vouchers awarded in the 1990s by the Colombian government to increase secondary-school enrollment rates, especially among the poor. As Bettinger notes, "The largest and longest-running education voucher programs in the world are in Chile and Colombia. The purpose of these programs is to increase the quality and quantity of education and thereby to improve economic conditions and reduce income inequality."

At the Academy, Bettinger worked with colleagues from Harvard and MIT to determine how the vouchers affected the long-term outcomes for the recipients, as compared with an unbiased comparison/control group. The initial findings suggest that the voucher program has had a generally positive impact on students, increasing the likelihood of their taking Colombia's college entrance exam.

As part of their long-term study, Bettinger and his colleagues compiled a sizable database that includes information about students' secondary-school experiences and college intentions. They continue to examine these data in greater detail, taking advantage of random assignment in assessing the effect of vouchers on the quality and type (e.g., religious, single-sex) of schools attended. The use of randomized data, which is common in medical research, is an important new development in education research and in the social sciences more generally. As a contributor to the Academy's UBASE Project, Bettinger prepared a critical review of recent studies employing the randomized data method.

Bettinger also writes about economics in American higher education. In January he participated in a meeting of the Academy's Humanities Indicators Project, which is working to improve data collection in the humanities. His study on the effect of Pell grants on continued college attendance shows a correlation between the size of each grant and the length of time the grant recipient remains in school.

Since returning to his teaching at Case Western, Bettinger has continued to work on several papers, including "The Effect of Educational Vouchers on Long-Run Outcomes," submitted to a refereed journal in summer 2003. In December 2002 the *American Economic Review* published "The Effect of Educational Vouchers on Student Outcomes: Evidence from a Randomized Natural Experiment," which he coauthored. Bettinger is also examining the impact of adjunct and part-time faculty teaching on students' success rates—a study that grew out of discussions with his VSP colleagues. He spoke on that topic at the annual meeting of the American Educational Finance Association in March 2003 and at the National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER) Summer Institute in July 2003. Last spring, he was appointed a Faculty Research Fellow at NBER.

Joseph Entin

A year in residence at the Academy gave Visiting Scholar Joseph Entin an opportunity to transform

his doctoral thesis, "Sensational Modernism: Disfigured Bodies and Aesthetic Astonishment in American Literature and Photography," into a book that he hopes will make a valuable contribution to American cultural studies.

Entin received his B.A. at Wesleyan University and his graduate degrees at Yale University. His goal is to continue expanding the definition of modernism by bringing art "out of the garret and down to the gutter," as he puts it. His study looks at a dissident and largely overlooked group of modernists who used the motifs and techniques of tabloid journalism to depict the most vulnerable of modern city dwellers: tramps, immigrants, slum residents, and workers. The writers and photographers whose work he explores use startling images of disfigured bodies to shock readers and viewers into a new awareness of poverty, prejudice, crime, and violence.

"Some of America's most important art—what others have loosely called 'low art' or art of the bizarre—has been completely left out of accepted definitions of modernism," Entin explains. "A study of this 'art on the ground' brings a new perspective to the traditional description of modernism as a movement of elite artists who cultivated highly privatized languages that turned inward on the self and away from history, mass culture, and everyday experience."

In Entin's view, modernism, rather than merely expressing the angst of a relatively privileged "lost generation," included a range of artists who challenged conventional modes of representation that either sentimentalized or exoticized the poor. Drawing upon the spectacular aesthetics of popular sensationalism, these artists created a willfully unorthodox modernism, using avant-garde techniques of estrangement to depict the shock of class, racial, and ethnic difference. Among the writers and

photographers Entin examines are Stephen Crane, William Carlos Williams, Tillie Olsen, Richard Wright, Henry Roth, Aaron Siskind, Weegee, and Dalton Trumbo.

Throughout his book, Entin calls attention to modernism as an interdisciplinary movement incorporating a wide range of media, from literature and "high art" to photography and popular culture. "I'd like my work to be thought of as making important links between race, class, and representation, and between literary and visual forms of knowledge," he says.

In fall 2003 Entin will begin his teaching career as an assistant professor of English at the City University of New York, Brooklyn College. He has two essays slated for publication: "Monstrous Modernism: Disfigured Bodies and Literary Experimentalism in *Yonnondio* and *Christ in Concrete,*" to be published in *The Novel and the American Left: New Essays on Depression-Era Fiction*, edited by Janet Casey, and a short essay on Erskine Caldwell for *The Encyclopedia of the Great Depression*, due out later this year from Gale. Entin continues to serve on the editorial board of the journal *Radical Teacher*, for which he is currently coediting a special issue entitled "Class in the Classroom," to be published in December 2003.

Page Fortna

Page Fortna devoted her year at the Academy to studying the tools and technologies of peacekeeping by examining the effectiveness of United Nations peacekeeping missions in states torn by civil conflict in the post–cold war era. As part of her study, she interviewed government and rebel decision makers in Bangladesh, Mozambique, and Sierra Leone to learn from the "peacekept," as well as from the peacekeepers, whether and how the presence of international personnel helps to secure and maintain stability.

Following her graduation from Wesleyan University in 1990, Fortna researched case studies on arms control and peacekeeping at the Henry L. Stimson Center. At

Harvard University, under the direction of Academy Fellow Robert Keohane, she developed and tested an explanation of how the content of cease-fire arrangements affects the prospects for lasting peace.

While Fortna's earlier research focused on wars between states, her current study reflects the increasing concern with threats posed by civil wars. As she observes, "The global security implications of states wracked by protracted internal conflict are more apparent than ever in the aftermath of the attacks on September 11, 2001. Arguably, one of the global community's most important tools for dealing with these issues is the practice of peacekeeping: sending international personnel to monitor cease-fires, provide security, oversee the disarmament of warring factions, and, more recently, observe elections or even administer the governments of these states."

Fortna points out that despite the vast literature on the subject, we do not know exactly how peacekeeping works to ensure stability, nor have we rigorously tested the effectiveness of external intervention. In defining a new perspective, she will "draw on cooperation and bargaining theory to spell out a causal theory of peacekeeping, focusing on ways in which the presence of international personnel might alter the incentives of belligerents, ameliorate mistrust, and help avoid the dangers of accidental spirals back to war." In addition to statistical analysis and in-depth field research, her work will include brief case histories of all internal conflicts ended since 1989. Fortna believes that "a theoretically informed and systematic analysis of the effects of peacekeeping will not only contribute to academic work in international relations and security studies; it will also strengthen practical tools for restoring lasting peace to war-torn regions of the world."

Fortna returns to Columbia University this fall as an assistant professor of political science. She is

also beginning to process the statistical analysis and field research she completed in Bangladesh, Sierra Leone, and Mozambique during her year at the Academy for a new book project on peacekeeping in civil wars. Her essay "Inside and Out: Peacekeeping and the Duration of Peace After Civil and Interstate Wars" will appear in *Dissolving Boundaries: The Nexus Between Comparative Politics and International Relations,* edited by Suzanne Werner, David Davis, and Bruce Bueno de Mesquita (forthcoming from Blackwell), and in a special issue of *International Studies Review* (December 2003). Fortna's book *Peace Time: Cease-Fire Agreements and the Durability of Peace* is forthcoming from Princeton University Press.

David Greenberg

During his year at the Academy, David Greenberg traced the recent history of Supreme Court nominations, examining the tension between professional merit and ideology in the selection process. In his study "The New Politics of Supreme Court Appointments: The Unacknowledged Role of Ideology in Naming Justices," Greenberg identifies several key developments that may account for the emergence of both the new combativeness of the nominations and the popular fiction that ideological differences are not at issue. "A lot of political scientists and legal scholars have looked at recent Court appointments," Greenberg says, "but not many historians have done so. So the debates over appointments have focused mainly on jurisprudential arguments, which I think have diverted scholarly attention away from the history of our current predicament. I want to explore how the process evolved historically, to try to explain the roots of the new, contentious nomination process and perhaps suggest how it might be overcome."

Among the topics that interest Greenberg is the controversy that surrounded the Abe Fortas appointment. "It's often forgotten," he notes, "that the conservatives stopped Abe Fortas from succeeding Earl Warren as chief justice not because of his financial dealings, but because they disliked the stands he had taken on such issues as pornography and the rights of the accused when he was part of the Warren Court majority. There was a filibuster led by Strom Thurmond and other right-wing Southerners to prevent Fortas's promotion, and eventually Lyndon Johnson pulled the nomination. Only the following spring did Fortas's questionable dealings with financier Lewis Wolfson emerge, at which point he resigned. This is interesting, as we tend to remember Fortas's downfall as due to financial chicanery, when in fact that was simply a coda to an ideological battle."

A 1990 Yale graduate, Greenberg earned his doctorate in history from Columbia University in 2001, under Academy Fellow Alan Brinkley. He was a visiting assistant professor of history at Columbia for a year before he entered the Visiting Scholars Program. After completing his residence at the Academy, he was hired to teach history and political science at Yale.

Greenberg has written for many scholarly and popular journals, and his book *Nixon's Shadow: The History of an Image* will be published by Norton this fall. In November he will present his paper "Partisanship by Any Other Name: The Taboo Against Discussing Ideology in the Supreme Court Appointment Process" at the 2003 annual meeting of the American Society for Legal History.

Jay Grossman

"Until now, no study has taken on the whole of F. O. Matthiessen's life," says Jay Grossman. During his time as a Visiting Scholar, he launched a cultural biography that encompasses the many disparate Matthiessens. A professor of American literature at Harvard from 1930 to 1950, Matthiessen was the author of *American Renaissance,* a book that estab-

lished the canon of nineteenth-century literature as it is taught and studied today.

Whereas others have written about the individual characteristics of this extraordinary and controversial author—most notably his prodigious talent for literary criticism, but also his politics, radicalism, and homosexuality—Grossman is attempting a synthesis of the personal and political strands of Matthiessen's life and work, revealing how he both influenced and was influenced by his own time. Toward that end, he is examining Matthiessen's books, articles, and papers, in addition to the full range of his unpublished political writings and activism.

Why does Matthiessen interest him? "It's partly the challenge of writing the life of the cultures that shaped him," Grossman observes, adding that he also wants to explore more deeply the notion of Matthiessen as a cultural translator. "Matthiessen's dissertation was on Elizabethan translation," he notes, "and it intrigues me to think about translation as a trope for examining his life and work as a whole." In a 1998 article in the journal *American Literature,* Grossman incorporates social history and the history of literary criticism in his investigation of Matthiessen's writings about Walt Whitman. As he explains, it is impossible not to see Matthiessen as a kind of translator of American culture.

His year in residence at the Academy provided an opportunity to mine the "Cambridge archive" on Matthiessen, Grossman says. He attempted to exhaust as many archival sources as possible in and around the Cambridge academic community and to undertake the "daunting" task of interviewing those who knew Matthiessen when he was at Harvard. To organize his research, he divided Matthiessen's life and work into three distinct periods: the early years, up to the 1930s; the middle years, until the mid-

1940s, when his public prominence broadened; and the years following the death of his longtime partner, the painter Russell Cheney, in 1945.

Grossman earned his Ph.D. at the University of Pennsylvania. He taught at Harvard University, Amherst College, and Boston University before joining the faculty at Northwestern University. In spring 2003 he was awarded tenure and a promotion to associate professor of English at Northwestern. His first book, *Reconstituting the American Renaissance: Emerson, Whitman, and the Politics of Representation,* was recently released by Duke University Press.

Andrew Jewett

As a Visiting Scholar at the Academy, Andrew Jewett analyzed the relationship of science to American cultural and political history in the early twentieth century. His book, tentatively titled *To Make America Scientific: Science and Democracy in American Public Culture, 1870–1940*, is an outgrowth of the dissertation he completed at the University of California, Berkeley, under the direction of Academy Fellow David A. Hollinger. Jewett also received his bachelor's and master's degrees from UC Berkeley.

Jewett disputes the commonly held thesis on the relation of the sciences to political and public life between 1870 and 1940—namely, that scientists, social scientists, and their supporters claimed that their research could be disengaged from pressing sociopolitical matters. On the contrary, Jewett says, many of the intellectuals who turned to science prior to World War II were deeply engaged with critical public questions, believing that only science could provide the basis for a renewal of democratic culture.

As Jewett notes, physicist Robert A. Millikan and like-minded colleagues thought that science de-

monstrated that the new corporations promoted the public interest. Others, including physiologist Walter B. Cannon, believed that scientific research supported a strong national government oriented toward the protection of social welfare. A third group, following the line of philosopher John Dewey, focused on science as the ideal communicative model for a new, "deliberative" democracy in which the people would make their own policy decisions through public dialogue. Jewett contends that these efforts to link science and democracy strongly shaped discussions of scientific methodology before World War II, and also influenced problem selection and theory development in such disciplines as biology, philosophy, history, linguistics, anthropology, and sociology.

Jewett will be teaching in the History Department at Yale University during the upcoming academic year. In spring 2004 he will begin writing his second book, with the help of a Spencer Foundation Fellowship from the National Academy of Education.

Ann Mikkelsen

What fascinates Ann Mikkelsen is the reemergence of the pastoral mode in twentieth-century American poetry and the role that pastoral poets have played in defining the modern American citizen and the nature of American culture. During her stay at the Academy, Mikkelsen researched the work of ideologically disparate poets who nonetheless speak with a common new poetic voice. Rather than being dismissive or despairing of modern life, they use what Mikkelsen terms "a pragmatic pastoral mode" to reconcile social, political, and economic inequalities with their own marginal status as "representative" voices of a democratic society.

After receiving her B.A. from Harvard University, Mikkelsen completed her graduate work at the University of California, Irvine, with Academy Fellow J. Hillis Miller. Her current research is an outgrowth of her dissertation, "Voices from the Field: Pastoral, Pragmatism, and Twentieth-Century American Poetry." Mikkelsen takes issue with the critical consensus that American pastoral died out with the end

of the frontier, the increase in urbanization, and the rise of corporate capitalism. Instead, she argues, "The pastoral mode remained alive well into the twentieth century, although it was deflected in new directions by the influence of American pragmatism, as presented by William James and especially John Dewey."

As Mikkelsen explains, the poets in her study—John Crowe Ransom, William Carlos Williams, Robert Frost, Wallace Stevens, John Ashbery, Lyn Hejinian, and Susan Howe—struggle to find a place in modern culture while simultaneously attempting to consider the plight of other marginalized groups: the working class, women, ethnic and racial minorities. Theirs is not a poetry disengaged from modern culture but a pragmatic poetry that reveals, questions, and exposes it. For example, Mikkelsen points out, "Contrary to his popular reputation as a 'nature' poet, Robert Frost has a persistent interest in the immigrant, working class, and itinerant figures of Lawrence, Massachusetts, who populate such poems as 'A Lone Striker' and 'Two Tramps in Mud Time.' By the turn of the century, the tramp has become a prototype of the unemployed worker, whose mere existence reflects the failures of the political economy and the need to reimagine the role of the citizen in the modern state."

In fall 2003 Mikkelsen will join Harvard University's History and Literature Department as a lecturer, coteaching a sophomore tutorial and directing junior and senior tutorials. She will also continue her affiliation with the Visiting Scholars Program. Her first journal article, "'The Truth About Us': Pastoral, Pragmatism, and Paterson," will appear in *American Literature* this year. A second article, "'Fat, Fat, Fat, Fat': Wallace Stevens's Figurations of Masculinity," is forthcoming from the *Journal of Modern Literature*. This summer Mikkelsen will present a paper on the poem "The Self-Seeker" at a conference on Robert Frost at Dartmouth College.

Tribute to Herman Feshbach and Victor Weisskopf, Past Presidents of the Academy

Carl Kaysen, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Editor's note: The following remarks were presented at the 1868th Stated Meeting, held at the House of the Academy in Cambridge on March 12, 2003. Carl Kaysen's tribute to Herman Feshbach and Victor Weisskopf was followed by Nobel laureate Steven Weinberg's communication, dedicated to these past presidents of the Academy.

Tonight I am honored to pay tribute to two past presidents of our Academy: Victor Weisskopf and Herman Feshbach.

Viki, as his friends knew him, was president of the Academy from 1976 through 1979. Herman was president from 1982 to 1986. Both were theoretical physicists who made very substantial contributions to nuclear physics at the frontier of that science.

Both had long careers at MIT, and both concluded their careers as Institute Professors—MIT's mode of recognizing a handful of its most distinguished faculty. Both were presidents of the American Physical Society, their election registering the esteem in which they were held by their fellow scientists. Both had far-reaching intellectual interests and concerns. Both felt strongly about the internationalism of science and the importance of maintaining it in the face of political conflicts and across the chasms of the cold-war world. As scientists, both felt deeply their responsibility for helping the world understand the consequences of the new weapons they had helped create in the course of the Second World War. They acted on their beliefs and brought their concerns to the programs of this Academy.

As president of the Academy, Viki did many things, including stimulating and organizing several major international meetings on arms control and on other aspects of the interaction of technological choices and social values. He provided guidance for the discussions and planning that led to the creation of the National Humanities Center in Research Triangle Park, North Carolina.

Certainly the most visible accomplishment of Viki's term in office was the construction of this House in which we now meet. He played a central part in the complex negotiations among the donor, Edwin Land; the City of Cambridge; the landlord, Harvard University; and the architects, Kallmann, McKinnell and Wood. The close relationship between Viki and Edwin Land (himself a past president of the Academy) was critical to the successful completion of the project.

Viki also played a major role in planning the program that combined the dedication of the new House and the celebration of the Academy's 200th anniversary, including symposia in a wide range of disciplines, poetry readings, concerts, and exhibits of paintings and sculptures by Fellows. He truly brought both the arts and sciences to life here at the Academy, remaining active until his death in April 2002.

Carl Kaysen (MIT)

Herman Feshbach's term as president featured a number of initiatives that sounded the themes of the internationalism of science and the urgency of scientists' involvement in educating politicians and the public about the necessity and possibility of arms control.

The boldest of these moves was Herman's leadership in encouraging the Academy to assume the National Academy of Science's role as the US member organization of the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA) in Vienna. IIASA, a research institute dedicated to examining the "common problems of industrial societies," is staffed primarily by applied mathematicians, statisticians, economists, and other social scientists from the United States Canada, the countries of Western Europe, Russia, Poland, East Germany, and Hungary. The US-Soviet negotiation that led to its creation was initiated in the Johnson administration and completed with the opening of the Institute in 1973. IIASA was conceived as a channel of communication among scientists from the Soviet bloc and the West, with the idea that, among other things, it might be a means of exposing the Soviet bloc participants to Western ideas on economic organization and the efficiencies of markets.

In order to make IIASA something other than a governmental organization, the American negotiators (of whom I was one) proposed that it be an organization composed of national members—in the US and Soviet cases, their respective Academies of Science—and the Soviets accepted this idea.

In 1983, under pressure from the Reagan White House, the National Academy of Sciences withdrew as the US member organization. Herman took up the challenge of keeping the enterprise alive, persuading the Academy's Council to accept the role of member and the responsibility of raising the funds for the US contribution, which had previously come through the government. That arrangement continued until this year. With the growing importance of IIASA's research on global change, the American Academy is currently engaged

in conversations with the National Academy of Sciences to revitalize a cooperative relationship in support of IIASA.

Herman institutionalized the Academy's Committee on International Security Studies (CISS) to strengthen and expand the Academy's long-standing commitment to the study of arms control and security issues. CISS continues as one of the most active of the Academy's study groups.

Herman also developed the Kistiakowsky Scholars program to bring specialists in arms control, nuclear weapons, and security policy to speak at smaller colleges and universities lacking such experts, so as to expose undergraduates to these subjects.

In 1985 he organized an international symposium at the Academy to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the birth of Niels Bohr. It included scientific discussions of quantum mechanics, policy discussions on the threat of nuclear weapons and the future of East-West relations, personal reminiscences of Bohr, and an international teleconference on the role of scientists in arms control, with participants from Boston, Moscow, and Copenhagen. He continued to serve the Academy by participating actively in meetings of its Council until his death in December 2000 at the age of 83.

I had the good fortune to count Viki and Herman among my friends for more than fifty years.

Nuclear Terror: Ambling Toward Apocalypse

Steven Weinberg, Josey Regental Professor of Science, University of Texas at Austin

Introduction: Carl Kaysen, MIT

Steven Weinberg was educated at Cornell, Copenhagen, and Princeton, and taught at Columbia, Berkeley, MIT, and Harvard. In 1982 he moved to the University of Texas at Austin and founded its Theory Group. At Texas he holds the Josey Regental Chair of Science and is a member of the Physics and Astronomy Departments.

Steven's research has spanned a broad range of topics in quantum field theory, elementary particle physics, and cosmology, and he has been honored with numerous awards, including the Nobel Prize in physics and the National Medal of Science. He also holds honorary doctoral degrees from thirteen universities. He is a member of the American Academy, the National Academy of Science, the Royal Society of London, and the American Philosophical Society. Currently, he serves as a member of the board of editors of *Daedalus,* a member of the board of directors of the Federation of American Scientists, a senior adviser to the Mitre Corporation's Jason Group of defense consultants, a national sponsor of the Committee of Concerned Scientists, and a member of the Council on Foreign Relations's Independent Task Force on Homeland Security Imperatives.

In addition to the treatises *Gravitation and Cosmology* and (in three volumes) *The Quantum Theory of Fields,* he has written several books for general readers, including the prizewinning *The First Three Minutes* (now translated into twenty-two foreign languages), *The Discovery of Subatomic Particles, Dreams of a Final Theory*, and, most recently, *Facing Up: Science and Its Cultural Adversaries.* He is a regular contributor to the *New York Review of Books.* In 1999 he received the Lewis Thomas Prize, established by Rockefeller University to honor "the scien-

tist whose voice and vision can tell us of science's aesthetic and philosophical dimensions."

I recently read his 1992 book *Dreams of a Final Theory* and urge you to read it too. It may or may not give those of you untrained in physics the sense that you understand quantum mechanics, but it will give you a deep insight into how physicists think and what they mean by a scientific understanding of nature.

Steven Weinberg

It is always an honor and a pleasure to speak to this Academy, but it is a special honor for me to give a talk dedicated to two great men: Herman Feshbach and Victor Weisskopf. I knew them as senior figures at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology: Viki recruited me to the Physics Department, which he chaired, and Herman was director of the Center for Theoretical Physics, where I worked. Of course, long before I knew them, they had made their reputations as theoretical physicists. Among other things, both had made major contributions to nuclear physics, which in the 1940s became an important factor in world history. Herman's Ph.D. thesis was on tritium, an isotope that later became an essential ingredient in hydrogen bombs. Viki was one of those at Los Alamos who designed the first atomic bombs, and he felt the heat of the first nuclear explosion at Alamogordo from ten miles away.

The experience of participating in the development of nuclear weapons gave a generation of physicists a sense not of guilt but of responsibility—of what Viki called "an obligation to inform the public about the awesome consequences of a nuclear war . . . our nightmarish vision of an actual nuclear conflict, based on our particular understanding of the power of the weapon we had made." To carry out this aim, Viki and others created the Federation of Atomic Scientists. Later, in 1969, Viki and Herman and I joined thirty-eight other faculty at MIT in forming the Union of Concerned Scientists, of which Herman was the first chairman. In the 1970s Viki worked, through the Academy, at organizing conferences

on arms control. During Herman's first term as president of the Academy, the Committee on International Security Studies was established. These organizations have played an essential role in providing the public with independent scientific judgments about national nuclear policy and other matters.

I wish that I could say that with the end of the cold war, these efforts are no longer needed. Unfortunately, the reverse is true. Since September 11, 2001, we have been painfully aware that there are people in the world who hate America so much that they will give their lives to hurt us. If terrorists succeeded in exploding a nuclear weapon in one of our cities, it would kill so many people and do so much damage that it would make September 11 look like an ordinary working day. Given a hundred pounds or so of highly enriched uranium, it would not be difficult to make a nuclear weapon and put it in an American city, on a truck or plane, or in one of the seventeen million containers that freighters bring into North American harbors every year.

Last fall I participated in the Hart-Rudman Independent Task Force on Homeland Security Imperatives, convened by the Council on Foreign Relations. Our task force concluded that "a year after September 11, 2001, America remains dan-

Speaker Steven Weinberg (University of Texas at Austin)

gerously unprepared to prevent and respond to a catastrophic attack on US soil." For instance, we noted, the American Association of Port Authorities estimates that the cost of adequate physical security at our commercial seaports is about $2 billion, yet only $92.3 million in federal grants had been authorized and approved.

Whatever we do to guard our cities, some vulnerabilities will always remain. We also have to guard against nuclear terrorism by working with other countries to control fissionable materials. Russia now holds about 150 tons of plutonium and 850 tons of highly enriched uranium. Since 1991 the United States has been committed to the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction Program, which among other things aims to improve Russian control over these materials to keep them out of the hands of terrorists and other states, and to make them unusable for weapons. Our rate of spending on this program, however, is only about a third of what it should be. The planned upgrade of security has been completed for only about 40 percent of Russian nuclear storage sites, and less than a seventh of Russia's stockpile of highly enriched uranium has been made unusable for weapons. Last year President Bush proposed to cut spending on this program by 5 percent; this year he has asked for only about 10 percent in additional funds.

We are not even adequately protecting our own nuclear weapons facilities. Energy Secretary Spencer Abraham has said that his department "is unable to meet the next round of security mission requirements" and has asked for $379.7 million to rectify that situation, but the White House has approved just $26.4 million. There are no technical obstacles here—only a shortage of funds.

One program did receive a flood of new funding after September 11: ballistic missile defense. Pressures for this project had already been revived when Korea fired a three-stage rocket on August 31, 1998, even though that rocket could not have carried a nuclear weapon. More for protection from Republicans than for protection from Korean missiles, President Clinton began tentative steps

toward a new antimissile system. During the summer of 2001, Senators Joseph Biden and Carl Levin planned hearings of the Senate committees on foreign affairs and armed services, which might have led to a termination or suspension of Clinton's program. After September 11, those hearings were canceled, and opposition to missile defense collapsed.

On December 13, 2001, President Bush announced that the United States would abrogate the treaty that since 1972 had banned the deployment of missile defense by the United States or Russia. This past December he announced the decision to deploy a limited missile defense by October 2004. There is $9 billion in the 2004 budget for missile defense—a figure that will surely increase as the program moves from testing and development to deployment. I have heard estimates that the total cost of the missile defense program through 2014 will reach a trillion dollars.

The irony in the contrast between support for missile defense and for other programs is painful, because attack by ballistic missiles is not only just one of many ways that terrorists could use nuclear weapons against us; *it is the least likely way.* Terrorists may be willing to commit suicide, but the leaders of the states that harbor them never are. Why should anyone attack us with ballistic missiles, which always reveal their source, rather than in any of the many ways that do not?

Well, I can think of one reason. A rogue state that is in the process of being put out of business by the United States and that has nuclear-armed ballistic missiles might, *in extremis*, launch them at us. But if that would deter us from adventures in regime change, how would it help if we had an antimissile system of uncertain capability? According to the 2004 budget, the administration plans to deploy an antimissile system that has had no realistic operational tests and does not have the high-frequency radar that had previously been thought necessary. Even if we can build a system and tune it up so that it doesn't keep failing tests, we will never know what sort of decoys or other countermeasures it might encounter. And even if we could protect

Carl Kaysen and Academy Vice President Louis Cabot

ourselves, depending on the scope of the missile defense program, we might be deterred anyway by the danger of a nuclear attack on our allies. As an audience mostly of academics, I think you will understand what I mean when I call our present missile defense program "pure missile defense"—that is, missile defense undertaken for its own sake, not for any application it might have in defending our country.

The real danger is not that a rogue state will launch nuclear-armed intercontinental ballistic missiles at us, but that it will use nuclear weapons in local conflicts or hand them over to terrorists. There is no easy answer to this. We may have to consider preemptive nonnuclear attacks on nuclear facilities, such as the nuclear fuel reprocessing plant in North Korea. On this I disagree with Senators Robert Byrd and Edward Kennedy, who have called on the United States to respect an absolute ban on preventive attacks. There have been times when preventive war would have been necessary and proper—for instance, in March 1935, when Germany announced that it was tearing up the Versailles Treaty and building a military air force.

It would help if the United States could act against nuclear proliferation with clean hands. Under the terms of the 1970 Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, we are committed to deemphasize the role of nuclear weapons and work toward their elimination. But there are signs that the Bush adminis-

tration is trying to revive the idea that nuclear weapons are for use and not just for deterrence.

The administration's Nuclear Posture Review, on which I testified in the Senate last fall, has called for the development of Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrators—nuclear weapons for attacking underground facilities (even though such weapons can't be used without creating severe nuclear fallout)—and the new budget contains a small appropriation for this purpose. The chair of the Defense Science Board has called for a study of nuclear-armed antiballistic missile interceptors. White House Chief of Staff Andrew Card has said that the United States would not rule out the use of nuclear weapons in Iraq. President Bush has announced that he will not seek to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. Leaders at the Los Alamos and Sandia weapons laboratories continue to press for a resumption of nuclear weapons testing, and the Bush administration has called for the repeal of the Spratt-Furse amendment, which bans development of low-yield nuclear weapons. For a nation with an overwhelming superiority in conventional arms, the development of nuclear weapons for actual use seems counterproductive to the point of insanity.

Some say that nuclear testing is needed to maintain safety and reliability, but both a committee of the National Academy of Sciences in 2002 and the Council of the American Physical Society in 2003 have concluded that it is possible to maintain confidence in the safety and reliability of the existing nuclear weapons stockpile without actually producing nuclear explosions. Indeed, when we tested nuclear weapons in the past, it was usually to develop new weapons.

Personally, I don't think it would be so bad if nuclear weapons on all sides did become somewhat unreliable. We might not then be able to use them for preemptive attacks or bunker busting or missile defense—but what effect would it have on deterrence if there was a possibility that some fraction of our weapons would not achieve the nominal yield?

Meanwhile, nuclear proliferation continues: North Korea today, Iran tomorrow. Even in Brazil, a cabinet minister has called for a nuclear weapons program.

You may not realize it, but so far in this talk I have been looking on the bright side. A nuclear attack by terrorists or rogue states could do terrible damage and kill millions of people, but it would not destroy our country. Only one thing could do that: a mistaken attack on our country by the huge Russian arsenal of nuclear weapons.

It may seem terribly "retro" to mention this danger—akin to suggesting that a modern politician would worry about nineteenth-century issues like bimetallism or free love. Granted, in the present state of international relations, no one thinks that either Russia or the United States would ever plan a first strike against the other. Nevertheless, the strategic nuclear forces of both sides remain frozen in their cold war posture. Each is tasked with the responsibility of being able to respond to an attack by the other side before a single attacking nuclear weapon can reach its own land-based missiles and control centers. This means that the decision to attack must be made in minutes, before any nuclear weapons have actually exploded.

It takes only two minutes to launch our own land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles, and less than fifteen minutes to launch our submarine-based missiles. The pressure to decide quickly is more severe for the Russians than it is for us, because they have little left of the invulnerable part of their deterrent (their missile submarines rarely go to sea), and their land-based missiles are vulnerable to a relatively short-range attack by US submarines.

In January 1995 the Russian attack decision process was triggered by the launch of a US research rocket from a Norwegian offshore island to study the Northern Lights. The rocket firing was originally mistaken for a launch from an American submarine in the Norwegian Sea, with the separation of multiple stages perhaps giving the impression of an attack by several missiles. The Russian

response process was stopped only a few minutes short of their ten-minute deadline for a final decision. (Similar episodes occurred in the Soviet Union in 1983 and in the United States in 1979 and 1980.) The pressure on the Russians for quick decisions will become greater as the United States deploys and improves its antimissile system, which could be thought to have some capability against a ragged Russian second strike.

Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld has upheld the deployment of an ineffective missile defense system by saying that it is better than nothing, but in fact it is worse than nothing. Major General Pavel Zolotarev, past deputy chief of staff of the Russian Defense Council, has said that US missile defense plans make it harder for Russian nuclear planners to consider deep cuts in their arsenal coupled with de-alerting. Can we really assume that Russian judgments about whether they are under attack will always be made correctly, especially if relations between the United States and Russia sour in the future?

Several steps have been taken to ameliorate this danger, all sharing the common feature of being ineffective. In May 1994 Presidents Clinton and Yeltsin agreed that the United States and Russia would stop targeting each other's territory. This is a bad joke; the targeting can be restored in seconds. In 1998 the presidents of the United States and

Left to right: Steven Weinberg, James Carroll (chair, Visiting Scholars Program), and Leon Eisenberg (Harvard School of Public Health)

Russia agreed to establish a center in Moscow for the exchange of data on rocket launches. Plans for this center were completed, but it was never brought into operation. In March 2003 the Senate ratified the Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty, which had been signed last year by Presidents Bush and Putin. It requires a reduction in the number of strategically deployed nuclear weapons on both sides, but the treaty will reduce the numbers only to about two thousand weapons on each side by 2012, and the delivery vehicles and thousands of weapons taken out of service will not need to be destroyed, only separated.

We need to reduce the number of nuclear weapons on both sides to hundreds, not thousands; to count all weapons, not just those that are strategically deployed; and to take these weapons off hair-trigger alert. Nothing is more important. In any one year, the danger of nuclear attack by mistake is small, and aside from the warnings issued by a few hardy souls (such as Bruce Blair, the director of the Center for Defense Information, and former senator Sam Nunn), it receives little attention. No president of either party has given this danger a high priority. But it is always with us, and in the end it may destroy us.

JOINT MEETING OF THE ACADEMY AND THE BOSTON ATHENAEUM

How to Read a Diary

Patricia Meyer Spacks, President of the Academy and Edgar F. Shannon Professor of English, University of Virginia

Introduction: ***Bruce Redford,*** Boston University

This communication was presented at the second joint meeting of the Academy and the Boston Athenaeum, which took place at the Athenaeum on April 10, 2003. Fellows and their guests were welcomed to the event by Academy Executive Officer Leslie C. Berlowitz and by Richard Wendorf, Stanford Calderwood Director and Librarian at the Athenaeum.

Bruce Redford

As a teacher of eighteenth-century literature and art, I recommend to my students a book by Donald Greene, *The Age of Exuberance.* In his preface, Greene explains the title as follows: "When I was first exposed to the eighteenth century as an undergraduate or earlier, the custom of describing it as the 'age of reason' or decorum or restraint . . . never made the slightest sense to me; it still does not. What attracted me to the century then, and what still attracts me, is the magnificent, apparently inexhaustible and indefatigable fund of sheer *energy* that its best art affords: the energy one hears in the . . . orchestral climaxes of a Handel oratorio, that one sees in the fantastic design of a Vanbrugh mansion . . . that one responds to . . . in the poetry of a Christopher Smart." Our speaker this evening not only teaches this version of the eighteenth century; she embodies it. Yet the exuberance of Patricia Meyer Spacks—her "magnificent, apparently inexhaustible, and indefatigable fund of sheer *energy*"—is only one of her Augustan attributes. In person and on the page, Professor Spacks exemplifies those

qualities that one great writer of the period, Samuel Johnson, found in another, Alexander Pope.

In his *Life of Pope,* Johnson points to the poet's distinctive combination of "good sense" and "genius." "Good sense," for Johnson, means "a prompt and intuitive perception of consonance and propriety." "Genius" he glosses as "a mind active, ambitious, and adventurous." The President of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences needs good sense; the Edgar F. Shannon Professor of English needs genius. How rare to find two in one and one in two.

I first attended to the voice of our speaker some thirty years ago, when I found myself strangely enthralled by James Thomson's poem "The Seasons." A foray into the stacks of my college library produced a book called *The Varied God.* Its author was one Patricia Meyer Spacks. The title caught my fancy; the contents provided just what eighteenth-century readers looked for: a combination of instruction and pleasure.

The pleasure of reading a book by Professor Spacks always begins with the title. Let me read you a few: *Desire and Truth, The Insistence of Horror, An Argument of Images, Boredom, Gossip, Privacy, Imagining a Self.*

Imagining a Self, a pioneering study of eighteenth-century autobiography and fiction, includes a superb chapter on the diarist and novelist Frances Burney. Professor Spacks finds in Burney's journals a combination of literary and moral clarity that provides their embattled writer with "a principle of power." The pattern and principles at work in Burney's nonfictional prose give Professor Spacks a key to her fictional world, as does a passage from the diary of Virginia Woolf. I quote now from that passage—an entry in which Woolf the diarist takes stock of her own enterprise: "There looms ahead of me the shadow of some kind of form which a diary might attain to. I might, in the course of time, learn what it is that one can make of this loose, drifting material of life . . . . I should like to come back, after a year or two, and find that the collection has sorted itself and refined itself and coalesced, as such de-

Academy President Patricia Meyer Spacks (University of Virginia)

posits so mysteriously do, into a mould, transparent enough to reflect the light of our life."

What can one make of "this loose, drifting material of life"? How can one discern "the shadow of some kind of form"? Patricia Meyer Spacks may well suggest answers to these questions as she teaches us how to read a diary.

Patricia Meyer Spacks

I have two purposes in mind this evening. One is to think aloud about how it is possible to derive literary value from reading even a diary that initially seems dull, rich only in unmomentous detail. Some diaries we read for the stories they tell. I'm thinking of such works as Boswell's journals, full of scandalous self-revelations and compelling happenings, or Pepys's diaries, with their disclosures about details of private life that most people prefer to keep private. But there are also published diaries that contain no obvious revelations and tell no clear story. They too, I want to argue, can offer delight to an imaginative reader. The empty spaces they contain provide room for pleasures different from those one gets in reading Boswell, but no less satisfying.

My other purpose is to tell you something about two specific examples of what I might call com-

monplace diaries—diaries filled with almost nothing in the way of event or reflection and of no obvious narrative interest. Both were written partly during the American War for Independence, on opposite sides of the Atlantic. One is by a Quaker woman in Philadelphia, the other by a clergyman in rural England. Neither writer says much about the war; indeed, neither says much about anything of importance. Yet both kept extended records of their experience: the Englishman, James Woodforde, for forty-four years; the American woman, Elizabeth Drinker, for twenty-eight. To think about what might interest their readers tells us something about diary reading in general.

I'll get back to my two diarists in a few minutes. First, though, let me ponder the more general question. The most obvious appeal of diaries, aside from their possible historical interest, is that of metaphorically looking over someone's shoulder, seeing what we're not supposed to see; reading diaries is in this respect like reading private letters. We assume that diarists set down what they don't want everyone to know, perhaps what they don't want *anyone* to know. That's why it's so perplexing when one finds a diary that deals only in the external and obvious—in such matters as the phase of the moon or the dinner menu.

But there are other reasons for reading diaries. Maybe we seek moral and psychological insight. Maybe we want to participate intimately in another's life, imaginatively sharing experience. Maybe—and this is the idea that interests me most—we yearn for reassurance about the contours of that humanity we share with people from other times and places. Such reassurance would not depend only on revelations of a hidden life. Quite opposed kinds of revelation can validate aspects of the reader's experience. To uncover the relentless triviality of a writer's everyday life may confirm the value of a reader's mundane daily career. A diary can reveal the importance of commentary unspoken. It can uncover unexpected ways of achieving personal dignity. It can redefine authenticity.

The records of inconsequential lives may prove to have unexpected imaginative force. Records are not the same as lives, of course; writing experience down can transform it. I'll turn for evidence to my two diarists. Neither of them claims any personal importance, unless keeping a diary automatically implies such a claim. Both led lives far from the public eye. Elizabeth Drinker shared fellowship with an extensive community of Quakers, and she lived almost entirely within the conventions of that community. The tenets of Quaker faith in the eighteenth century included prohibition of imaginative or intellectual dwelling on the self. If Quakers kept diaries, Drinker's record suggests, they should be open to public view. Twice in the relatively short space she allots to her premarital years, she reports having been offered a friend's diary to read. She makes it clear that she expects her children to read what she has written, and she is careful about what she says.

Indeed, Drinker offers her reader little obvious imaginative substance. Day after day, she simply reports the weather or announces whom she has visited, without any record of what happened during the encounter. Indeed, she disclaims any intention of keeping a diary at all. I'll quote her most extended repudiation of the idea of an intimate personal record:

> With respect to keeping a Diary;—when I began this year, I intended the book for memorandams [sic], nor is it any thing else, the habit of scribbling some thing every night led me on,—as what I write answers no other purpose than to help the memory—I have seen Diarys of different complections, some were amuseing [sic], others instructive, and others repleat with what might much better be totally let alone—my simple Diary comes under none of those descriptions. (220)

As she continues her reflections on the subject, her main concern focuses on the possibility of saying "severe things" that might hurt or disturb others. Sometimes, she says, people change their opinions of others, or realize that they have been driven by corrupt motives to slander; but even though they

know they have been wrong in writing down negative views, they feel "unwilling to tear or spoil what they have wrote" and therefore "leave it to do future mischief." Such a possibility, she concludes, "ought to be avoided by every sensible or prudent person."

Sensible and prudent she certainly is, frequently consulted by her children and her neighbors about medical and domestic problems. Self-revealing she is not. Her life seems unexciting, except for events at some distance from it. Here is a more or less typical day's record:

> Molly fell out of Bed last Night an attempt was made last Night to break open the Jail, to resque one Steuart, who is condem'd for foarging Mony—Molly Gosnold here this Morning for to Borrow Sheets—Sarah Mitchel and Molly Stretch, drank Tea with us—A Lad call'd for HD. [her husband] to make up a Board. At the School Corporation Saml. Hopkins, call'd for a paper I step'd over to R Walns. (54)

Although attempted jailbreaks and school corporation meetings exist in the distance, the texture of Drinker's life derives more crucially from a child's falling out of bed, a neighbor borrowing sheets. And this is one of the more eventful entries in the diary. Many consist of a single line. In 1783 one line suffices for three days (July 22, 23, and 24): "The weather was extremely warm, many dyd drinking cold water" (95). The longer entry I quoted, the one about the jailbreak, is dated May 25, 1775—a moment when the national situation might be expected to attract some commentary—but Elizabeth Drinker sticks close to home. Soon enough, however, the national situation would touch her. Her husband—like her, a devout Quaker—refused to sign a loyalty oath to the Continental Congress and was therefore, along with other Quakers, arrested and interned in Virginia, leaving his wife to confront the actualities of wartime Philadelphia. The British overran the city; battles took place within earshot. At one point, five soldiers were briefly quartered in Drinker's house. On another occasion, a drunken officer

invaded the household, flourishing his sword and refusing to leave. Two neighbors were tried and then hanged for treason after the Americans retook control of the city. Their crime was their compulsory service as guides for the British.

Elizabeth Drinker reports such events, but on the whole they assume less importance in her "memorandams" than do her children's illnesses and her concerns about high prices and the servant problem. The invading officer (who kept returning to the house after a servant evicted him) gets considerably more attention than does the British army as a whole, since he constitutes a more immediate threat. At intervals we read of the diarist's concern for her husband, and we are offered a sketchy account of the journey she made, along with other Quaker women, to try to effect his return. When he actually comes back, she reports the fact very briefly, with virtually no emotional commentary. She offers no account of his homecoming, although she mentions that many fellow Quakers dropped in.

Although her explicit reason for limited communication turns on anxiety about harming others, she seems equally restrained about revealing tender feelings or personal problems. At one point, she suggests that because she expects only her children to read the diary, she doesn't mind writing about such matters as obstructed bowels. That is, in fact, the kind of matter she writes about extensively: an astonishingly large proportion of entries concern illnesses major and minor and the deaths, anticipated or unexpected, of friends and relatives of every age. Ordinarily, Drinker acknowledges no feeling about the constant reminders of human mortality. A rare exception is her account of the death of her last child, Samuel, at the age of two and a half. (She had given birth to nine children; three others also died in infancy.) Here is her narrative, which immediately follows a summary of the doctor's opinion. Dr. Redman, Drinker writes,

> ordred what he thought might prove a gentle vomitt, agatated him much, but did not work, and in little more than 20 minits from the time he took it,

> he expird aged 2 years 7 months and one day—about a week before he was fat, fresh and hearty—he cut a tooth a day before he dyed—thus was I suddenly depried [sic] of my dear little Companion over whome, I had almost constantly watchd, from the time of his birth, and the late thriving state seem'd to promise a [reward] to all my pains—he dy'd the 17 march, fourth day. (97)

The phrase "dear little Companion," as a description by a forty-nine-year-old woman of her tiny son, rings poignantly, suggesting the mother's loneliness despite the presence of a beloved husband and the routine of frequent visits from neighbors, friends, and relatives. As she recalls the child's "fresh and hearty" state a week earlier, and the tooth he cut the day before, she comes closer than she does anywhere else in the diary to reflecting on the mystery of life and death.

She also offers occasional hints that her inner life is less serene than her outward appearance. Thus, in 1800:

> a weight on my spirits or a heavy heart has lately been my portion, tho' some times for a length of time, I am favour'd with a tranquil mind—The first does not arise from a guilty consience, nor the latter from an unsteady disposistion of temper, which I esteem a great favour—but so it is—was "every ones faults written on their foreheads," we should see, as I think, crouded characters where they would not be expected, and clear smooth fronts where faults would be looked for: I hate the lieing Tongue. (224)

She provides no clue about whose "lieing Tongue" she hates, but the clear implication is that someone close to her has revealed, at least to this one astute observer, faults not written on the forehead, and has concealed such faults to others by lying. This is as close as Drinker ever comes to speaking ill of another, and she does not identify the object of her criticism. But she suggests that unvoiced disapproval constitutes her psychological burden.

More vaguely but more memorably, she puts her unease into verse:

> Could I write, instead of Trifles;
> That which most employs my mind:
> All that's here would be omitted,
> Nor should I mark, how blew the wind?

Immediately following these lines—which appear, without preamble, in the midst of an account of the weather—Drinker writes, "I have heard of people who have had so much work to do, that they knew not what to do first and so did nothing there is such a weight such a complicated weight upon my [Spirits] that words cannot express" (106).

Such interruptions of the mainly uneventful narrative come as something of a shock. I do not mean to imply, though, that they set the tone of the whole. Rather, they are occasional eruptions of emotions that Drinker believes unacceptable or, as the last quotation may suggest, that she simply does not know how to express. She is hardly more explicit in delineating the sources of happiness. Here, too, we must depend on hints. "This has been a fine day," Drinker writes on August 27, 1794. "I have felt rather better than usual—Different persons have different tasts, their likes and dislikes vary, to me the noise of insects is amuseing, the locust, the Cricket, the Cateydid, as it is call'd, and even the croaking of Frogs,—'tho their notes are inferior, they are pleasing" (133). A full entry in 1797 reads, "The full Moon rising more like Copper than Silver, indication I believe of dry weather—I love the Moon" (177).

I love the Moon. I think that's my favorite moment in the diary. It too seems like an eruption of feeling—of positive feeling as obscure to its experiencer as are its negative counterparts. Elizabeth Drinker does not waste time in self-analysis. Her occasional confessions of weighed-down spirits are rare bits of introspection. When she tries to describe herself more generally, she sounds a bit baffled. "It is pleasing to me to see things round me that I am accustomed too [sic], even the vane in the Cherry tree, 'tho the wind is easterly—I am one of those that deal in triffels, 'tho things of greater Consequence do not always escape me" (215).

The trifles she deals in create much of her diary's charm. Yet she feels at least faintly guilty for her pleasure in them, and her definition of the inconsequential does not necessarily correspond to ours. Thus, she reports reading "a foolish Romance" and also reading "Mrs. Barbalds hymns for Children in prose, very beautiful in my opinion." (Anna Laetitia Barbauld's hymns are works of almost paralyzing piety, tough going for a modern reader.) Drinker's entry continues, "finished knitting a pair large cotton Stockings, bound a petticoat, and mad a batch of Gingerbread—this I mention, to shew, that I have not spent the day reading" (161). When she reads Mary Wollstonecraft's *Vindication of the Rights of Woman*, a spirited feminist tract from the late eighteenth century, she acknowledges that some of the author's sentiments duplicate her own but concludes, "I am not for quite so much independence" (163). She fully accepts—at least rationally accepts—a life of orthodox female responsibility as she understands it. Reading poetry, listening to katydids, contemplating the moon: such activities may provide profound pleasure, but they do not contribute to her fulfillment of duty.

To say that trifles contribute significantly to the charm of Drinker's diary does not suffice to account for the pleasure of reading it. I don't know how many readers the diary has had. It was first published in 1991 by Northeastern University Press,

Left to right: Bruce Redford (Boston University), Richard Wendorf (Boston Athenaeum), President Patricia Meyer Spacks, Executive Officer Leslie C. Berlowitz, and Secretary Emilio Bizzi (MIT).

unabridged, in three volumes. Three years later, an abridged one-volume edition appeared—a fact that at least suggests that the original had found some popularity. The editor, a historian, claims for the diary only historical interest. Indeed, one can learn from this book a good deal about the daily life of eighteenth-century domestic women, as well as something about the strictures of a Quaker community. But reading for information does not necessarily correspond to reading for pleasure, and historical interest need not imply literary interest.

The primary source of literary interest and of reading pleasure in this diary, I suspect, is not one we ordinarily take into account. I base this surmise entirely on my own experience; to generalize it must be a matter of speculation. Let me talk about myself, then. I think what enthralls me about such diaries as Drinker's—and many published diaries resemble hers in their lack of obviously compelling material—what enthralls me resembles what compels me to listen to fragments of other people's conversation in restaurants. The diary gives one scrappy raw material for a story rather than the story itself. The story depends more on the reader than on the writer, though the reader would not be in a position to construct it without the writer's clues.

Those of us who teach literature are fond of insisting that reading—in distinction, for example, to watching television—is an active process, involving constant mental exercise. Reading such diaries as Drinker's, I'm tempted to argue, intensifies the level of activity. The story I make up about Drinker involves a woman genuinely happy in marriage and motherhood and piety, yet yearning inchoately for something more: more beauty, perhaps; more freedom; more romance. Made possible by small hints that the diary provides, this story also depends on interpretation of the blanks—what Drinker leaves out. Other readers might construct other stories.

I'll elaborate the point, at least indirectly, by pondering for a bit my other diary. The eighteenth-century clergyman James Woodforde has attracted a surprisingly steady audience since his *Diary of a Country Parson* was first published between 1924 and 1931,

in five volumes containing less than half the total diary. A World's Classics edition, further condensed, runs to 619 closely printed pages. Its introduction, by the original editor, John Baldwyn Beresford, testifies to the diary's great popularity. Yet the book, quite devoid of remarkable personal revelation, holds at least as little obvious interest as Drinker's.

Let me tell you about its writer. Woodforde never married. He proposed, sort of, and was sort of accepted, but the object of his affections subsequently married another man. His account of the "proposal"—which I'm about to quote in full; it won't take long—exemplifies his tone about intimate matters: "I went home with Betsy White and had some talk with her concerning my making her mine when an opportunity offered and she was not averse to it at all" (May 28, 1774; 95–96). The cautious negative formulation ("not averse") hardly suggests passion, on either side. If Betsy's later defection caused Woodforde suffering, he does not acknowledge the fact in his diary. If he regretted his celibacy, if he felt sexual longings or indulged them, if he endured loneliness, the diary never says so. Far from telling all, this particular diary firmly declares large stretches of personal experience off limits.

Yet I, for one, find it unexpectedly absorbing. The question is why. The data Woodforde provides are not obviously compelling, although a twenty-first-century reader must feel a certain fascination and even awe at the lavish menus. Many menus make their appearance: recording the food he has eaten, and especially the food that he has offered guests or been offered while visiting, constitutes one of the diarist's favorite activities. How could he and his friends eat so much? Two cods plus fried sole and oyster sauce, a beef sirloin, pea soup, and orange pudding: that's one first course, to be followed by wild ducks, a forequarter of lamb, salad, and mince pies. Or two boiled chickens, a tongue, a leg of mutton with capers and batter pudding for a first course; then ducks, green peas, artichokes, tarts, and pudding, followed by almonds, raisins, oranges, and strawberries, with two kinds of wine. Other equally stunning examples abound. In the final

years of his life, Woodforde recorded every dinner he ate. If consistency of notation be the criterion, food would seem James Woodforde's primary concern in life.

In second place—a close second, by the same standard of frequent occurrence—is money. The diarist records all his spending. He details the wages he gives his servants, the amount he pays for gin and books and buttons. Such data, like the lists of food, hold historical interest. But as the substance of a diary, the recurrent tabulations lack the resonance that readers of private records characteristically anticipate.

To dwell on small expenditures and large meals makes sense, given the apparent paucity of event in Woodforde's life. During the more than forty years covered by the diary, almost nothing happens. For twenty-six of those years, Woodforde lived in the country village of Weston, in Norfolk, which he served as pastor. His niece, Nancy, joined him there in 1779 and remained with him until his death in 1803. The deaths of siblings and parents punctuated his life. He had few intimate friends, and his most absorbing occupation beyond his pastoral duties apparently consisted in making beer. He sometimes helped his workers bring in hay; he bottled the gin he bought; he christened and married and buried his parishioners. He offers no evidence of any internal spiritual life. Occasionally he journeyed to a nearby town. Yet more rarely, he visited or was visited by members of his family. He shows some concern for the madness of King George III, some awareness of war with America, but little consciousness beyond this of national or international affairs.

His awareness of the war registers itself with no accompanying reflection. In the five-volume version of the diary, I count no more than four or five references to the American war. All concern church fasts ordained by the government to pray for victory or attempts to raise subscriptions for troops. Here is a typical entry, for December 13, 1776:

> This day being appointed a Fast on our Majesty's arms against the rebel Americans, I went to Church this

> morning and read the Prayers appointed for the same. I had as full a congregation present as I have in an afternoon on a Sunday, very few that did not come.

The size of the congregation seems to matter more to him than the war itself, about which he never comments. He devotes more space to an episode in which two pigs get drunk from the residue of beer making and remain drunk for almost three days. One might be tempted to deduce the quietness of his internal as well as his external life.

Part of his account's fascination consists in its very quietness. The forequarter of lamb one partakes of, the price one pays for buttons—these are hardly confidential matters. Yet their place in Woodforde's diary helps to define the nature of his existence. The texture of his life, like that of most lives, derives from routine, the things he does over and over. So it is for most people: much of our time goes into paying the bills, doing the marketing, picking up the dry cleaning, taking out the trash, sitting at a desk and performing repetitive tasks—we'd probably all feel some interest in a pair of drunk pigs. A diary like Woodforde's validates the aspects of life that we take for granted or even actively resent. Public personae conceal the universal secret that most "interesting" lives rest on a substratum of predictable and repeated small occupations. To write with precision about the things that one does all the time, almost without noticing, declares their importance. James Woodforde paid nine shillings sixpence for eleven dozen buttons: no more, no less. The buttons would adorn coats and waistcoats. Made of different substances, all were black. This series of facts appears in one diary entry. What could be more trivial? Yet, knowing about those buttons, a twenty-first-century reader can feel in touch with the kind of experience that composes a man's days. The quality of dailiness in this diary—a genre by definition recording the passage of days—creates much of its appeal and reminds its readers that the hidden life we posit in others actually includes not only psychic upheaval but also taking out the garbage.

Indeed, there is a peculiar sense of intimacy—and the sense of intimacy is one of diary reading's rewards—in sharing the trivia of every day. Husbands and wives, at the end of the day, often talk about just such matters: the price of buttons, the lunch menu. The special pleasure of conversing about "nothing" belongs primarily to those close to one another, those who share lives or live in close touch. In interpersonal writing, too, the minor detail surfaces only in frequent and intimate communications. What we paid for buttons does not make part, in all probability, of the yearly ritual letter to our college roommate, but it might come up in hasty daily e-mails to a friend. Learning of the trifles that compose much of Woodforde's experience, we partake in the essence of his life.

Yet we are unlikely to feel satisfied with self-revelation at this level. Reading diaries, we seek evidence not only of the hidden life, in the sense I have been trying to define, but also of the inner life of psyche or soul. *Diary of a Country Parson* provides, for the most part, clues rather than hard evidence about such matters. It creates a puzzle of meaning. This, too, constitutes part of its appeal.

The closest thing to a dramatic event in Woodforde's record of himself is a prolonged and inconclusive series of encounters between him and three recurrent visitors who made part of his life for several years. The cast of characters includes Betsy Davy, eleven years old when she first appears in 1781; her mother, identified only as Mrs. Davy; and her putative fiancé, Mr. Walker, who comes onto the scene in 1788, six years older than Betsy. Betsy and Woodforde's niece Nancy, who lives with him, become close friends. Mrs. Davy shows up frequently, invited or not, as, subsequently, does Mr. Walker. By 1785 the diarist has included many comments about how "bold" and distasteful Mrs. Davy is. Nancy and Mrs. Davy have forged a disturbing alliance: "Nancy had two Letters from Mrs. Davy this Afternoon done up in a parcel, and with the same a little Lump of something, but what, I know not—as Nancy never mentioned a word of what it was, nor of a single word in either

of the Letters—I care not for it, but shall take care to be as private myself in matters" (December 10, 1786). Mr. Smith reports that Mrs. Davy is a woman of bad character, but Nancy doesn't seem to care; Mrs. Davy continues to visit, although the parson does not wish to see her.

When Mr. Walker makes his advent, his visits follow a similar pattern. At first Woodforde seems to like him and to enjoy the liveliness he provides. Gradually, hurt feelings emerge:

> On his taking leave he went up to Nancy and wished her well shaking her by her hand, and then went to Betsy and did the same, but to me (altho' in the Room at the same time) he never said one word or took the lest notice of me (tho' I also helped him on with his great Coat) after he was mounted and just going out of the great Gates then he said good Morning and that was all—very slight return for my Civilities towards him of late and which I did not expect. It hurt me very much indeed. (November 19, 1788; 338–39)

Worse still: "Nancy, Betsy Davy, and Mr. Walker are all confederate against me and am never let into any of their Schemes or Intentions &c. Nancy I think ought not to be so to me" (January 2, 1789; 342). It comes as considerable satisfaction to Woodforde when a friend tells him that Walker has traded on Woodforde's name to try to raise money for dubious purposes. He is no good. "I was astonished to hear such things," Woodforde comments,

> but not so much as I should otherwise, had I not been an eye-witness in some degree of his profligacy and extravagance. I have a long time given him up, his behaviour to me last Winter made me despise him utterly. Nancys encouraging him to come to my House after such behaviour has greatly lessened my esteem for her, as she shewed no regard for me. (January 28, 1790; 370–71)

Woodforde begins, in his relations with all these visitors, by enjoying the novelty and excitement they provide. But he remains sensitive to slights. When he feels slighted, he confides his distress to his diary. Hurt feelings soon give way to a conviction that he is beset by conspiracy: Mrs. Davy

sending a mysterious "lump" that Nancy won't tell him about, Nancy and Betsy and Walker scheming against him. The progression delineates a man eager for, yet fearful of, relationship.

He often sounds depressed; he sometimes even acknowledges low spirits, not infrequently explained, the diary suggests, by ill health. His rare bouts of irritation hint at another cause, perhaps more important. On at least three occasions, he reports his niece's complaints about their shared life. (The diary never specifies Nancy's age, but she is obviously a good deal younger than its writer.) His reaction to those complaints—confided to the diary, not necessarily to Nancy herself—is always the same.

> Dinner to day, Breast of Veal rosted &c. Nancy made me very uneasy this Afternoon and does very often, by complaining of the dismal Situation of my House, nothing to be seen, and little or no visiting, or being visited &c. If we have of late lost our best Friends, by the removal of Mr. Custance's Family to Bath, and the Death of Mr. DuQuesne, must it not be affected by me as well as her? In short my Place has been too dull for her I am sorry to say for many Years.—As things are so—infœlix! (January 19, 1794; 451)

Nancy complains that life is dull at the parsonage; Woodforde responds that his situation duplicates hers. The reader might question this claim, recognizing that the diarist at least has regular occupation and an acknowledged role in community life, whereas his niece exists in a condition of absolute dependence on whatever social life becomes available to her. But such facts have little relevance. It matters far more that Woodforde clearly feels the monotony of his own existence. That recognition emerges only in the context of Nancy's complaints, which elicit both resentment ("I suffer as much as she does") and covert pride ("But I don't complain about it").

Instead of complaining, he keeps a diary. For himself alone, he can report the minutiae of his life. For himself alone, he can dignify minutiae in the setting down. He lives a life as dull as Nancy's, but instead of allowing himself habitually to resent it, he enables himself to celebrate it.

So, at any rate, I read *Diary of a Country Parson*: as an insistent record of the prosaic, dignified by its recording, an account that inadvertently reveals the longing and fear of its maker as well as the heroism with which he suppresses such emotions. The recording and its choices constitute a moral achievement. Woodforde's version of self-creation refuses grandiosity; the self he makes claims no more than the quotidian.

In finding heroism in confinement to such a claim, I in effect once more invent my own version of the diarist. Diaries provide a superficial illusion of transparency, but in fact they inevitably convey the ambiguity of experience. Eighteenth-century novels remind their readers in many ways of the layers of disguise that envelop the personality, hinting that the attempt to share all thoughts and feelings amounts only to a final disguise. Diaries may substantiate the point, inviting their readers to invent a personality for the voice that speaks through them. Whether they ostensibly reveal an inner life or confine themselves to external detail, they provide wonderfully ambiguous material for interpretation. Lacking coherent plot to focus the reader's attention, lacking deliberate structure beyond that of sequential time and recurrent reference, they do not systematically direct the search for meaning. Yet the fantasy of intimacy they encourage makes the reader believe in the possibility of "knowing" another consciousness on the basis of its language—the possibility that will, I hope, always lure readers.

Quotes from the Drinker diary are taken from the one-volume edition of *The Diary of Elizabeth Drinker,* edited and abridged by Elaine Forman Crane (Northeastern University Press, 1994).

AMERICAN ACADEMY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

Main Office Norton's Woods
136 Irving Street
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138
Telephone: 617-576-5000
Fax: 617-576-5050
E-mail: aaas@amacad.org
Website: http://www.amacad.org

Daedalus Telephone: 617-491-2600
Fax: 617-576-5088
E-mail: daedalus@amacad.org

Western Center 3000 Berkeley Place
University of California
Irvine, California 92697-7425
Telephone: 949-824-4553
Fax: 949-824-8022
E-mail: aaaswest@uci.edu

Midwest Center Lillie House, University of Chicago
5801 South Kenwood Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60637
Telephone: 773-753-8162
Fax: 773-702-1115
E-mail: amacad@uchicago.edu

Bulletin Staff Alexandra Oleson, *Editor*
Carol Leach, *Associate Editor*

Cover photo © Steve Rosenthal.

FORTHCOMING STATED MEETINGS

House of the Academy

October 11, 2003
Induction Ceremony

November 12, 2003
Program: "A Tribute to Robert K. Merton"
Speakers: ***Robert M. Solow*** *(MIT) and* ***Robert C. Merton*** *(Harvard University Graduate School of Business)*

December 3, 2003
Speaker: ***Lewis Lockwood*** *(Harvard University) on "Beethoven and His Royal Disciple"*
Performance: ***Boston Trio,*** *Beethoven's "Archduke" Trio*

Western Center

September 13, 2003
Los Angeles County Museum of Art
Speakers: ***Stephanie Barron*** *(Los Angeles County Museum of Art) on "Impressionists and Moderns: French Masterworks from the State Pushkin Museum, Moscow: A Story of Collecting" and* ***Thomas Crow*** *(Getty Research Institute) on "Collecting and Display as Subjects for History"*

North Carolina

October 29, 2003
National Humanities Center, Research Triangle Park, NC
Speaker: ***Walter E. Dellinger III*** *(Duke University)*

Midwest Center

November 1, 2003
Adler Planetarium, Chicago
Speaker: ***Michael Turner*** *(University of Chicago) on "The Absurd Universe"*

Visit our website at **www.amacad.org** for updates to this schedule.