

JOHN HARVARD'S JOURNAL



After a telephone news conference to discuss his resignation on February 21, President Lawrence H. Summers stepped outside Massachusetts Hall to face the broadcast media and meet with student supporters.

A Presidency's Early End

AFTER FIVE YEARS of frequent controversy on matters of fundamental academic and intellectual substance, and the style in which those issues were pursued, the Harvard presidency of Lawrence H. Summers will end on June 30. Throughout his administration, questions about how the University should develop faculty, teach students, and organize research in the twenty-first century were

constantly raised but incompletely explored. Given his unexpectedly brief tenure, that leaves much work for Harvard's transition leadership, and for Summers's ultimate successor. Those leaders must also help calm the community and refocus its energies on its academic mission—priorities that seemed particularly pressing in the fervid atmosphere immediately following Summers's resignation.

The news itself was announced on the University website at 1:00 P.M. on Tuesday, February 21, the day after Presidents' Day, accompanied by letters from the Harvard

Corporation and Summers. (Links to the texts are available at www.harvardmagazine.com.)

The Corporation's letter made these key points:

- Summers would serve through the end of the academic year. Following a sabbatical, he planned to return to the faculty, and the Corporation intended to appoint him to a University Professorship, Harvard's highest professorial rank, upon the completion of his presidential service.

- He would be succeeded July 1, on an interim basis, by Derek Bok, who was

JOHN HARVARD'S JOURNAL

END OF A PRESIDENCY

president from 1971 to 1991. For Bok, who led Harvard after the turmoil of the late 1960s—the antiwar protests, occupation of University Hall, and forcible removal of those sitting in by police officers—the new tour of service represents a second call to calm troubled waters. (Bok quickly began preparing to assume his new duties; see “The Interim Agenda,” page 64.)

- Provost Steven E. Hyman “will carry forward in his vital role.”

- The Corporation would have “more to say soon about the search for a new president, which we intend to launch promptly” (see page 66).

The statement was signed by James R. Houghton, Nannerl O. Keohane, Robert D. Reischauer, James F. Rothenberg, and Robert E. Rubin—the current Corporation members other than Summers. (Patricia A. King begins her service in May.)

Saying that it had accepted Summers’s resignation with regret, the Corporation cited his service to Harvard, animated by “a sense of bold aspiration and initiative, a prodigious intelligence, and an insistent devotion to maximizing Harvard’s contributions to the realm of ideas and to the larger world.” As examples of “invigorated” academic programs and keener engagement with “complex challenges facing society,” the Corporation cited work on the undergraduate curriculum; Harvard’s international agenda; the “pursuit of new intellectual frontiers” within and across departments and schools; enhanced financial aid for students from lower-income families and graduate students pursuing public-service careers; faculty appointments; and planning for Allston development, particularly in the sciences.

The past year, the Corporation noted,

“has been a difficult and sometimes wrenching one.” It exhorted members of the community to “look forward in a spirit of common enterprise” of scholarship and education.

IN HIS OWN LETTER, Summers cited “rifts between me and segments of the Arts and Sciences faculty” as the factor making it “infeasible for me to advance the agenda of renewal that I see as crucial to Harvard’s future.” That definition of what had transpired would become sharply contested ground.

He then presented an informal brief for what had been his presidential agenda. “Believing deeply that complacency is among the greatest risks facing Harvard,” Summers wrote, “I have sought for the last five years to prod and challenge the University to reach for the most ambitious

WEIGHING IN

THE RESIGNATION of President Lawrence H. Summers became grist for a torrent of commentary worldwide, much of it highly political, even ideological. On March 12, in the *Sunday Telegraph*, Tisch professor of history Niall Ferguson—no left-wing firebrand—coolly summarized the rhetorical warfare this way: “Either a reactionary despot has been deposed by faculty freedom-fighters, or a bold reformer has been thwarted by vested interests.” (At its extreme, the latter argument extended to claims that the president was being ousted by tenured opponents intolerant of his ideas and speech.) Without documenting all the passionate extracurricular volleys, here is a sampling of faculty members’ different opinions.

“The Debacle at Harvard”

MR. SUMMERS was trying to hold Harvard to a higher standard of excellence than it was becoming used to—exemplary scholarship from all faculty, hiring only the best without the pressure to meet a quota based on sex, and a challenging curriculum that gets the best out of both students and faculty....

Mr. Summers proposed a curriculum review that would result in solid courses aimed to answer students’ needs, replacing stylish



Harvey C. Mansfield

courses designed to appeal to their whims....Mr. Summers also began a move to rein in grade inflation; he dispelled some of Harvard’s political correctness by inviting conservative speakers and looking for conservative professors to hire; he transformed the policy of affirmative action by reducing the pressure to hire more blacks and women as such; he opposed Harvard’s hostile attitude toward the U.S. military. Besides these measures of cultural politics, he sought to put or keep Harvard first in science....

Thanks to the Harvard Corporation, all this effort is suspended—who knows for how long. In forcing Mr. Summers out, the Corporation surrendered to the “diehard left” ([Frankfurter professor of law] Alan Dershowitz’s expression) which had opposed him from the start and is now celebrating in triumph and glee....I do not know, but I suppose this was done out of sympathy and fear combined, probably out of fear of not showing sympathy. The Corporation is composed of liberals and leftists, and was reportedly led in this action by the feminist Nannerl Keohane, former president of Duke University, and by liberal democrat Robert Reischauer, president of the Urban Institute.

But the Corporation was also afraid of showing too much sympathy with the left. It could not summon the manly confidence to avow that Mr. Summers was being ousted because his agenda of renewal clashed with the diversity agenda of the feminist left and its sympathizers.

Harvey C. Mansfield, Kenan professor of government, excerpted with permission from a manuscript submitted to the *Claremont Review of Books*

“Wanted: A Leader”

SUMMERS WAS NOT forced out by a radical “segment” of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. He was not forced out because bold visions threatened a complacent faculty. Most faculty in arts and

goals in creative ways.” Acknowledging that there “surely have been times when I could have done this in wiser or more respectful ways,” Summers wrote of his “sense of urgency” stemming from a conviction of Harvard’s special ability to “make a real difference in a world desperately in need of wisdom of all kinds.” He also spoke of “laying some of the foundations for what may come.” (This was an eerie echo of Faculty of Arts and Sciences [FAS] dean William C. Kirby’s resignation letter of January 27; Kirby wrote, “[W]e have set a strong foundation.” The furor following Kirby’s announcement, and the manner in which the end of his deanship was handled, widened the fissures between president and faculty, as revealed at the faculty meeting of February 7. (See “Arts and Sciences Dean to Leave Office,” March-April, page 58, and below.)

Summers cited as priorities work on the undergraduate curriculum and student life; “renewal of the faculty” when “the median age of our tenured professoriate is approaching 60”; extending financial aid; “unprecedented commitments to science and technology” and to engineering; overcoming “artificial boundaries of departments and schools,” which would require an increased willingness to “transcend parochial interests in support of broader University goals”; and the planned Allston campus. (Because Summers remains president through the end of the academic year, a review of his administration will appear in a future issue.)

In retrospect, mixing these implicit perspectives—that the College was not educating its students as well as it could; that Harvard had become, or risked becoming, complacent; and that prodding

was necessary to effect desired change—with Summers’s especially forceful personality was a sure formula for unsettling members of the community, constructively or not. The contrast with the almost self-effacing manner of his predecessor, Neil L. Rudenstine, was especially great. Summers acknowledged in his letter the tensions that did ensue, noting “strains and moments of rancor.”

DURING A 35-MINUTE telephone news conference that Tuesday afternoon, Senior Fellow James Houghton summarized the Corporation’s written statement before Summers spoke. After saying, “This is a day of mixed emotions for me,” the president summarized his accomplishments. He acknowledged that he felt “very much regret for the rifts and cleavages” between himself and

sciences are eager to reinvigorate undergraduate education, strengthen cutting-edge science, internationalize the university, develop the Allston campus, and encourage collaboration among the schools. Any president of Harvard at this time would have essentially the same goals.

Achieving such goals requires raw intelligence, which Summers has in abundance. But more crucial to leadership than IQ is the ability to inspire others with your vision and to help them come to see it as their vision, too. You must understand the culture of an institution even as you try to change it. *Business Week* wrote: “Summers joins the ranks of recent leaders brought in to generate change in organizations only to misfire and fail, [such as] Carly Fiorina at Hewlett-Packard.” Giving orders goes only so far. As the late Richard Neustadt, America’s premier student of the U.S. Presidency, put it: Presidential power is the power to persuade....

[Summers] came in with much political capital, but frittered it away on battles he did not need to fight. He alienated even those—from all disciplinary and ideological backgrounds—most committed to his goals and to Harvard.

Take one of Summers’ highest priorities—reforming the undergraduate curriculum. Successful curricular reform requires that hundreds of instructors change their behavior in hundreds of classrooms that cannot be policed. The hard part about curricular reform is not finding “the right answer,” because there is no single right answer. The hard part is inspiring and persuading....

Bold statements and a forceful personality are not enough. Indeed, clumsily applied, boldness and forcefulness can lead to weakness. What was most dispiriting about Summers’s final year to those who shared his values was that he relinquished the capacity to say no, even to bad ideas.... Political correctness was

not the root of the problem, and politically correct decisions could not solve it....

Above all, the power to persuade depends on the capacity to maintain trust. Colleagues need to believe that leaders will not only act honorably but speak truthfully. Once a faculty comes to believe that their president is “less than truthful” (as a former dean reportedly said of this president), the basis for leadership of any kind has vanished.

...Harvard faculty have followed strong leaders in the past, and they will follow them in the future. What Harvard needs now is a boldly reformist leader, but one who actually knows how to make reform happen.

Robert D. Putnam, Malkin professor of public policy and a past dean of the Kennedy School of Government, excerpted from an essay published in the Boston Globe on March 5

“A Continuing Agenda”

IRONICALLY, THE EVENTS of recent weeks have helped bring into focus an agenda for this faculty and the University that appears to be widely shared and well in place. What is important to recognize, as well, and what gives us cause for optimism looking ahead, is that this agenda had in fact emerged in its broad outlines from before the time Larry Summers started as president, and can surely be expected to continue to have our support. Let me offer a bit of detail.

First, on the matter of undergraduate education: the *Boston*



Robert D. Putnam

JUSTIN IDE/HARVARD NEWS OFFICE

JOHN HARVARD'S JOURNAL

END OF A PRESIDENCY

"segments" of the FAS. He had spent time reflecting on that during the past couple of weeks, Summers said, and then during the last week had reached the decision to make way for new leadership. (The decision made, he then departed on a holiday-weekend skiing vacation with his children.)

Responding to an initial question about the "complacency" he had cited, Summers said that Harvard was a "very different place" from five years ago, having "unlocked a great deal of questioning and restless energy," especially among students and, he said pointedly, younger scholars. Given the opportunity to comment on those who disagreed with him, Summers characterized them as "sincere and not politically motivated."

Nonetheless, he said, his decision to step down had been prompted by "the

extent of the rancor that had emerged" and the extent to which he personally "had become a large issue" within FAS. He had thus "very reluctantly" concluded that it was best to step down. He felt he had "worked very hard over the last year to build bridges to meet members of the faculty part way" on issues of concern and of control, but it had become clear that for a substantial segment of that faculty, the gap could not be closed.

The president said that resigning "was my decision," and that any governance issues the University may have do not concern the Corporation, which has shown "continuing commitment to an aggressive agenda of renewal." Rather, the challenge is "to make plans and make decisions that transcend the parochial interests" of individual schools—a view he said was not particularly shared in FAS. A successor

president should be equipped with "a lot of energy, a lot of patience, a lot of ability to engage with what is both an academic and a very political environment."

Was there a risk, a reporter asked, that in ceding the office, Summers would allow a "small vocal group" within a faculty to "take down" Harvard's president, threatening to make the University ungovernable? "As I assessed the situation, I very much had the concern that you referred to," Summers said, but he concluded that making way for new leadership was in Harvard's best interest, and his own.

Reflecting on the "marvelous variety" of the University's research and teaching, he said it had been "my approach and my conviction that all of that could best be harnessed, be enhanced, by seeking to do more, to do it in bolder ways that had more impact." It was to that end that he had

WEIGHING IN

Globe in an editorial today stated that Larry Summers "started a conversation about revamping the curriculum and he pushed professors to do more undergraduate teaching." This is incorrect. It would be much more accurate to say that he joined and continued an already lively conversation. It was on the watch of Neil Rudenstine as president, with Jeremy Knowles as dean and Susan Pedersen as dean for undergraduate education, that an important initiative was launched to re-energize the freshman seminar program, and put more faculty

into small classes with students.... Likewise, it was Dean Knowles in about 1997-98 who set forth a goal of expanding the size of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, initially by 10 percent from 600 to 660, in significant measure to allow greater faculty involvement in undergraduate teaching. This previous administration also conducted a review of the Core curriculum, which...in many ways prepared the ground for, and made people see need for, the current more ambitious review effort. It was also at the end of the 1990s that the committee on study abroad led by Bill

Fash [Bowditch professor of Central American and Mexican archaeology and ethnology] and Bill Kirby began to push for expanding the opportunities for students to study abroad....

Investing in the sciences was also an emerging priority in these years, as planning began for the major new buildings on the north side of Harvard Yard. And the importance of moving to

take advantage of the extraordinary opportunity to develop a new campus in Allston was certainly made clear by the end of Neil Rudenstine's presidency....

In sum, Larry Summers came to the Harvard presidency having been given the gift of an ambitious agenda already emerging in outline, given its shape by the efforts of this faculty and previous administrators. He articulated that agenda forcefully on many occasions, and has advanced it effectively in some areas. I am not particularly interested in going into detail on the ways in which his leadership was too often not effective.

It is up to us to carry forward, and I am optimistic that there is considerable and deeply rooted consensus on the major tasks before us.

From remarks at the March 7 Faculty of Arts and Sciences meeting by Andrew Gordon, Folger Fund professor of history, chair of the history department, and co-chair of the caucus of FAS chairs

"Ensuring Intellectual Diversity"

FAS IS CURRENTLY at pains to convince itself and the world that it ousted President Summers solely because of his style of governance. Yes, and Jack Abramoff was only trying to promote Native American culture. Alas for the spinners, the minutes of [the] faculty record the nature of the attacks against the president: complaints about his governance were merely the more decorous finale of a sustained and exceptionally nasty political onslaught....

My colleagues say they are now eager to get on with the business of curricular reform that they subordinated for several years to the task of expelling President Summers. The most crucial reform would require ensuring greater intellectual diversity among those who teach the students. The dearth of



Andrew Gordon

KRIS SNIBBE/HARVARD NEWS OFFICE

sought to be challenging: for many members of the community, that had “very positive results,” but for others, “it was threatening.” In retrospect, he said, he might have more successfully advanced the University’s interests by showing more reverence for its traditions. As he noted in his letter, he would have “preferred to stay longer,” to complete more of his vision for twenty-first-century Harvard.

He then left Massachusetts Hall for a rally outside with student supporters, and a photo op for the evening news broadcasts, the next morning’s newspapers, and the University website.

How, THEN, did Summers’s resignation come about, making his the briefest Harvard presidency since Cornelius Conway Felton (1860-62) died in office? (Poignantly, in the current con-

text, Samuel Eliot Morison’s *Three Centuries of Harvard* quotes Felton as confiding to a colleague that “there is no more comparison between the pleasure of being professor and president in this college than there is between heaven and hell.”) Was this vigorous president, a skilled student of power, suddenly overwhelmed by “segments” of one faculty? And why did matters come to a head at this moment?

Though many of the details and discussions remain private, the president’s own comments, referring to developments during the prior two weeks, suggest some of what unfolded.

The January 27 leak, deliberate or inadvertent, of Dean Kirby’s resignation—before he could discuss his departure with his senior staff and release the news on February 1, as he planned—and the characterization of that departure by

anonymous sources as Kirby’s firing by Summers, was obviously personally wounding to Kirby. With Summers at the World Economic Forum in Davos, Switzerland, into that weekend, while the College was still on its intersession break, the news and the manner of its dissemination struck many FAS professors as signs of deep-seated differences between the president and their faculty, and emblematic of persistent leaks, innuendoes, and management by indirection emanating from Massachusetts Hall. Far from passing with the day’s headlines, Kirby’s announced departure heightened the broader concerns.

As the new term began, both Summers and faculty members realized that the atmosphere had been altered. At the February 7 FAS faculty meeting, 300th Anniversary University Professor Laurel Thatcher Ulrich, speaking for its Faculty Council,

conservative views...affects the nature of what is being taught, as well as the intellectual mettle of those doing the teaching. Students, irrespective of their own views, are being short-changed by a faculty that does not even acknowledge, much less wish to tackle, diverse opinions.

Ruth R. Wisse, *Peretz professor of Yiddish literature and professor of comparative literature, excerpted from a letter to the Harvard Crimson, March 17*

“We, the Faculty”

I BELIEVE THAT WE, the faculty, share the view that the student experience is the hub around which the University revolves. The most rewarding, moving experience for professors is seeing students outgrow us by transforming themselves into educated, independent leaders. To all families who have sent children to Harvard: thank you for raising your remarkable children and letting us participate in their transformation.

We, the faculty, share the view that a Harvard education is great but should be greater. I was a Harvard student myself and have never met anyone whose university gave him more or better opportunities than I was given, yet I am frustrated when I think how much better educated I could be. More than anything, the problem is time: knowledge expands every year but a student’s years here do not. We must make the years seem longer by en-

suring that students never have to waste time or courses and that summer opportunities are as rich as—though different from—school-year opportunities....

The faculty share the ideal that character, knowledge, and reasoning should enable a person to advance his ideas. Because we hope students will imbibe these virtues, we want the University to embody this ideal in its own conduct and not resort to politics that ultimately divert progress.

Who are we, the faculty? We have been called the hard-core radical left, but anyone who checks my credentials will see that the description is silly as applied to me. (My favorite topics include tax reform, incentive pay, and—yes—school vouchers.) We have been told that Harvard contains a junta for maintaining a politically correct police state, but I have not met those faculty. Since I have a wide acquaintance, I doubt their existence. The faculty I know are people of integrity, whose expertise is often beyond my ken but for whose dedication to students, research, and the good of the University I will personally vouch.

Welcome, Derek Bok. Welcome, Harvard’s president-as-yet-unknown. The future is before us; we have much to do and much need of you.

Caroline M. Hoxby, *Freed professor of economics, excerpted from an essay circulated privately*



Ruth R. Wisse

JON CHASE/HARVARD NEWS OFFICE



Caroline M. Hoxby

STEPHANIE MITCHELL/HARVARD NEWS OFFICE

JOHN HARVARD'S JOURNAL

END OF A PRESIDENCY

outlined a plan, negotiated with Summers in a series of meetings, for unprecedented faculty involvement in the search for Kirby's successor. (Summers had never gone beyond convening an informal advisory group for decanal searches.) Having already dealt with the Faculty Council (FAS's elected representatives) and having apparently responded to the intense fac-

ulty concern about the situation by agreeing to this concession, the presi-

dent may have felt that a plan was in place to proceed with pending business. But the meeting headed in a sharply different direction. Fifteen speakers rose to challenge Summers's truthfulness; to object to the manner in which Kirby had been treated; to question Harvard's moral position in the wake of the federal litigation against the University and Summers's friend Andrei Shleifer, Jones professor of economics (see "HIID Dénouement," March-April, page 67); to ask whether fundraising could be conducted in the prevailing circumstances; to express

doubt that a dean could legitimately be appointed; to propose, somehow, a direct decanal appointment endorsed by the Corporation, bypassing the president; and, most ominously, to raise the specter of a second vote of no confidence in the administration. No one spoke on Summers's behalf.

The circumstances recalled the faculty meeting of February 22, 2005, when three senior faculty members suggested a mechanism for communicating professors' concerns to the Corporation, only to see the suggestion swiftly swept aside by



Derek Bok

The Interim Agenda

DEREK BOK, Harvard's president from 1971 to 1991, resumes those duties on July 1 on an interim basis until a permanent successor to Lawrence H. Summers takes office. In late March, shortly before his second visit to campus in preparation for his return to Massachusetts Hall, Bok discussed his emerging perspectives and priorities with *Harvard Magazine*.

- On possible disarray within the Faculty of Arts and Sciences (FAS) or other parts of the University:

"I haven't spent enough time in Cambridge in the last three months to answer that question with complete confidence," Bok said. But based on extended meetings earlier in March—including with FAS's Faculty Council and some of the department chairs—he said, "I strongly suspect that there is a widespread desire throughout the FAS to get back to work and put the past behind them."

- On decanal appointments and other significant vacancies:

Responding appropriately "calls for a delicate balance," Bok said. "I don't want to risk making long-term appointments that could cause a problem for the next president. On the other hand, I don't want to burden my successor with having to make more major appointments right away than a new president can comfortably handle." To strike the proper balance, he said he would make permanent appointments "where there is a very strong and obvious candidate," opting in other instances for temporary appointments but doing "enough of the preliminary spadework to ease the task of my successor." (Moving quickly to fill the most prominent vacancy, Bok in mid March solicited ideas from faculty, staff, and students concerning the FAS deanship. He noted that the Corporation had asked him to undertake this search "immediately," in the hope that a successor can be in place by July 1.)

- On revising the undergraduate curriculum:

"[FAS dean] Bill Kirby has already asked me to meet with

several of the committees involved," Bok said, and some faculty members have extended invitations, too. "So I will certainly accept those invitations and share any knowledge and ideas that I have, because the subject is not only very important to Harvard but of great personal interest." (Bok was president when the current Core curriculum was created, and his new book, *Our Underachieving Colleges*, addresses curriculum design and pedagogy.) But he proceeds with the "clear understanding that the ultimate decisions in these matters are for the faculty to make."

- On Allston:

Acknowledging that he had not yet studied the plans in depth, Bok noted, "My strong impression is that progress should continue and not be stalled merely because the University is looking for a new president. I don't think we can afford to have the process bog down."

- On his general goals:

"I hope that I can maintain the progress that is already under way to promote interdisciplinary initiatives, to improve undergraduate education and the development of science at Harvard." Bok said he aims to "allow my successor to take office with as few unnecessary problems and with as much helpful preparation as I can provide." As an interim leader, Bok said, he would not formulate major new multiyear University initiatives, noting, "I think there will be plenty to do maintaining momentum with the ones that we have." He has already asked each dean and vice president for plans for next year, indicating their goals, anticipated problems, and ways he could be most helpful, so he can begin his tenure with "a pretty good sense of what I need to do to help the University move forward."

- On the presidential search:

"At my request," Bok said, "I am not going to serve as a full member of the search committee," because of his administrative duties. "But I do hope that I will be able to consult frequently."

He added, "I have no way of knowing how long my tenure will last, but I would say that everyone seems agreed that it should be a lot shorter than last time. I will be mightily surprised if I am still in Massachusetts Hall past June of 2007."

wary colleagues. (That meeting was followed by the faculty's 218-185 March 15 vote that it lacked confidence in the administration, a rebuke that clearly surprised Summers and his supporters; see "At Odds," May-June 2005, page 55.)

As the February 7 meeting proceeded, the president—usually well-briefed and fast on his feet—again seemed taken by surprise. (He had scheduled a business trip to New York the next day, complete with an appearance at a fiftieth-reunion dinner, suggesting that he was not expecting a renewed confrontation.)

Given colleagues' evident dissatisfaction, the Faculty Council found itself unable to advance the proposed faculty-driven search committee—or any action. On February 15, it issued a statement: "On balance...we believe that a plan resembling the one put forth at the February 7 meeting, giving a strong role to the Faculty in the process, would be the most appropriate. However, a significant number of faculty have expressed doubt that any search at this time could succeed because they lack sufficient confidence that it would result in a dean who could enjoy the support of both the President and the FAS. As a result, we believe that this issue must be resolved before the search for the next FAS Dean can begin." The subtext was that nothing could, or should, happen with the president in place.

As Summers conferred with counselors, Corporation members, and others—and Corporation members undertook information-gathering efforts and conversations—deadlines for a resolution loomed. By February 13, when the preliminary agenda was set for the February 28 FAS meeting, Weary professor of German and comparative literature Judith L. Ryan had moved ahead with her proposal for a new no-confidence motion. Another proposed motion called on the Corporation to collaborate with the faculty and to inject itself more directly and forcefully in current questions of governance and management. The meeting was scheduled for Sanders Theatre, to accommodate the expected crowd. The agenda would become final on February 21, following the Monday holiday.

Summers and his backers reportedly sought support from professional-school

deans and faculties, eliciting relatively little public comment. Advisers weighed in with opinions on the aftermath if Summers lost another no-confidence motion. (In the end, absent a tally, there were only opinions: writing in the *Sunday Telegraph* on March 12, Tisch professor of history Niall Ferguson suggested that the vote "would have gone overwhelmingly against him.")

Then, on February 16, the *Boston Globe* reported that the former dean of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences (GSAS), Peter T. Ellison, Cowles professor of anthropology, attributed his decision to step down in 2005 directly to actions by Summers. In a statement dated February 14, Ellison wrote that his dealings with the president, like Dean Kirby's, unfolded in "a similar pattern, involving undermining the authority of a dean in front of others, hollow statements of support, and denials

As the new term began, both Summers and faculty members realized that the atmosphere had been altered.

that appear less than fully truthful.... This does not seem to me any longer to be a matter of style or personality, but of character.... When someone with the skill and integrity of Dean Kirby does not flourish in his post, something is seriously wrong. I would not now recommend to any colleague that they consider serving as dean under this President."

By then, Summers or the Corporation—or both—had decided that a change must take place. The Corporation was not likely to welcome a faculty motion advising on its conduct. Given his self-described "searing" experience a year earlier, Summers was unlikely to relish a protracted, even more heated extension of the February 7 exchanges at the next faculty meeting. Derek Bok, who on February 13 had announced publicly his intention to step down as chair of Common Cause's national governing board, received a formal request about the succession from Corporation members James Houghton and Nannerl Keohane early in the Presidents' Day weekend.

Whenever the terms of Summers's separation were negotiated, the conferral of a

University Professorship provided a graceful interim position for what was evidently an outcome arrived at under time pressure. (Ironically, the first issue publicly dividing some FAS members and Summers was his interaction with Fletcher University Professor Cornel West, who subsequently left Harvard for Princeton.)

WAS THE PREMATURE END of this administration caused by a faction of one faculty exercising undue power, or generating unwarranted resistance to needed change?

It would be presumptuous to try to aggregate the opinions of hundreds of individual faculty members, or to guess at Corporation members' private thoughts, and it is far too soon to attempt a history. But it seems clear that these events were about far more than a dean's departure, or

differing opinions (academic or political) held by a few professors opposed to the president. Similarly, the harsh confrontations in early 2005 were sparked by sharply divergent views about Summers's controversial remarks on the role of women in science and engineering—but that was hardly the sole factor, nor perhaps even the most important.

Then, as reported (see "At Odds," May-June 2005, page 55), faculty members from a variety of disciplines spoke about their sense that the president, in pursuing change, had claimed "sole agency" to do so, soliciting and then ignoring informed counsel, resorting to "bullying and personal aspersions," humiliating faculty members, and even silencing their opinions. All this suggested classic management problems, albeit in a university context (see "The Way Forward," page 67). Summers at the time responded along those lines: acknowledging the criticisms and promising to adapt his style, to rethink the "roles of the central administration and deans" on curriculum ("very much the responsibility of the faculty"), to consult on matters like Allston plan-

JOHN HARVARD'S JOURNAL

END OF A PRESIDENCY

ning that are “inherently University-wide in their significance,” and to create “more transparent” academic planning centrally and in the schools. Over time, he hoped, those steps would yield “both continued momentum and a necessary rebuilding of trust.” He began the academic year with a new chief of staff, his third, and a new personal press spokesman. He tempered his visible involvement in faculty policy-making.

But in other respects, the decisions he had made earlier were not revisited, and remained flashpoints for diverse members of the University community who were involved in thinking about how to shape the institution's future.

To cite one high-profile example, work on Allston proceeded on its former course, with the appointment in January of a chief operating officer and a separate organization reporting directly to Summers (see “Brevia,” page 77). The announcement on February 17 of a site and architect for a first building complex, comprising some 500,000 square feet of laboratory space, made tangible Summers's vision of a third locus for scientific research.

Those decisions put Allston development on a fast track—but without any evident process for the academic and administrative management of the research

to be done there, or for coordinating that work with the rest of the University. Meanwhile, FAS is building extremely expensive and as yet unfilled labs (see “Fraught Finances,” March-April, page 61), and Harvard Medical School has unused space (now leased out) in its New Research Building. Will these facilities end up competing with the new Allston space? Although the central administration had conducted a planning process for interdisciplinary research that might locate in Allston (see “Scientific Ambitions,” July-August 2005, page 58), a University-wide review of the future of science at Harvard—embracing FAS and the

now yielding more than \$100 million annually—it is better able to finance such new ventures than some of the schools themselves. That poses important questions for the faculties whose professors will work in any new location—questions ranging from budgeting and teaching responsibilities to possibly recasting departmental and school boundaries and authorities.

Though such issues may seem internal, they reach deep into the disciplinary organization of the modern research university. In this sense, one person's perception of “complacency” or “resistance” is another's vision of how academic talent has been developed, contact with students

Such issues may seem internal, but they reach deep into the disciplinary organization of the modern research university.

medical and public-health schools, and examining appointments, academic administration, and more—began only this year, and will not even report until this summer.

Because the central administration has been collecting since the beginning of the decade a “strategic infrastructure fund” assessed on all the schools' endowments—

encouraged, and new knowledge evolved. Such differences can be resolved, but not with a snap of the fingers.

Similar questions arose earlier in Summers's tenure as the administration floated ideas such as moving *all* science, or *all life* science, to Allston (at the risk of segregating the liberal arts and sciences from one another, or the life scientists

Precedent-Setting Presidential Search

THE SEARCH for a successor to President Lawrence H. Summers will involve expanded outreach to the Harvard community. In a March 30 news release, the University announced that, consistent with past practice, the Corporation had formed a search committee comprising its six members other than the president, plus three Overseers. But beyond encouraging faculty, students, staff, and alumni to weigh in through letters and private conversations, the committee will conduct its business in two new ways.

- Meetings, there and here. The committee “plans to consult with alumni in a series of meetings, at various locations beyond Cambridge and Boston as well as locally,” to assure that it hears a variety of perspectives. (Alumni groups already scheduled to meet locally will also be able to devote time to discussing the search, and the Board of Overseers will play a “key consultative role” directly and as a further channel through which alumni can communicate.)

- Advisory bodies. The Corporation will appoint two advisory groups—of faculty and of students—“from a broad cross-section of the University.” Their chairs, and the presi-

dent of the Harvard Alumni Association, will “sit with the search committee from time to time,” and representatives of the search committee will “periodically attend” meetings of the advisory groups. These efforts are intended to convey ideas about Harvard's opportunities and challenges to the search committee, and to help frame the questions the committee should have in mind as it evaluates nominees.

These measures create a mechanism for broader input in the search without making alumni, faculty, and students formal participants in the process; they also recognize the increasingly broad geographic scope of the Harvard community.

The Overseer members of the search committee are Frances D. Fergusson, Ph.D. '73, president of Vassar College; Susan L. Graham '64, Chen distinguished professor in electrical engineering and computer science, University of California, Berkeley; and William F. Lee '72, co-managing partner of Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr, a law firm. Comments on the search can be sent in confidence to psearch@harvard.edu or by mail to Harvard University Presidential Search Committee, Loeb House, 17 Quincy Street, Cambridge 02138.

from collaborating chemists and physicists); delaying or canceling FAS science projects that were well advanced toward construction (perhaps stalling faculty recruitment in critical fields); building new Houses to expand the College student body (even as FAS sought to achieve a more favorable faculty-student ratio); or scaling back investments in the humanities, art museums, and other fields deemed of lesser priority—a barrage of big-picture suggestions that made professors wary.

Such questions arise now as freestanding scientific institutes are contemplated. And they continue elsewhere, as the Harvard School of Public Health pursues its mission alongside the administration's robust Harvard Initiative for Global Health, and the Graduate School of Education eyes a contemplated presidential initiative on public schooling. (Both faculties have had differences with Summers.)

Those two schools, and others whose graduates pursue public service, also looked forward urgently to the fruits of a Harvard-wide capital campaign. Summers effected important measures to centralize fundraising, in part on the promise to increase donors' gifts beyond their "home" schools in support of the less-well-endowed faculties. Nor is the financial pressure confined to those schools: as it has built facilities and ramped up new fields like systems biology, the medical school has had to tighten its belt, and as noted above even FAS, with its \$11.7-billion endowment, is laboring under significant financial strain. Having expanded their faculties, facilities, and aid commitments, many parts of Harvard were already forced to rethink their budgets as plans for a fund drive were delayed last year. That concern factored into the atmosphere generally (and has only been heightened by the realization that the transition to a new presidency pushes a capital campaign far later into the decade).

WHERE DOES HARVARD head now? The current anxieties extend throughout much of the University, and form part of the very large agenda for Derek Bok, the interim president, who must reach out to reassure faculty, students, and alumni worldwide. The transition begins, moreover, with significant staff vacancies. In

The Way Forward

WHAT CAN HARVARD LEARN from the administration of Lawrence H. Summers—cut short of its expected duration, and short of achieving many of its ambitious goals? In selecting Summers to be the University's twenty-seventh president, the Corporation opted for a figure who promised to promote change, to bring force and energy to Massachusetts Hall, and to use his office to speak out on issues of institutional and public interest. Summers did all that, but did it almost exclusively as a solo act. Therein lies the most important lesson for Harvard's governing authorities to consider as they begin the search for the University's next leader.

The way forward begins with sound self-assessment. Some supporters of President Summers attribute his resignation to political opposition (see "Weighing In," page 60). There were indeed differences of opinion about political and social issues bearing on the University. But others knowledgeable in the field saw the unfolding story in other terms. Combining Harvard perspective with presidential experience at Stanford, Donald Kennedy '52, Ph.D. '56, wrote about these themes in the March 10 issue of *Science* (he is editor-in-chief). The academy, he noted, is horizontal: "There is little hierarchy in the organization, and the professoriate consists of smart, independent-minded people who don't always do what they're told. Governments are different, and Summers may have been unprepared for a venue in which failure to consult is costly the first time and unforgivable when repeated. I was happy with his appointment and thought his challenge to Harvard was timely. It failed not because of political differences or constituency mischief, though his image and its contrast with Harvard's has tempted many observers to misallocate blame. The real story here is a classic tragedy: a brilliant thinker and scholar, capable of great leadership, brought low by flaws of personal style." More succinctly, Robert H. Atwell, president emeritus of the American Council on Education, told the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, "I don't just blame a recalcitrant faculty. In a place like Harvard, you can't just announce your vision—you've got to sell it. He did this to himself."

Some University officials who worked closely with the president on a range of functions and programs—and who in public and private enthusiastically endorsed his vision for growth in sciences, for Allston campus expansion, for curricular change, and for greater international presence—share this view. The president, they reluctantly conclude, failed as a manager: his ideas and energies remained personal; the hard work of reaching out to people and engaging them in action simply did not happen; colleagues were treated in ways that proved unproductive, and presented with decisions in which they had no stake.

As a result, those decisions were not always for the best, or did not win needed support from a large, complex organization. Although a building site and an initial project have been designated for Allston, other plans remain vague and unsettled. The Faculty of Arts and Sciences began adopting changes in College course requirements this spring, but there is little agreement on what general-education needs today's undergraduates have, or on how those needs should be met. Although individual schools have identified urgent fundraising priorities, preparations for a University-wide capital campaign have repeatedly been pushed back, and will probably need to be relaunched by a new president. Faculty recruitment, development, and diversity may ultimately be advanced by the past two years' controversies, but no one would have deliberately charted such a course to get there.

These issues join the agenda for the future. Harvard's challenges can be met and its opportunities realized by sound management and leadership that is inclusive and consultative. It is heartening that the Corporation's recently announced search process for the new president—soliciting advice and help from faculty members and alumni expert in the field—embodies these values.

JOHN HARVARD'S JOURNAL END OF A PRESIDENCY

his February news conference, Summers said he hoped to complete searches for new deans for Harvard Business School and the education school. The FAS dean-ship, he indicated, would land on the interim president's to-do list (Bok has taken it up). FAS's search for a successor

the central administration and FAS dean's staffs may occur. Harvard Management Company's new leadership, on whose investment results every school heavily depends, is just settling in (see "El-Erian for the Endowment," January-February, page 54).

The current anxieties extend throughout much of the University, and form part of the very large agenda for Derek Bok.

dean of engineering and applied sciences, a key growth area, may not be easily concluded in the current unsettled circumstances. The vice president for finance, Harvard's chief financial officer, departed at the end of March. Further turnover in

After a breathtaking and bruising five years, the University appears stimulated by visions for the Harvard of the twenty-first century—and eager for a leader who can enlist more members of the community in refining those visions and making

them a reality. In the meantime, a battle-weary community seems to want an uneventful conclusion to the decanal and presidential terms of William Kirby and Lawrence Summers.

Thereafter, Harvard's hopes are invested in the interim return of Derek Bok. He brings to the task a successful past presidency, strong connections to University constituencies, and continuing engagement with issues in contemporary higher education. In the February 21 announcement of his new service, Bok said simply, "I will do my best to carry out the Corporation's request. There is no institution I care about more deeply, and I will make every effort to work with colleagues to further the University's agenda during this transitional period."

Bolstering Business

THE FIRST Harvard Business School (HBS) capital campaign, launched publicly in the fall of 2002, ended on December 31, having raised at least 20 percent more than its half-billion-dollar goal. Proceeds are "over \$600 million," said Robinson professor of business administration Jay O. Light, the school's acting dean.

Consistent with a high priority enunciated at the outset of the fund drive (see "Capitalism Campaign," November-December 2002, page 55), the school raised \$112 million for 150-plus new fellowships. Light called that accomplishment "among the really important things we've done." The rising cost of business education has made it more difficult for students to attend, he said. Moreover, the traditional dependence on debt financing "overly constrains what people can do" upon graduation. Fellowships make it much easier to enroll international students—one-third of the HBS population. But Light indicated that such aid was also "particularly important for students who are interested in social enterprise," who launch immediately into entrepreneurial ventures, or who pursue a variety of innovative careers with limited initial remuneration. The new funds also make it possible to offer experimen-

tal fellowships to students at the end of their schooling while they explore, for example, a public-service enterprise in Latin America.

In terms of intellectual capital, HBS endowed its doctoral program—the source of future faculty—which had previously been funded through unrestricted resources. Light said the endowed doctoral fellowships and extra resources for faculty involvement will enhance the program. A new teaching and learning center

will strengthen faculty members' skills in the school's distinctive case-teaching method, which is increasingly integrated with interactive multimedia tools and systems. Sixty-five new research funds underwrite faculty scholarship, and additional professorships were endowed.

Substantial sums supported extensive new construction (Spangler Center, the M.B.A.-program and student-campus center; Hawes Hall, a classroom building) and renovation (the overhaul and expansion of Baker Library; a "commons" created there serves as the venue for collaborative research seminars, a key goal of HBS's faculty-development plan, Light said). The new Hawes classrooms and a separate program of retrofitting Aldrich Hall ("technological repurposing," he said) equipped each class with multiple screens and projectors, allowing simultaneous, integrated video conferencing, video projection, and use of spreadsheets or other tools for vivid multimedia case presentations—another reason for the faculty to use the teaching center.

The campaign also provided a permanent foundation for HBS's increasingly global research and case-writing, which is now conducted through a half-dozen field offices from Buenos Aires to Hong Kong. The newest outpost, in Mumbai, was formally opened

Campaign Contributions

Proceeds of the HBS fund drive

