

willing to step up and help the institution when it needed them.”

In 1971, Bok recalled, the dominant images of Harvard were of students occupying University Hall, faculty members who refused to talk to one another, and alumni disengaged from the institution. During the first two-thirds of his administration, the stock market was flat and inflation regularly exceeded investment returns on the endowment.

But today, he said, “The focus is really on all the things we *can* do in the future and making good choices to capitalize on these opportunities as best we can.” Among the intellectual possibilities, he cited science and international activities—and the strengths of Harvard’s faculty and administrators to realize them. Bok said he was “very pleasantly surprised” by the quality of candidates for tenured appointments, and pleased by “some real success in encouraging the development and the promotion of younger people” without compromising standards. Though the costs of building and operations are markedly higher, the University’s financial position is healthier still.

His self-effacing style and dry humor may have helped members of the Harvard community focus on their individual and collective roles in making the most of those assets. In January, the general-education and teaching task forces issued their reports, the Allston plan was released, and HUSEC was established and funded. All reflected work Bok had guided or encouraged, but none was particularly publicized in his name. As he presided at FAS faculty meetings, Bok helped defuse tensions in a way that advanced discussion. In March, when a professor inquired about foreign-language requirements, Jeremy Knowles suggested the matter would be studied by his successor, prompting Bok to comment, “Expertly dodged, I think,” and eliciting laughter. In May, having navigated most of the academic year with no unexpected business having arisen during the “question period” docketed for each meeting, he observed, “I have an unbroken record of being unquestioned by the faculty this year, which I will cherish.”

While Bok prepared for the unusual circumstance of conferring an honorary degree on his successor-plus-one and immediate predecessor, in (continued on page 64)

HARVARD PORTRAIT



Annette Lemieux

Though she’s been called a conceptual artist, “That’s just for lack of a better term,” says Annette Lemieux, professor of the practice of studio arts in the department of visual and environmental studies. Maybe “mixed-media artist” comes closer; think Robert Rauschenberg. Lemieux’s pieces range from *Two Vistas*, a 17-by-67-foot mural of clouds, to *Hey Joe*, eight wooden charger rifles grouped in a vertical bouquet with pink carnations stuck in their barrels. Her works tend to be life-sized, like *The Great Outdoors* (1989), an old black-and-white postcard enlarged into a background vista for an actual Adirondack chair, table, and lamp. “I want to break down the barrier between the viewer and the work, and take you to the actual space and time of the piece,” she explains. “I’m not interested in illusions.” Her family of origin is both Roman Catholic and military; early on, she used icons like crosses and flags “to create a dialogue with the audience.” Trained as a painter at Hartford Arts School (B.A., 1980), she worked in New York for a decade, taught at Brown, then came to Harvard in 1996. Husband Erik manages business authors, and Lemieux gardens at their Brookline home. After 9/11, she temporarily turned away from political pieces like *Stampede*, a riff on Nazi goose-stepping, to “comfort art,” including a 64-inch pillow. (“I am 64 inches,” she explains.) Her studio courses include “Building Thought” and “Post Brush,” whose students, unexpectedly, moved beyond works on paper to mixed media. “You can do anything possible, as long as it’s good,” Lemieux says. “You can’t stop an idea.”