



STEPHANIE MITCHELL/HARVARD PUBLIC AFFAIRS AND COMMUNICATIONS

academic freedom and free inquiry while being sensitive to the University's administrative and operational needs." Accordingly, it said any search of electronic records should be governed by principles codified in these recommendations:

- Limited justifications for access: "Access to electronic information should be permitted only for a legitimate and important University purpose, as informed by the illustrative list of the limited purposes that have historically justified such access."

- High-level, accountable authorization: "In general, access to electronic information for reasons other than systems maintenance and protection should be undertaken by information-technology personnel only when specifically authorized by the head of the school or component of the University making the request, such as a dean of a faculty."

- Notice to users: "There should be a strong presumption that users should receive timely notice in any case in which access to their electronic information has been authorized."

- Minimization: "Access to electronic information, if authorized, should be undertaken in a narrow manner and pursuant to minimization rules and protocols that information-technology components have codified in advance."

- Record-keeping: "Written records of decisions to access electronic information should be prepared in a manner that permits subsequent review of such decisions."

- Independent oversight: "Decisions to authorize access to electronic information should be subject to periodic review by

an oversight committee that includes faculty in order to ensure an independent set of 'eyes' also lends its perspective on any such decisions and on possible policy or process changes."

In outlining the kinds of legitimate access the University has exercised in the past five years, the report cites as one example "business continuity": the need, perhaps, to access important "financial information on the computer account of an individual who is not available." Academic-misconduct investigations, the report states, are another legitimate reason for accessing electronic communications, as are legal processes external to the University (such as a court-issued subpoena).

The report notes that there has been a shift in the capacity of institutions to access individuals' information as more people communicate and store data electronically. "In light of this reality," it states, "'privacy' does not exist in precisely the same way it once did. In the past, writing, conversing, and communicating did not inevitably and routinely entail that

the contents of those communications or even related data might be available to anyone beyond intended recipients. Now it does. Thus, today, those who use University systems and devices often communicate in writing in a way that is extremely convenient but that unavoidably gives the University the potential capacity to access that information."

This "shift in practice," the task force declares, "does not mean access should always be permissible. In determining the appropriate rules for permitting access to this information, we must look beyond the fact that the University owns, provides, and/or administers the information systems and devices. Rather, the increased capacity for access heightens the need for policies and protocols that structure and constrain decisions about when and how such access may occur."

The policies, or some modified version, are likely to be formally adopted following a public comment period. For a complete report, see <http://www.harvardmagazine.com/policy-14>.

Undergraduate Aid and Campaign Milestones

KENNETH C. GRIFFIN '89, founder and chief executive officer of the Citadel LLC, a multi-billion-dollar, Chicago-based hedge-fund and financial-services enterprise, has given Harvard \$150 million, principally for undergraduate financial aid, the University announced in February. That large gift, and others, helped The Harvard Campaign and its Faculty of Arts and Sciences (FAS) component achieve significant progress toward their overall goals in the months since their public launch announcements last autumn (see below).

In making his gift, the largest in College history, Griffin called it

extremely important that students of all backgrounds have the opportunity to challenge themselves, learn to solve complex problems, and ultimately better our world. My goal with this gift is to help ensure that Harvard's need-blind admission policy continues, and that our nation's best and brightest have continued access to this outstanding institution.

The gift:

- establishes 200 Griffin Scholarships (such financial-aid endowment scholarships are now available for donations of \$250,000 each; that minimum is to rise to \$500,000 in the fiscal year beginning July 1); and

- provides matching funds through the new Griffin Leadership Challenge Fund for Financial Aid for 600 new scholarships to encourage other donors to make commitments to the College's financial-aid program.

Depending on the matching formula and timing of gifts, the Griffin Scholarships, other donors' gifts (when received), and the matching funds provided by Griffin could collectively generate a significant portion of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences' (FAS) \$600-million capital-campaign goal for undergraduate aid. (The only equivalently large FAS priority is its \$600-million faculty-related target for endowed chairs, graduate-student fellowships, research support, and related purposes.) In acknowledgment, the College financial-aid office will be renamed the Griffin Financial Aid Office, led by the Griffin director of financial aid.

Griffin's gift also includes \$10 million to establish the Griffin professorship of business administration at Harvard Business School (from which his wife, Anne Dias Griffin, who runs a separate hedge fund, earned her M.B.A. in 1997).

FAS dean Michael D. Smith declared himself "absolutely bowled over by the generosity of Ken Griffin and his leadership to provide a truly transformational gift" for the top College priority in the capital campaign. During an interview last autumn, before the campaign launch, Smith said the aid budget had "never been put on the table" in the aftermath of the 2008-2009 financial



Kenneth C. Griffin

crisis—even as the faculty's assets decreased by \$5 billion and family need rose during the ensuing recession. But, as he said in an interview concerning Griffin's gift, he has worried continuously about "truly making our program sustainable," even at its current scale. In the statement announcing the gift, Smith declared that Griffin's philanthropic leadership "has set financial aid...on a lasting foundation," and his gift "will impact the lives of students and their families, now and for generations to come." For a complete report on the gift and its implications for FAS, see <http://www.harvardmagazine.com/aid-14>.

In other campaign-related news, the University disclosed that The Harvard Campaign has secured gifts and pledges of \$900 million since last September, when it was launched with \$2.8 billion in hand; that brings the proceeds to 57 percent of the \$6.5-billion goal. And in a March 31 message to his faculty colleagues, Dean Michael D. Smith revealed that the \$2.5-billion FAS campaign, unveiled in late October with \$1.0 billion of gifts and pledges secured, had by the end of February raised an additional \$300 million of commitments, bringing the fundraising drive to 52 percent of its target; he highlighted progress on priorities including funding faculty positions and scholarly initiatives, House renewal and other aspects of student life, and of course undergraduate financial aid. For a detailed report, see <http://www.harvardmag.com/campaign-14>. Harvard Divinity School launched its campaign as this issue went to press; for additional information, visit <http://harvardmagazine.com/topic/capital-campaign>.

THE UNDERGRADUATE

Word-upmanship

by NOAH PISNER '14

Lexiphane, *n.* [lək'ʃɪfən] – Last week, I overheard one editor at the *Crimson* accuse another of being a lexiphane. The accused, quick to his wit, replied that to indict someone for lexiphanicism is the surest way to confirm one's hypocrisy. Meanwhile, I surreptitiously tapped the OED app on my iPhone to find out what all of this meant. *Lexiphane*: someone who fashions ostentatious exhibition of an eclectic vernacular via uttered or indited discernments declaimed *semper sans* prudent jocosity, fatuous futility, sagacious garrulity, and sesquipedalian rodomontade to ingratiate some semblance of highfalutincy that resonates more as pleonastic philosophunculum than connatural erudition. *Lexiphane*, I read: "someone who shows off by using big words."

But I already had words to describe this kind of person: *prolix/digressive/loquacious/*

circuitous/periphrastic/circumlocutory. Actually, *b.s.er* is probably the best synonym—it's a moniker just about any Harvard student will admit to affiliate with. Masses of Latinate and French words sift upon our facts when we speak, like parmesan on a pizza slice, obfuscating the topic, draping the details. Embedded in the language of the classroom are all the anxieties and social pressure we place upon ourselves as students. We tell ourselves that if we sound smarter, schmooze smarter, then we *are* smarter. When we do not know what to say in section, on an exam, in a paper, but feel compelled to say something anyway, we turn instinctively to long words and exhausted idioms. The problem, I'd speculate, is endemic to academia, to our professors whose job, an alien observer must think, is simply to invent new words for things we've

already named. Indeed, to invent a phrase or coin some disciplinic terminology (I'm coining "disciplinic," by the way) is almost as much a rite of passage for scholars as is tenure. Very little art or effort is involved in this lexical invention, which, more often than not, simply entails the suffixation of an *-ism*, *-ic*, *-ent*, *-ium*, or *-ation*, or a combination thereof, to an old word (e.g., *boredismization*).

There's nothing inherently wrong with a lengthy or redundant word. No, the issue isn't the word, but rather it's how it's used. Once, in a seminar on Cold War art, a seemingly sheepish-looking student piped up about a recently screened film: "Though the demidocumentary's utilization of unruly display—parenthetical: cannons, fireworks, et cetera—is viscerally sensational, it fails, subjectively speaking, to arouse the amygdala." It was an Oscar-worthy performance, like watching Leo DiCaprio freeze to death in a kiddie pool. Of course, what he meant was that he thought the pyrotechnics were cool but didn't really add much to the drama.

Harvard is a place where excess language fills the void of ignorance. Walk into just about any section meeting and I guarantee you'll hear at least one of the following: *ne plus ultra*, *problematize*, *preternatural*, *diaspora*, *hagiography*, *antipodal*. We all do it (myself in-