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The Constantine Panunzio Distinguished Emeriti Awards

CUCEA extends sincere congratulations to the 2013 Constantine Panunzio Distinguished Emeriti Awardees, Professor Emeritus Michael Nauenberg (UCSC) and Professor Emeritus Frederick Burwick (UCLA). As the 2013 winners they are also the 31st and 32nd awardees since the first award was made in 1983. The newsletter is proud to feature articles by Professor Nauenberg and Professor Burwick relevant to the achievements that the awards give recognition. Nauenberg is recognized for his influential work on the history of science, and Burwick for his extensive work in the field of romantic drama. A postscript to their articles, expressing a few words about the origin, structure and administration of the Panunzio award, is appended.

My Early Work in the History of Physics

By Michael Nauenberg, Research Professor, Physics, UCSC

Introduction

Kepler remarked that “the roads by which men arrive at their insights seem to me almost as worthy of wonder as these matters in themselves”, and some two centuries later Laplace made a similar comment regarding the discoveries of Isaac Newton. As a physicist, I became intrigued by how Newton arrived at the now well known three laws of motion that enabled him to derive a correct theory of planetary motion, and how he initiated the mathematical methods to solve the problems of astrophysics that kept mathematicians busy for the next two centuries. While there are probably more books and articles on this subject than on any other on the history of physics, I found that important details were described unsatisfactorily. Fortunately, most of Newton’s original manuscripts and correspondence on this subject have been preserved, allowing me to study them and reach my own conclusions. I will briefly describe some of my findings to illustrate how a scientist, without prior training in history, can contribute to its development in his own field. Before I became an emeritus faculty at UCSC, my research and teaching was in theoretical physics. At the end, I will add some remarks on why I think history of science is important in teaching and research.

A step on Newton’s road to the Principia

While reading Newton’s correspondence, I found that a small diagram that appeared in a corner of a letter that he had written to Robert Hooke in November 1679 (Fig.1) contained important clues that had been overlooked by Newtonian scholars. The date of this letter is important because it was written five years before Newton sent Edmund Halley a draft, de Motu, that he expanded into his magisterial Principia three years later. After obtaining a photocopy of this
diagram from the British Museum, I found that most publications had reproduced it incorrectly. In particular, certain asymmetries in Newton’s free hand drawing gave important clues on how he constructed it. These asymmetries revealed that Newton’s understanding of the motion of a body under the action of a central attractive force was much more developed at that time than had been previously thought, but that he had not yet understood a very important aspect of this motion. The text associated with this diagram reveals that
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**Figure 1** Newton had correctly deduced that under general central attractive forces and arbitrary initial conditions, the motion consisted of similar curves around the center of force, returning periodically to maximum and minimum distances from the center. Newton had also deduced that under the action of a special radial dependence of the force, the orbit was closed, a result of great interest because it corresponded, to a very good approximation, to planetary orbits. But he did not reveal this radial dependence to Hooke, and only later, when Halley visited him in Cambridge in the fall of 1684, did he remark that he had a mathematical proof that such a force varied inversely as the square of the distance from the center of force. But an important aspect of central force motion appears to have been missing from Newton’s construction. I have inferred that this construction is based on a geometrical method developed independently by Christiaan Huygens that obscured, however, the relevance of the conservation of angular momentum for central forces, a property first discovered empirically for planetary motion by Kepler. In later correspondence with Halley, Newton admitted having discovered the mathematical basis for this law, prompted by his correspondence with Hooke. This was a crucial discovery, because it allowed Newton to represent the passage of time in purely geometrical form. Without it, writing the *Principia* would not have been possible. Later, the theorem associated with this law became the cornerstone of the *Principia*, appearing as Proposition 1 in Book 1.

**Hooke’s contributions**

Already in 1674 Hooke had published a short tract proposing that planetary motion around the sun could be compounded by an inertial motion along the tangent of the orbit, and an acceleration towards the center of force located at the Sun. But Hooke lacked the ability to express his physical insight in mathematical form, and Newton accomplished this feat only after his correspondence with Hooke. I found further evidence of Hooke’s physical insight in a diagram contained among his manuscripts in the archives of the Wren Library in Trinity College, Cambridge. In this diagram Hooke had drawn the orbit of a body in a central field of force that depended linearly on the distance from the center of force. In contrast with Newton’s hand-drawn diagram, Hooke’s was made carefully and to scale with a straight edge and compass (Fig.2). It is dated September 1685, a year after Newton’s *De Motu* had arrived at the Royal Society, and we can be certain that Hooke had access to it because, in a letter after Newton’s manuscript had been registered at the Royal Society, Flamsteed complained to him that “I shall not get a sight of them till our common friend Mr. Hooke and the rest of the town have been first satisfied”. I have shown that Hooke’s diagram is based on his own physical principles about planetary motion, but its mathematical implementation was due solely to Newton, as he first described it in *De Motu*. Until recently, however, Hooke was just a footnote in most histories of physics (where he is known only for his elasticity law). But in 2003 a meeting was organized to celebrate his many accomplishments, and today there are over half a dozen books on his life and works, including one that named him, justly, the Leonardo of England.

**Disputations with Newtonian scholars**

After I wrote an account of my findings, and circulated them for comments to a few prominent Newtonian scholars, I was pleasantly surprised that it was generally well received. But I also received a very long critical response from D. T. Whiteside of Cambridge University, who claimed that much of
what I had written was essentially wrong. As the editor of Newton’s mathematical papers, published in eight thick volumes with his extensive commentaries, Whiteside has been acknowledged as the great expert and arbiter on this subject. I found it encouraging, however, that he had taken the trouble to criticize my work in such detail, perhaps because it challenged some of his own analysis and long-held beliefs. From our subsequent correspondence, I learned a great deal more about Newton’s early work, but I found that Whiteside, who had learned mathematics on his own, exhibited the same problems that most Newtonian historians have had when dealing with the subtleties of Newton’s mathematics, which combines Euclidean geometry with the infinitesimal calculus that he helped to develop. These problems were acknowledged by another well-known Newtonian scholar, I. B. Cohen from Harvard University, with whom I also had many exchanges. He told me that he had gone for help to some of his most prestigious colleagues in the Physics department, but they were unable to respond to his queries. Later on, he asked me to review, for physical and mathematical clarity, selected parts of his manuscript of a translation and guide to Newton’s Principia. It has now appeared, 273 years after the familiar translation by Andrew Motte.

Teaching vs. preaching

The laws of physics are often taught without giving any inkling on how they were discovered – like Moses’ tablets handed down from above, but now replaced by Newton’s laws or other laws enunciated by the great physics pioneers. This approach (I call it preaching) known in pure mathematics as the axiomatic method, is quite convenient in order to move rapidly through a lot of material that must be covered (the standard excuse) during the allocated time for a course. In connection with these lectures, the students perform experiments conveniently set up to exemplify and verify the postulated theories. Admittedly, this method is efficient, but it may leave at least some of the brighter students mystified. Why, for example, should \( F = ma \) or \( E = mc^2 \), to mention two proverbial examples in my field? Even a small amount of historical background can elucidate and answer such questions. More importantly, such an axiomatic approach does not offer any guidance to students who want to become future research scientists searching for new laws. The history of physics also gives some perspective to beliefs that motivate or mislead physicists in their research.

Today, for example, many physicists talk about collapsed wave functions in quantum mechanics, or multi-universes in cosmology, and other far-out speculations that do not have any observable effects, without being aware that they sound like theologians in the Middle Ages. Finally, in the Humanities it is recognized that a good education includes reading some of the Great Books, but in Physics it is not required to read even excerpts from Newton’s Principia, although it is one of the greatest scientific masterpieces of all time. Chandrasekhar, who was one of the great astrophysicists of the 20th century, revealed that he began reading this book only very late in his life, and when he did, he had an “epiphany, finding so many beautiful results.” Unfortunately, he expressed great disdain for the work of Newtonian historians, who he claimed not to have read and, as a result, his own work on the subject is riddled with errors. This example also illustrates that in the history of science, correct insights are more likely to emerge when scientists and historians collaborate.

Acknowledgment

I would like to take this opportunity to thank my fellow emeritus, the eminent astrophysicist John Faulkner, for inspiring my interest in Robert Hooke, and for many enlightening discussions about the history of physics during the past 40 years.

Reflections and Appreciation

By Frederick Burwick,
Research Professor,
Humanities, UCLA

When informed that I was a recipient of the 2013 Constantine Panunzio Distinguished Emeritus Award, I had two responses, both disparate and inseparable. The first was immense pride in the high honor being bestowed, a response that was conflicted by an associated sense of humility at joining other recipients whose achievements and contributions were widely respected, also knowing that many UC colleagues, not yet nominated for the award, were equally deserving. My second response was gratitude
to Constantine Panunzio for his vision in establishing an award to recognize the achievement of UC emeriti. That response was accompanied by a wish that there should be many more such awards. In spite of the continuing expansion in the community of emeriti, there are few grants, fellowships, or awards specifically designated for their active scholarly pursuits. Fortunately for those of us in the UC system, our individual campus offers representation and advocacy through our Emeriti Association, and our Academic Senate continues to make travel and research grants available to emeriti. These blessings are not available at many other institutions.

My nomination apparently succeeded because of extensive work completed since my retirement in 2004. Thus far I have constructed my scholarly reputation with the publication of 30 books and 136 essays. Five of the nine books that I published in the last nine years are in the field of early nineteenth-century drama, as are thirty-five of the fifty research articles published in the same period. In Romantic Drama: Acting and Reacting (Cambridge University Press, 2009), I offered a performance-based interpretation of the plays of the period by drawing from the diaries and letters of actors and managers, contemporary reviews, and eye-witness accounts. In Playing to the Crowd: London Popular Theatre, 1780-1830 (Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), I explored how the management, players, and house playwrights of some of the London theatres successfully catered to their local audiences, especially crucial in neighborhoods that had become markedly ghettoized by rapid urban expansion. As a recipient of the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation Emeritus Fellowship, 2011-2012, I completed another book, tentatively entitled Working-Class Drama, 1798-1838, which traces the support for the working-class offered by many theatres during the period (from the Combination Acts to the advent of the Chartist Movement). At a time when workers were prohibited to meet and attempt to form trade unions, some theatres offered plays exposing the wide-spread exploitation and also provided a safe haven for workers to gather without being arrested or killed in a public assembly, such as occurred at St Peter's Field, Manchester, in August 1819.

Through the financial generosity of the Panunzio Distinguished Emeritus Award, I have an opportunity to expand my current research to examine the literary and theatrical representation of pirates. The money from my Panunzio Award was deposited in my research account in the UCLA English Department to support my visits to the libraries at key sites along the British coast. To be co-authored with Manushag Powell (UCLA Ph.D. 2006; now at Purdue University), British Pirates in Print and Performance will trace the relationship between actual historical pirates and their counterparts in fiction and on stage during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries when Britain "ruled the seas" as a maritime nation. During the years of the American and French Revolution many of the lower and middle classes were inclined to cheer pirates, highway men, and other rebels against authority. The celebration was economically as well as politically motivated, for pirates often supplied the wares distributed tax-free and well below market price by the smugglers.

Errol Flynn in Captain Blood (1935) and The Sea Hawk (1940), Tyrone Power as Jamie Waring in The Black Swan (1942) established the cinematic pirate in a genre that was exploited and parodied by Johnny Depp as Captain Jack Sparrow in the Disney series on The Pirates of the Caribbean (2003, 2006, 2007, 2011, and a fifth slated for 2015). The predecessors in this genre were the pirates of the Romantic stage. The significant difference lies not in the script but in the audience. A production of Blackbeard the Pirate in Plymouth, or Bristol, or other British port of the late eighteenth or early nineteenth centuries, was likely to have a few dozen pirates and smugglers in the audience, far more than most movies houses in recent years. Exploring this difference requires a careful discrimination of reality and fantasy, fact and fiction.

Drawing from the Panunzio to finance research in Bristol, Liverpool, and a visit to the Orkney Islands, I intend to investigate local theatres as well as local pirates. Several teasing relations exist between the pirate and the privateer, the pirate and corsair or buccaneer, the pirate of fact and the pirate of fiction, the pirate of romance and the pirate of melodrama. When Philip Astley opened the Olympic Theatre on December 1, 1806, he proudly announced that it was built from the timbers of the defeated French warship Ville de Paris, with the deck actually serving as the stage. This physical link between striding the deck and strutting the stage suggests that in spite of theatrical flamboyance, the drama of the period retained a degree of documentary accuracy in performing in the theatres.
the exploits of piracy as reported in the current newspapers and journals.

The skewed relation of pirate activity, past and present, and the popular reception is readily apparent in numerous pirate plays, including the staging of Lord Byron’s tales of the Mediterranean corsairs. Michael O’Sullivan’s adaptation of Byron’s *The Corsair; or, The Pirate’s Isle* (1814), William Dimond’s stage script for *The Bride of Abydos* (1818), in which Edmund Kean did a very convincing imitation of Byron in performing as Salim, in love with his supposed half-sister Zuleika. William Douglas Jerrold’s aquatic drama *The Island; or, Christian and his Comrades* (1823) made thorough use of the huge water tanks at Sadler’s Wells. Identifying Byron with his fictional characters also informed the anonymous aquatic drama, *Lord Byron in Athens; or, The Corsair’s Isle* (1832).

The relation of fact and fiction can be closely traced in the historical record of John Gow, the Orkney pirate, as transformed by Sir Walter Scott into the romance of Captain Cleveland in *The Pirate*, and in the quick succession of four competing stage performances in London. Similarly, the historical John Paul Jones, Scottish pirate transformed into American patriot, provokes relations of national rivalry and conflict far more complex than propagandized fact into nationalist fiction. In *The Pilot*, Cooper declared his intent to outdo Scott in writing a pirate novel that represented the Scottish seaman John Paul not as traitor to the British but as hero of the American navy. That relation was again reversed when *The Pilot* was adapted for the stages of London and Edinburgh. British and American relations were again prominent when Edward Fitzball adapted another Cooper novel for performance at the Adelphi as *The Red Rover; or, The Mutiny of the Dolphin* (1829). The most topical and sensational relations are those involving pirates and women (captive narratives and cross-dressing women) and women as pirates (those who command a pirate crew). The historical occurrences acquire eroticized embellishments in the narrative tales and stage plays.

Many of the pirates and their exploits are well known to maritime historians. With the support from the Panunzio Award I shall visit numerous port towns and investigate local record offices. I hope to uncover and identify some of the pirates whose notoriety was regional and whose theatrical representation never travelled beyond performance in one or two theatres. At the very least, I am confident that I will be able to add to the understanding of one of the major literary and theatrical interests of the Romantic Era. In addition to being excited by the prospects of a new project, I look forward to travel in the coming months with gratitude that the range and depth of my research has been significantly enhanced by the vision of Constantine Panunzio.

Postscript: The foregoing articles surely demonstrate that retirement can be a very active and productive period in an academic career. They also reveal retirement as an opportunity to explore new areas of interest. The founder and donor of the Panunzio Award, Dr. Constantine Panunzio, recognized this and had the vision to encourage it through the award. He was a professor of Sociology at UCLA from 1931 until his retirement in 1952. During the last dozen years of his life, he was instrumental in bringing about a substantial increase in the stipends of colleagues already retired at the University of California. In fact, UC Emeriti owe the present pension system largely to Dr. Panunzio whose efforts on behalf of emeriti led the Board of Regents to establish the retirement system in 1954. Edward A Dickson, who was Chairman of the Board of Regents at the time, described Dr. Panunzio as the architect of the UC Retirement System. Dickson himself endowed the Dickson Emeriti Faculty Awards.

The Panunzio award is unusual in that it is one of the very few UC faculty awards open to nominees from any of the ten campuses. There are, however, several restrictions named in the gift instrument that narrow the scope of the award. As implied in its title, the award is for emeriti andemerita faculty, and its purpose is to recognize outstanding scholarly achievements and/or education service since retirement. Furthermore, the award is limited to retired faculty from the humanities or the social sciences. Exclusion of science, engineering, and other disciplines may seem unfair but few awards are completely inclusive and overall there are fewer awards for achievements in the humanities and social sciences. Nonetheless, it is significant that one of the awards this year goes to a physicist (Nauenberg) whose work points to the importance of connecting science with the humanities.

Administering the Panunzio Award within a multicampus system is not altogether simple. For historical reasons, the UCLA campus has
administered the award and currently does so through the office of the Vice Chancellor for Diversity. The call to solicit nominations goes out annually to the constituent departments in the early spring from the appropriate dean. These initial nominations can originate by self-nomination and may consist largely of curriculum vitae. However, a campus may submit only one nomination for final review by the Panunzio Award Selection Committee. This requires that each campus establish procedures for nomination collection, coordination and selection. Most choose to have the selection process coordinated by the president of the campus emeriti association who will submit the ultimate campus nomination (by way of the provost) as a full supporting dossier complete with the letter of nomination, curriculum vitae, and supporting letters. Nominations are usually due in early March. The Selection Committee, which meets once at UCLA to review the nominations, now includes a member chosen by CUCEA from the list of former Panunzio awardees. CUCEA views this an important step in broadening the representation on the Selection Committee.

---

**Additional Emeriti Awards**

**UCLA**

Our three recipients of the Dickson Faculty Fellowship Award are Charlotte Neumann, Vivian Sobchack, and Lawrence Kruger.

**Charlotte Neumann** is Research Professor and Professor Emerita in the School of Public Health. The award recognizes her ongoing work in global health (nutrition and the immune function) much of it in Africa. She is active in a long-term project to improve nutrition and reduce obesity levels in Hispanic children and continues an impressive amount of professional service.

**Vivian Sobchack** is a 30-year veteran of the UC system in Theatre-Arts of Motion Pictures and Television. Her work in film is of the highest quality and cultural relevance. Her most recent work, *Carnal Thoughts*, combines the cinema experience with philosophical insights. She continues to be a prolific scholar, teacher, and indispensable participant within and outside of UCLA.

**Lawrence Kruger**’s career in neurobiology UCLA spans more than 50 years. In addition to his experimental work in neurophysiology, he has exercised a life-long interest since retirement in the history of neuroscience. He has demonstrated extraordinary dedication to UCLA and the greater Community in the Arts.

**Carole Pateman**, Distinguished Professor Emerita of Political Science, received the Emeriti Association’s award Emerita of the Year. She has had a storied career on three continents filled with awards, honorary degrees, prestigious posts, speaking invitations and an impressive list of books and articles.

**UCSF**

**Dorothy P. Rice, Sc.D.,** Professor Emerita of Medical Economics, is the recipient of the 2013 William B. Graham Prize for Health Services Research. The Prize is the highest distinction that researchers in the health service field can achieve. Professor Rice is Professor Emerita in the Department of Social and Behavioral Sciences and at the Institute for Health and Aging at UCSF. She has also had a distinguished career in the Federal government where she held several leadership positions. As Director of the National Center for Health Statistics she led in the development and management of an
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indispensable nationwide healthcare information system. She has authored more than 200 published monographs, books, articles, and book chapters on the various cost-of-illness studies and has received numerous honors.

Professor Rice is well known to CUCEA for her long-standing Council membership representing UCSF’s Emeriti Association. She is donating her Prize of $50,000 to the Dorothy Rice Center for Health Economics in the Institute for Health & Aging at UCSF. The Center was named in her honor in 1999.

UCSC

J. Casey Moore, Research Professor and Professor Emeritus of Earth and Planetary Sciences, has been elected a fellow of the American Geophysical Union. Moore’s research is focused on structural geology of subduction zones and active margins, especially involving fluid-rock interactions and the geologic signature of earthquakes. He was also awarded the 2013 Shepard Medal for Marine Geology from the Society for Sedimentary Geology.

Harry D. Husky, Professor Emeritus of Computer Science, will receive the 2013 Fellow Award from the Computer History Museum in Mountain View. The prestigious award honors distinguished technology leaders who have forever changed the world with their accomplishments.

UCSD

Melvin H. Green, Professor Emeritus of Biology, is the 2013 recipient of the Dickson Faculty Fellowship Award for his long-standing contributions and leadership in student mentoring programs by emeriti faculty. An article by Professor Green in the October 2012 issue of the CUCEA newsletter best describes UCSD’s Emeriti Mentoring Program and provides some understanding of Professor Green’s role which has earned him the Dickson award.

A Bit of CUCEA History

By Ralph Johnson, UCLA

CUCEA Archivist and Historian

From its inception, Council membership has included a Historian to serve as the Council’s institutional memory and recall past actions to inform the Council’s present deliberations. We fondly recall Norah Jones who initially served CUCEA as its Archivist and then as Historian. Her project as Historian was to write about the first CUCEA meeting to be hosted by a given campus. Sadly, she was able to complete only four campus accounts before her passing in 2010. They include UCB’s first meeting on October 29, 1987; UCD’s on October 27, 1988; UCI’s on April 26, 1990; and UCR’s on April 25, 1991. As the current Historian, I plan to complete Norah’s project. My first such report is UCSC’s first CUCEA meeting held October 25, 1990. This and Norah’s reports cited above can be viewed on CUCEA’s website (http://cucea.ucsd.edu/info/history.shtml).

Norah’s first report as Historian is possibly her most notable. It describes the first intercampus meeting of UC emeriti associations that predates CUCEA by several years. It was held at UCLA on April 15, 1981 to discuss mutual concerns and consider the formation of a university-wide organization of emeriti (now CUCEA). This interesting report is like stepping back in time and is reproduced here for the reader’s enjoyment.

*****

Historian’s Report to CUCEA, April 27, 2006, at UCLA

Norah E. Jones

As CUCEA Historian, I am going to tell you a story -- a story about an event that took place almost exactly twenty-five years ago in this building, just a few feet down the corridor from where we are sitting. The date was April 15, 1981, and the occasion was the very first joint meeting ever held among UC emeriti associations.

But first, some brief background. In the late 1970s and early ’80s, the nation, and California with it, had
fallen on hard economic times, and there was considerable concern among UC academics about salaries, let alone annuities, keeping up with the cost of living. At UCLA we fortunately had a determined and visionary emerita professor of microbiology, Meridian Ball, who had been our association's president in 1976/77. She saw clearly that a single campus could not seriously influence statewide policy to protect emeriti interests, and so she initiated contacts with emeriti on other campuses, encouraging them to form associations and to join together in statewide cooperation. Under the UCLA association's auspices she and another emeritus, Ralph McKee of biological chemistry, calling themselves "Liaison Representatives to Systemwide Organization," issued an invitation to emeriti from the then-active southern associations at Santa Barbara and Riverside to a luncheon at UCLA on April 15, 1981, at which they had already secured President David Saxon to speak. (They had also hoped to have representatives from Irvine and San Diego where associations had not yet been formed, but neither Stuart Krassner of Irvine nor Allen Lein of San Diego, with whom they corresponded, was able to come or to send a colleague.)

On the day, 122 people were actually present, strongly attracted by the promised presence of David Saxon: 27 came from Santa Barbara, 11 from Riverside, and 84 from UCLA, including Lina Boardman, Eddie Murphy's predecessor -- all reserving lunch for $6.36. They met at 10:30 in the UCLA Faculty Center's California Room for coffee, a welcome from Vice-Chancellor Harold Horowitz, and presentations by Theodore Hatlen who led the Santa Barbara contingent, James Early who led the Riverside group, and President Margaret Jones of UCLA who presided. These presentations laid out the concerns for President Saxon, concerns pointed up by a resolution to the Regents which had just been passed by the Riverside association and was now endorsed by Santa Barbara and UCLA as well. This resolution began by expressing appreciation for a 1981 one-time adjustment in annuities, but concluded:

"Pending accurate measures of changes in the living costs of retired individuals and couples, we call upon the Regents to include, in their annual legislative request for funds, the funds needed to make adjustments of UCRS annuities equal to the average range of adjustments provided for UC faculty and staff."

At 12:15 the assembly moved to the dining room for lunch, where UCLA Chancellor Charles Young, whose schedule kept him from joining them, rushed in and went from table to table shaking hands. At 1:00 p.m. the meeting resumed in the California Room for President Saxon's informal talk. "The University and its Emeriti," followed by wide-ranging discussion. The whole occasion was so successful that everyone present expressed a wish to repeat it with enlarged representation.

In writing to thank President Saxon, Margaret Jones said in part: "I can hope that the cordiality and spirit of the group adequately expressed our regard for and our gratitude to you for finding the time to be with us. ... I have been impressed with the esprit de corps and the concern the emeriti show for the University. This, I believe, can only be an asset for individual campuses and for the University as a whole."

N. E. Jones, CUCEA Historian, 2006

The 2009-2012 Biobibliographic Survey

Foreword: If you are one of the 1,581 UC emeriti respondents to the 2009-2013 biobibliographic survey of emeriti achievements, you are familiar with the prodigious efforts of Charles (Chuck) Berst (UCLA) to produce the survey. He deserves our deepest thanks for guiding this project to completion and recognition for the valuable service he has rendered the University. The survey reveals much about the scale and scope of activity emeriti faculty contribute to the University's continuing mission in teaching, research and service.

The unabridged survey is on the CUCEA website. It contains the survey data and reports from nine UC campuses, including an introduction authored by the editor, Charles Berst. We are pleased to include here his introductory comments. They convey a serious message about the value of emeriti as a UC resource illuminated by the author's inimical literary style. Enjoy the read!
Introduction

By Charles Berst, Survey Editor

A
ter conducting seven biennial surveys of emeriti activities since the 1990’s, the Council of UC Emeriti Associations (CUCSEA) decided last year that a triennial version might be even more effective by reducing survey fatigue and increasing the survey’s newsworthiness at the same time.

The data throughout this report suggest the idea was a good one: their representations of 1,581 emeriti, 36% of 4,403 surveyed, are a record. Ironically, the professional preoccupations of some very active emeriti apparently deflected them from responding to just a statistical accounting of their work, but the generosity of many who took the time emerges in the survey’s sheer numbers.

Why the bother of gathering these numbers? Building on a primary gist of all preceding surveys, their importance lies in nudging UC’s culture toward a clearer awareness of a component uniquely valuable to each campus community, especially in these financially strained times for the university. Often overlooked or marginally recognized, hundreds of productive emeriti, a broad assortment of leaders in their fields, are redefining “retirement.” As these persist in their research, teaching, advising, and professional service, they amount to a very experienced and prestigious workforce intrinsic and even essential to UC’s future.

Still, higher education usually attends more to the cost of emeriti benefits than to what emeriti do. And since most schools have many ponds of other fish to fry, why should they mix their missions (or metaphors) to meddle or muddle with odd old ducks?

Updating its predecessors, this survey reiterates why:

(1) Because, in an inspiring contrast to common assumptions about retirement, the survey’s 1,581 academically active respondents forcefully reveal what a lively resource emeriti can be.

(2) As the reputation of major universities primarily relates to the quality of their faculty, survey data illustrate emeriti as prestigious veterans at or near the peak of their careers in forwarding UC’s research, repute, and educational values.

(3) Especially heartening in these troubled budgetary days, most emeriti research, mentoring and service cited in the survey have been pro bono, in effect a bonus and great bargain for the University.

(4) The survey shows how durable this bonus and bargain can be. As world-class scholars (hardly the sort to stop thinking and sharing when they turn 65), most UC emeriti are quintessentially obsessive, making them a remarkable investment, a blue chip asset likely to pay generous dividends to students, UC, the state, and the country for many years.

(5) Moreover, the number of those years, with all their productivity, is increasing. Far beyond the 65-year lifespan assumed by Social Security in 1935, modern healthcare has already given emeriti an average of 20 additional years to flourish — virtually the mature half of an extra career.

In revealing how much many emeriti continue to do, gratis, the survey’s data mix a sense of something commonly taken for granted as inexpensive yet invaluable, a curious paradox of altruism submerged by the realities of money that makes the world (and universities) go ‘round’: one where the Golden Rule often means that those who have the gold ‘rule.’

But after all, when renowned lawyers charge $1,150 an hour, what’s a renowned scholar’s expertise worth; and what about the innumerable hours donated by UC’s 1,581 emeriti?

Since such conundrums are bothersomely metaphysical, Adrian Harris, UCLA’s renowned economic realist and Vice Chancellor for Planning Emeritus, promoted the insertion of hard-core $ accounting-contribution figures in this survey, such as those of its new Financial Data category near the survey’s end. As these numbers have turned out, they are not as solidly hard at the core as one might wish, since they rely on the survey’s 36% response rate and/or campus development officers’ variable emeriti records.

Still, as they total well over half a billion dollars, such figures punctuate the survey, while nonetheless supplementing abundant evidence of altruism which finally outweighs such gold.


NEWS ITEMS

April 2013 CUCEA/CUCRA Meeting at UCR

The spring CUCEA/CUCRA meeting was held at UC Riverside, April 23-24. In keeping with current custom, CUCEA and CUCRA met jointly and then separately during the two-day event. The welcoming event was a rousing performance by the UCR world-renowned bagpiper, Mike Terry, followed by a brief history of the campus by interim Chancellor Jane Close Conoley. As for the business aspects of the meeting, details are given in the minutes in the CUCEA and CUCRA websites, http://www.cucea.ucsd.edu and http://www.cucra.ucsd.edu.

In addition to the opportunity to stay and dine at the gloriously interesting Mission Inn, the campus organizers arranged a tour of UCR’s new cultural complex known as UCR ARTSblock. The experience deserves a more detailed description.

The complex houses the California Museum of Photography, the Sweeney Art Gallery, and the Barbara and Art Culver Center of the Arts- all three located on a single block in adjacent historical buildings in downtown Riverside. It provides a great cultural meeting ground for the university and the community and offers all kinds of exhibitions, installations, dance, music, theatrical performances, spoken word, and foreign and independent film programs. It has revitalized downtown Riverside.

The Culver Center is a museum in itself. It is the converted, or rather “transformed” 1895 Rouse Department Store and, like the Mission Inn, one of Riverside’s architectural jewels (note the beautiful mosaic panels on the building front). The transformation was the result of a lead gift from the Culver family and the support of private donors, UCR, and the City of Riverside.

The highlight of the visit to the Culver Center was a tour of the Keystone-Mast Collection – the world’s largest and most significant imagery collection. It consists of 250,000 stereoscopic glass-plate and film negatives and 100,000 vintage prints depicting global culture from1870-1960.

This treasure is preserved for posterity in the safety of the Culver Center Vault, thanks to timely Federal matching grants for the preservation of national cultural treasures.

Many of us are old enough to remember Keystone stereoscopic photography. Two seemingly identical side-by-side images are looked at through a special viewer (stereoscope) that superimposes the two images, creating the illusion of three dimensions. This technology was very popular in the Victorian era but is scarcely remembered today. The glass negatives in the collection can be viewed on-site but only by appointment. The best access is via the internet where you can browse nearly 40,000 digitized images from the collection (http://www.oac.cdlib.org/findaid/ark:/13030/ft1q2n999m/). An example of an image of Russian peasants in a village in the late 19th century is shown below. If you squint hard at the center at the dual images shown (cross-eyed), you may see the 3-D effect revealed.

Fall 2013 CUCEA/CUCRA Meeting

The fall meeting will be held at UCSF on Monday November 4 and Tuesday November 5, 2013, at the Mission Bay facility. The scheduled date is later than usual because of difficulties getting space for the meeting in late October.

Inauguration of the UC Berkeley Chancellor

Berkeley’s new Chancellor, Nicholas B. Dirks, will be inaugurated on November 8, 2013.

Appointment of the UC Riverside Chancellor

Kim A. Wilcox was appointed Chancellor of UC Riverside by the UC Board of Regents on August 8, 2013.

The UC Presidents – Changing of the Guard

UC President Mark Yudof steps down as President in September following five of the most tumultuous budget years in UC’s history. In his parting address to the Regents in May he paints an interesting picture of UC at the terminus of his tenure (http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/news/article/29490). It is well worth the read, short on sentiment perhaps,
but full of useful facts. He reveals the depth of the strain imposed by the fiscal crisis on the university system but reassuringly that it remains strong and able to fulfill its mission. His service during these difficult years deserve our deep gratitude.

Janet Napolitano, the US Secretary of Homeland Security, has been named the next President of the UC system by action of the UC Board of Regents, July 8, 2013. This will be the first female UC President in UC’s history. Although a ‘first’, this was not the reason behind some protests within UC regarding her selection. The concern was partly that, unlike previous UC Presidents, she has no previous university leadership experience. Also, some have objected to a lack of “transparency” in the search process. It is arguably doubtful that Napolitano or other viable candidates would submit to a search process resembling election to political office rather than appointment to a university presidency. She will assume her new responsibilities by the end of September 2013.

UC has New Medical Plans for 2014

Details of the forthcoming health plan changes are posted on the “AtYourService” website [http://atyourservice.ucop.edu/news/general/1309-medical-plans.html](http://atyourservice.ucop.edu/news/general/1309-medical-plans.html)


Remembering Valued Colleagues
Sad, Roderic Park, former Vice Chancellor at Berkeley, passed away September 6 after a brave fight with cancer. He was also a Dean of the Biological Sciences, a Botany Professor, and instrumental in the reorganization of biology at Berkeley. He served as Chancellor of the Merced campus in its formative years, and contributed to UC Davis in a number of ways after his retirement. A fuller account and words of appreciation are posted on the UCB website [http://newscenter.berkeley.edu/2013/09/11/roderic-park-dies-at-81/](http://newscenter.berkeley.edu/2013/09/11/roderic-park-dies-at-81/)

With great regret, we report the loss of John A. Marcum. He died September 12 as a result of complications following cancer surgery. He was 86. Besides being an international educator and renowned Africa scholar, he was a long-time member of the faculty at UC Santa Cruz, serving terms as provost of Merrill College and academic vice chancellor. He is widely known in the UC system for his leadership of the UC Education Abroad Program (UCEAP), serving as director from 1990-2007. Additionally, he assumed the role of the newly created position of Associate Provost for International Academic Affairs at UC, Office of the President, 2001-2007. This position reflects the growth and importance of international education and the UCEA program which owes so much to John’s vision and leadership. The program continues to be administered in association with the Santa Barbara campus.

He retired in 2007 but was active in the emeriti association at UCSC. In 2012, he was elected Vice-Chair of CUCEA and was to become the CUCEA Chair in the fall of 2014. He will be hard to replace.

A more complete description of his distinguished career is posted on the UCSC website [http://news.ucsc.edu/2013/09/marcum.html](http://news.ucsc.edu/2013/09/marcum.html)

On The Lighter Side

A smile for the ladies

On The Lighter Side (to share with grandchildren)
To write with a broken pencil is ....................pointless
The batteries were given out ..........................free of charge
A will is a ................................................dead giveaway
A boiled egg is .............................................hard to beat
He had a photographic memory .....................which was never developed
When a clock is hungry ................................it goes back for seconds
The guy who fell into an upholstery machine......was fully recovered
In a democracy it’s your vote that counts; in feudalism it’s your Count that votes
Those who get too big for their britches.............will be exposed in the end
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