The following is the first of what I hope will be a series of articles this year by our distinguished Emerita Helen Ranney, aimed at our particular population of emeriti. —Ed.

STROKE – IMPROVING TREATMENT AND CHANGING OUTLOOK
—by Helen M. Ranney

Stroke is an all too common illness — the diagnosis causes a great deal of anxiety among patients and members of their families. Like auto accidents or heart attacks, strokes may be fatal, but most other illnesses are not feared in the same way as stroke. The increased apprehension regarding stroke is based not on the immediate risk of death, but on the possibility of survival with long-term severe physical and/or mental handicap. The prospect of permanent disability that may require institutional living haunts the patient and the family. Discussions of stroke (and of Alzheimer Dementia) have probably increased the sales of long-term health insurance more than any other effort of the insurance sales force. Since with changes in life style, the incidence of stroke has declined and new treatment has improved the outlook for stroke victims, a few notes about the illness and its treatment may convey information and hope for the future.

In the last decade, the medical management of acute stroke has changed a great deal with the introduction of a new therapy (thrombolysis). Ongoing research on other therapeutic interventions, including other drugs (and recently hypothermia) has promise of additional significant improvements in the near future. The improved outcome of newer management strategies in stroke depends on prompt institution of therapy following the onset of symptoms. Some common symptoms of stroke are: sudden onset of weakness of an arm or a leg or both (on the same side), numbness, difficulty in speaking or garbled speech, confusion, sudden loss of vision, severe headache, or unconsciousness. Sometimes the symptoms are mild and disappear within minutes or hours.

Ischemic strokes are the most common: they result from damage to brain cells when the vessel carrying blood (containing oxygen and glucose) to those cells is occluded, generally by a blood clot (thrombus). Usually the clot that interrupts the blood supply has formed on the lining of a brain blood vessel previously chronically damaged by arteriosclerosis or hypertension. The occlusion may be partial or neighboring blood vessels may supply some blood to the affected brain cells: the symptoms may clear completely. If symptoms clear within 24 hours, the illness is classified as a transient ischemic attack or “TIA”. In other cases, the blockage remains more or less complete; brain cells die and the disability persists.

Another (less common) cause of ischemic stroke is the dislodging and migration of a blood clot that formed in another area of the body to one or more blood vessels in the brain. This migratory thrombus or embolus also occludes blood vessels that may be normal or diseased. Such clots most often originate in the heart or in the blood vessels of the neck. A migrating blood clot from the leg normally lodges in the blood vessels of the lung. Uncommonly however a clot from the extremities will find abnormal detouring routes through the heart, bypass the lung and reach the cerebral circulation. This is called a paradoxical embolus. Strokes may rarely result from other types of emboli, e.g., fat emboli from bone marrow trauma.

Hemorrhagic strokes resulting from the rupture of an artery in the
brain account for perhaps one fifth of the cases of stroke. While large hemorrhagic strokes are often preceded by headache, followed by loss of consciousness and death (you may recall the brief final illness of Franklin D. Roosevelt), breaks may occur in smaller blood vessels, resulting in clinical symptoms indistinguishable from those of ischemic strokes. As in ischemic strokes, hemorrhagic strokes may be associated with blood vessels damaged by hypertension or arteriosclerosis. In addition, congenital deformities of blood vessels may cause hemorrhagic strokes even in young individuals.

There are two obvious approaches to the treatment of acute stroke. One approach would be to dissolve the blood clot and prevent formation of more clots; the other, to find a neuroprotective agent to protect brain cells from the deadly effects of oxygen and glucose deprivation.

The current treatment of acute ischemic stroke is designed to dissolve the blood clot by the intravenous administration of a thrombolytic agent, recombinant tissue plasminogen activator (rt-PA), within THREE HOURS of the onset of symptoms. The use of rt-PA was approved following a clinical trial carried out at 43 sites between 1991 and 1994. In that trial, significant improvement three months after the acute stroke was observed in patients who had received rt-PA, when compared with controls who received conventional treatment and rehabilitation. Professor Patrick Lyden of the Department of Neuroscience at UCSD was a leading investigator in that landmark stroke study. (An aside, the usual anticoagulants, heparin and coumadin, prevent blood from clotting; rt-TPA dissolves a clot that has already formed.)

Because rt-PA dissolves blood clots, it carries a risk of bleeding. Therefore rt-PA is NOT used for hemorrhagic stroke nor is it given to patients who have had recent surgical procedures or illnesses associated with impaired blood clotting. To distinguish hemorrhagic from ischemic stroke, the patient must have an evaluation that includes a brain CAT scan.

Now the difficult part of the three-hour window becomes obvious. During the 180 minutes after the onset of symptoms of stroke, the patient must be taken to a hospital with a stroke center, evaluated by the emergency room physician and by a consulting neurologist. Their review of screening laboratory work and CAT scan to rule out hemorrhagic stroke must be completed before rt-PA can be administered. Both the public and hospitals have been slow to recognize the urgent nature of evaluation of stroke for possible thrombolytic therapy. “Stroke Teams” including those at UCSD can complete this work-up within the three-hour window if the patient comes to the Emergency Room even an hour or more after onset of symptoms. In the absence of stroke teams, delay is often encountered in timely orchestration of the evaluation.

Patients with stroke who do not receive rt-PA are mobilized as rapidly as possible; physiotherapy during the initial months may improve function, although physiotherapy does not alter the brain damage. For patients whose strokes were cardioembolic in origin, anticoagulation with heparin/coumadin is strongly recommended. For the majority of ischemic strokes that are due to thrombosis the efficacy of anticoagulation is less certain. One of the important aspects of the demonstrated benefit of thrombolytic therapy is the hope that it brings for other therapeutic agents. While better thrombolytic agents may be found, the brevity of the three-hour window is related not to inadequate thrombolysis but to the onset of irreversible damage to the brain cells. Current research on neuroprotective strategies that protect the brain cells from death due to lack of oxygen and glucose may lead to the next therapeutic approach to stroke. Neuroprotective agents might well be used in both hemorrhagic and ischemic stroke. Stroke is now a disease with a specific treatment: the success of one agent generates confidence that other agents will also lead to improved outcomes.

The Stroke Center at the UCSD Medical Center, directed by Dr. Patrick Lyden, provides round the clock response to patients presenting to the Emergency Room with stroke symptoms. The UCSD Stroke Center, staffed by five physicians and four nurses, has received national recognition as a center for stroke treatment. There is a national effort to increase the number of patients who receive specific treatment for stroke. A five-million-dollar grant from the NIH has been awarded to Dr. Lyden as Principal Investigator for studies of a new ultrasound screening tool, provision of remote consultations and possible use of hypothermia to extend the window of treatment effectiveness from three to six hours.

Gratification about the promising therapy for stroke should not distract us from the favorable news about the epidemiology and prevention of stroke. Although most of this article has been devoted to its management, the prevention of stroke is obviously a much better therapeutic strategy. In the United States, the incidence and death rate from stroke declined steadily throughout the 20th century with an accelerated decline beginning in the 1970’s. The incidence of stroke has stabilized at 0.5 to 1.0 per thousand but is a good deal higher (20 to 30 per thousand) in people over 75 years of age. Incidence of stroke, while declining, remains higher in Europe and Japan than in the United States. The decline in incidence of stroke, like the decline in cardiovascular disease generally, reflects changes in life style. Smoking, hypertension, diabetes, elevated blood cholesterol and obesity all increase the risk of stroke. The decline in incidence of stroke probably reflects attention to control of these risk factors. Patients who have transient ischemic attacks that by defini-
How My Field has Changed Since I Began

Editor’s Note: The following article continues the series recording important changes that have occurred during our scholarly lifetimes.

Changes in Analytic Philosophy in the Last Half Century

—by Avrum Stroll

It is not often that one has a chance to write reflectively about the recent history of a topic so well trodden as contemporary philosophy. When one is deeply engrossed in a field one tends to follow its flow without much retrospective reflection; and that is indeed a good description of my own case. The task of briefly describing an activity that is often highly technical, with its own arcane terminology, is especially difficult because it requires explaining what philosophers, as a collective group, do; and then explaining the nature of analytic philosophy, as a sub-case of this more general discipline.

Historically, there have been many definitions (accounts, characterizations, depictions, etc.) of philosophy, and some of these are incompatible with one another. Some exegetes have asserted that philosophy is dedicated to investigating the ultimate nature of reality, while others have rejected this description and have asserted instead that philosophy is not a fact-finding activity at all, and therefore cannot tell us anything about reality. It has been affirmed that philosophy is a rational activity in which good reasons are adduced in support of a particular conclusion. This description identifies philosophy with argumentation. Yet others have denied that the use of reason and/or argument in philosophy is either important or even relevant, and some of these persons, mainly skeptics, have claimed that no arguments in philosophy are any good. From such a perspective, argumentation is pointless and a waste of time.

The definitional problem is compounded when we turn to analytic philosophy. The name does not describe a specific doctrine but rather a loose concatenation of approaches to problems. In its modern form, analytic philosophy can be traced back to a book, Principia Ethica, published in 1903 by the English philosopher, G.E. Moore. In that work Moore argued that many of the difficulties in ethics, and indeed in philosophy generally, arise from an “attempt to answer questions, without first discovering precisely what question it is which you desire to answer.” Questions thus require “analysis” to unpack them and to know what they mean. Moore’s monograph unquestionably sensitized his contemporaries and many of his successors to the importance of becoming clear about the questions they asked and the kinds of answers that would be appropriate. There are many different ways of carrying out his program from strictly formal approaches to aphoristic, example-oriented techniques. So one can say, though perhaps with some degree of trepidation, that nearly all practitioners concur that analytic philosophy is concerned with deciphering the meaning of certain important concepts, such as “knowledge,” “belief,” “truth,” “probability,” “evidence,” “justification,” and “goodness.”

The above characterization is drastically simplified, but it is probably accurate enough to allow us to trace three major changes in analytic philosophy in the half century since I received my Ph.D. at Berkeley. Chronologically, they are Logical Positivism, Ordinary Language Philosophy, and Naturalized Epistemology. To understand how they differ it is necessary to take a step backward in time to the creation of symbolic or mathematical logic in 1879 by Gottlob Frege. In a slightly different version, due to Bertrand Russell, it is probably the single most important contribution to philosophy in the 20th century. Apart from its intrinsic interest, and its significance for computer studies, artificial intelligence and linguistics, it has exercised an enormous influence on philosophy per se. In particular, it be-
came the basis for new forms of realism that replaced an idealistic philosophy that originally derived from the German metaphysician, G.W.F. Hegel, and that dominated English and American thought in the 19th century. It quickly set the scene for the appearance of a scientific philosophy based on logic. Logical Positivism, which was still influential when I was a graduate student, was a product of this new outlook. Its basic idea was that science and science alone could make significant statements about the real world. It thus jettisoned any form of speculation, such as traditional metaphysics and theology, whose claims were not verifiable in principle.

For a short time after I received my Ph.D., I considered myself to be a positivist. But then a new development occurred, a second stage in the history of analytic philosophy, which rejected the importance of mathematical logic and science for dealing with conceptual problems, and which led me to abandon positivism. The main figure responsible for this movement was Ludwig Wittgenstein (1889-1951). His *Philosophical Investigations*, published posthumously in 1953, had a revolutionary impact.

Because of the aphoristic nature of his writing, his achievements are difficult to summarize. It is probably reasonably accurate to say that he rejected any appeal to logic or science in formulating, analyzing, or resolving philosophical problems. He contrasted any form of theory construction, such as those we find in the philosophy of science, with a new method that he developed in his later writings and which avoided the kind of generalizations essential to logic and science. In its place he insisted that description should replace explanation (i.e., theory) and that the main task of philosophy was to give an accurate account of what he called “language games,” i.e., slices of everyday living. He thus stressed the importance of examples, including *Zwischenglieder* (intermediate cases) in accurately describing “what goes on.” The emphasis was thus on ordinary discourse and its usefulness in resolving intellectual dilemmas. In a well known maxim, he stated “What we do is to bring words back from their metaphysical to their everyday use.”

In the past two decades, ordinary language philosophy as originally practiced by Wittgenstein, J.L. Austin, Gilbert Ryle, and Norman Malcolm, and then later by Zeno Vendler, John Searle and me, inter alios, has lost ground to a revivified, older tradition initiated by the founders of mathematical logic, Frege and Russell. Indeed, if anything, the applications of their logical/scientific approach in philosophy have intensified in the last quarter of the twentieth century, mostly due to the influence of the late Harvard logician, W.V.O. Quine. Quine’s position, in summary form, was that the only facts are scientific facts. The doctrine is thus a form of positivism without the so-called “analytic/synthetic” distinction. His outlook included a sophisticated form of materialism, that he labeled “naturalized epistemology,” a doctrine that today enjoys widespread support. Naturalized epistemology is thus a third, and the latest, stage in the recent history of analytic philosophy.

These general remarks do not reflect the rapidity with which major movements in the 20th century suddenly appeared, flourished, lost momentum and eventually vanished—or in some cases, such as materialism, were revived in new forms. There are signs that the influence of Wittgenstein which had waned in America is growing again, and there is abundant evidence that “scientific philosophy,” now dedicated to understanding the human mind, will continue to be a dominant force. How these differing approaches will eventually play out is anybody’s guess. As the Austrian philosopher, Moritz Schlick once wittily said: “The method of verification is waiting.” We shall thus have to wait and see what the future brings.

*****************
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**Stanley Mills**
“Aging without Disease”

Stan Mills came to UCSD in the initial surge of three from Yale, with John De Moss and the chairman-elect of Biology, David Bonner, the innovator of our campus’ piss-and-vinegar originality. Mills brought with him his credentials as an M.S. and Ph.D. student at Yale; as a post-doctoral fellow for three years at Brandeis University with Gordon Soto, Martin Kamen, and Nathan Kaplan, all future UCSD luminaries; a gift for research culminating in some good stuff completed during his emeritus years, and a great gift for teaching, recognized by a National Danforth Foundation Award. His avocation has been, is, and will continue to be, health. He says he has had a very good time here.

********************************

**Ranney from p. 2**

tion clear rapidly should seek neurological evaluation promptly — the causes of some TIA’s are reversible.

Stroke has joined the growing list of diseases that have begun to yield to measures that have reduced their incidence and is now approached with specific measures that are beginning to reduce long term disability.

The author is grateful to Dr. Patrick Lyden for advice and to Dr. Chris Kenney, Assistant Clinical Professor of Neuroscience for his help in preparing this article and for his review of this and an earlier version.

---

**Chronicles, December 2003**
I joined Henry Booker at UCSD in 1965 when he was invited to start up a new department devoted to the science associated with electrical devices. At the time, the term engineering had gotten a tarnished reputation at the university level because of the “cookbook” approach used at some universities to teach subjects such as highway and bridge building, and the design of electrical generating plants. Henry wanted me to act as the initial experimental side of a balanced theorist + experimentalist faculty. His charge was to set up a radio & radar experimental research program extending what both of us had been involved in elsewhere.

I quickly ran into a near brick wall associated with the UC-wide management politics of running central computing services. To get our radio research going, I had to negotiate approval to bring the first minicomputer to UCSD — a Sigma 5. To get approval, it took many months of proving to various administrators and committees at UCSD, then UC-wide, that such a machine would perform our needed computations at less than 1/1000th the cost of doing the same computations on UCSD’s CDC 3600 central computer. By 1968, the campus needed to upgrade its computer center, the center needed a new director, and research funding for radio probing of the natural environment was in serious decline. Chancellor Galbraith persuaded me to take over as computer center director (and ever since, Bill Coles has capably carried on as the lead in the radio probing research at UCSD). It was a time when computer center directors at most American universities became very controversial, especially because of the accelerating shift from central to independently operated smaller computers, and because of the beginnings of online computing propelled by the BASIC language introduced by Tom Kurtz and John Kemeny at Dartmouth. I’ll not dwell further on those controversies.

Eventually, the UC-wide politics of computing got me fired rather suddenly in 1974 from my position as (by then “academic”) computer center director at UCSD, and I took a sabbatical leave in residence. I turned to the goal of applying the best of currently available computers to improved teaching of large introductory programming courses. By then Computer Science was becoming recognized as a legitimate research discipline at the better universities worldwide, although people’s models of what that meant were, and are still, amazingly diverse. Niklaus Wirth, at ETH in Zurich, had published a book describing his new language Pascal, which owed its beginnings to the ALGOL project. Wirth’s student Urs Ammann had written a virtual machine program, in Pascal itself, with instructions on how to implement Pascal on almost any computer of the day. At about the same time, the first desktop microcomputer, the MITS ALTAIR, had been introduced as a commercial product by a small group in Albuquerque. At UCSD we implemented the Pascal virtual machine first on a classroom full of Digital Equipment PDP-11’s. We then went on to implement the same software on roughly 10 of the rapidly emerging commercial microprocessor models coming from various vendors. We proved that the same
complex software, without modification above the virtual machine, could be run on almost any computer the industry cared to produce.

That’s where we got in trouble with the distinction between engineering and technology. We had licensed the UCSD Pascal software to over 500 commercial firms, for a small royalty fee that supported the 50 or so students we employed as programmers. UC-wide forced us to license the project away to a commercial vendor because of fears of federal tax consequences. We tried to interest people named Gates and Jobs to license the software for small royalties to be paid to the University. Jobs agreed, and UCSD was sold with the Apple computers for several years. Gates declined, following the game plan that eventually made his Microsoft a monopoly. At the time, both Gates and Jobs were building small start-up companies in their respective garages. After six months of negotiation controlled by the UC-wide patents office, we licensed the UCSD Pascal system to a commercial software vendor well known to us from contacts related to the ARPAnet. That vendor failed to understand the rapidly changing market environment for buyers of microcomputers. IBM introduced the Personal Computer, and decided to deliver it with three separate operating systems. One was UCSD Pascal, one was Microsoft’s DOS, and the third was CPM from Digital Research. Gates gave IBM a royalty free license, but retained rights to sell for royalties to all other vendors. The UCSD licensee tried to maximize the royalties both IBM and other vendors paid. The result was that our licensee went bankrupt near the end of 1983.

The sudden drop in income caused the collapse of most of our UCSD Pascal project at UCSD. That led me to join the effort to promote and use the technically superior Ada language. I started a company called TeleSoft, which became one of a small number of the world’s leading suppliers of compilers for the Ada language. The “Tele” in the name was because we had an initial business plan that emphasized the delivery of software products to buyers using public communications — i.e., plain old telephone service then, and InterNet today. We were too early with that goal, and business reality quickly forced us to concentrate on the Ada compilers. I took early retirement from UCSD in 1984 to concentrate on TeleSoft, then sold my interest in the company to Swedish Telephones in 1989. By then, control of the company was in the hands of the venture capitalists, with some of the consequences reflected in the news of high-tech businesses in the last couple of years. On one of my projects, I created a browser program using Ada, mainly as a teaching tool. That didn’t last very long, because Mark Andreeson created Mozilla at the University of Illinois, and shortly after that started Netscape. Microsoft reinvented Netscape and its product, not Andreeson’s, enjoys the monopoly today. Ada is still being used, refined, and promoted — but at a level that’s just a small sideshow of the computer software industry. The Defense Department long since gave up trying to force its software to be developed using the much less error-prone discipline provided by using Ada. I continued to work as a consulting contractor on the international committee refining the ISO and ANSI standard definitions of Ada until 1995.

So in the computer field, the statistics suggest that one can “win a few, but lose quite a few others.” The outcomes of most struggles depend more on marketing skills than technical merits.

Today I’m enjoying the benefits of 2003 technology in the pursuit of digital photography — mainly birds and wildflowers. Last year, the Jicamarca Radar Observatory in Peru staged an international conference to celebrate the 40th anniversary of when we finished building, and started using that facility. I was delighted, and amazed (but more than a little wistful) that routine observations are being done there now, aided by today’s desktop scale computers, that are squeezing vastly more useful details about atmospheric science than we were ever able to do with the computers of the 1960’s. But the industrial size electronics, and the huge antenna, are still operating essentially as we built them.

Ken Bowles’ Antenna Array in Peru

Ken standing (20 years ago) in front of a big background photo of Ada Lovelace (daughter of Lord Byron) after whom the Ada Programming Language was named.

Jicamarca Radar Observatory in Peru
In the October 16 issue of the *NY Times*, the Bush administration is reported to have said that the Medicare premium will rise next year to $66.60 a month, an increase of 13.5%. There are members of Congress that wish to have elderly people with “high incomes” pay larger premiums for Medicare than those with lower incomes.

The open enrollment brochures for 2004 have already been distributed. For active employees, UC is already proposing a graduated scheme of payments for the medical plans based on yearly salary. A number of the UC-sponsored medical plans are Blue Cross plans. In a recent issue of the *NY Times* it was noted that Anthem expects to buy out Wellpoint (which operates Blue Cross of California). Both companies have converted various Blue Cross units into for-profit companies. Dr. Donald Palmisano, president of the American Medical Association, said the merger leads to concerns that “the country is headed toward a health care system dominated by a few publicly traded companies that operate primarily in the interest of the shareholders.” The merger would create the nation’s largest health insurer.

On October 2, 2003, Marjorie Caserio and I had attended a joint meeting of the Council of University of California Emeriti Associations (CUCEA) and the Council of University of California Retirement Associations (CUCRA). This was apparently the first joint meeting of the two associations and was held at UC Riverside. There were two sessions: a joint session in the morning and separate meetings of the representatives of the two associations in the afternoon. After a continental breakfast there were greetings by the Riverside host committee and the UC Riverside Chancellor. This was followed by remarks of a health-benefits representative on the 2004 plan costs for UC California annuitants.

There is now a tighter Medicare requirement by the University. If you qualify for Medicare part A, you will have to sign up for Medicare part B. If you don’t, you will lose UC coverage. The University apparently has had some difficulty in its negotiations with Kaiser. There does seem to be something strange about some of the Kaiser rates — rates with Medicare cited there are higher than rates without Medicare. As a positive development, members of Blue Cross plans will be able to pick up a 90-day supply of drugs at various UC Medical Center pharmacies instead of ordering them by mail.

The later half of the morning session of the CUCEA meeting was devoted to a report from the treasurer’s office on current investment strategies of the university and possible changes in Money Market Funds investment and Multi Asset Funds structure. The report was presented in an articulate manner by David Russ, Treasurer of the Regents and Vice President for Investments. There was a focus on two brochures: the first an Investment Performance Summary Report of the UC Regents’ Committee on Investments; the second a UC Managed Funds Semiannual Report. Russ stated that the retirement investments are still in a good state, in spite of the debacle on Wall Street of the past few years. Access to a good deal of information about UC and its investments and investment policy can be obtained on the internet at http://www.ucop.edu/treasurer/. Russ suggested that one could also contact him directly at David.Russ@ucop.edu.

The budget crisis facing the University is the worst in UC’s history. In the past, UC was able to fulfill its commitment of offering admission to the top 1/8 of California’s high school graduates. The 2003-04 budget indicates that the state does not plan to fund UC’s enrollment increases this coming year, so that as many as 5,000 of more than 45,000 newly admitted students may not enroll. The enrollment limit is currently under discussion by the Regents, the Administration and the Academic Senate of UC. For your information, as of September 1, Lawrence Pitts, professor neurological surgery at UCSF is Academic Senate Chair and George Blumenthal, UCSC professor astronomy is Vice Chair.

At the afternoon session of the CUCEA meeting we heard reports on activities of the emeriti associations on the various UC campuses. In addition, we were told that a biennial request for biobibliography reports is being sent to each campus for distribution to emeriti, and it is hoped that a greater number will respond than have responded to previous requests. At the end of the meeting, Adrian Harris of the joint Benefits Committee expressed concern about the difficulty people who retired 25 or more years ago are having in making ends meet, and he suggested that these people might be treated differently from those who retired more recently.

We note with sadness the death of our esteemed fellow faculty, Patrick Ledden and Marshall Rosenbluth.

Two UCSD emeriti, Robert Engle and Clive Granger, won the Nobel prize in economics for their development and application of methods in time series analysis to problems in economics.

In many ways we’ve had too exciting a year, what with elections, wild fires, war, etc. Our hope is for a more stable and peaceful year with broad prosperity for California and the nation.
A representative of the UCSD Retirement Association attended the recent meeting of the Executive Committee of our Emeriti Association. Her purpose: to extend a warm invitation to all emeriti to join the Retirement Association ($35/year), to hand out a two-color brochure about their organization and a sample of their three-color newsletter, Retirement Association Gazette, and to invite all emeriti to attend their 2003 Holiday Party at the Faculty Club on Friday, December 5 ($10/person).

In addition to its glitzy newsletter, the Retirement Association offers its members a number of interest groups: the sample newsletter describes a Writing Club, a Golf Group, a Poker Group, a Book Club, and a “Gone Fishing” group that plans a variety of fishing trips.

The Retirement Association sponsors special classes for members (e.g., introduction to E-mail), a winery tour, and announces needs for volunteers: for UCSD’s Open House, Preuss School mentoring, Early Academic Outreach assistance, and blood donation.

All in all, it is an impressive list of activities for retirees that our own organization has not matched, so it is not surprising that some emeriti have chosen to join them. At this point, we don’t know how many have joined the Retirees rather than, or in addition to, our own Emeriti Association. When our Executive Committee has discussed offering a comparable set of activities (say, with chess rather than fishing, learning the wonders of Google or Microsoft Excel rather than elementary e-mail, investment club rather than blood donation?) to our members, we have been loath to act without some indication from the membership that such activities would be welcomed.

Our organization’s constitution and bylaws indicate that our obligation is to serve the welfare of our members and their spouses, even after the member dies. Maybe what we are doing now is enough, but the Retirees Association gives an indication of some of the additional things we might consider.

I’m pretty sure that nothing more will be done unless members somehow ask more of their organization. One way for them to do that would be to address their suggestions and proposals to me, as a Letter to the Editor, or to Murray Rosenblatt, mrosenblatt@ucsd.edu, as President of the UCSD Emeriti Association.

Leonard Newmark, ldnewmark@ucsd.edu