Chronicles

Newsletter of the UCSD Emeriti Association

Volume IV, No. 3 March 2005

Private Fund Raising And the Public University: An Exchange

Dear Chancellor **Fox**,

I've been a University of California person for fifty years: a Ph.D. from Berkeley and professorships at Davis and San Diego. It doesn't take so long a memory to remember when California taxpayers felt pride and privilege in supporting its distinguished system of higher education. Now, reading the report on "The Campaign for UCSD," I'm beginning to wonder how different our state university is from private universities, with their annual fund raising drives among parents, alumni, and local elites. The University of California became perhaps the greatest state (i.e., public) university without its prestige depending on the endowment of Chairs and other luxury boxes from the deep pockets of private donors. At the recent ceremonies welcoming you as our new Chancellor, the speakers were business leaders and an alumni association official, all involved in private fund raising. Representatives of the students and faculty were notably absent from the podium.

Let me be clear: I have no beef with private philanthropy; it ennobles wealth (although its greatest ennoblement is anonymous giving). But when a state university begins to depend on it, it loses something essential to its public character. A state university is indebted to "the people," the taxpayers, for which it owes them nothing in return but public service: educating their children and enriching the state and the nation materially and culturally with our research and creativity. If there is no such thing as a free lunch, what does the university owe to its private benefactors? Favoring some curricula over others? Schools and buildings named for them? **Carnegie**,

[Continued on p.2]

Bennett M. Berger

Dear Professor **Berger**,

Chancellor Fox asked me to respond to your e-mail, in which you raised concerns about the extent to which the Campaign for UCSD might be obviating our essential commitment to the public and the taxpayers of the state.

I recognize that every institution can lose sight of its core values from time to time and is well served by people like you who are willing to raise probing questions about "mission drift." I will attempt to answer those questions in forthright manner.

First of all, let's put our $1 billion goal in some perspective. About one-third of the gifts we receive in this campaign are deferred; we will realize no income from them until the death of the donors. The majority of deferred income, therefore, will be spread over a 10-20 year period. The remaining $660 million in pledges will be paid over a five-year pledge period. The actual cash that we will receive in any given year, therefore, could fluctuate from $100-$150 million. While such funds are critically important in augmenting other sources of funds, and in allowing us to innovate in select areas, they are dwarfed within the University's $1.8 billion budget need.

The event that you mention in which only the Foundation, Alumni Association, and business community were present on the stage was only one of scores of events that were designed to introduce Chancellor Fox to UCSD and the extended community. The event in question was designed primarily for those constituencies represented on the stage. The vast majority of events designed for other segments of the community have included broader

[Continued on p.2]

James M. Langley

*[**Berger** from p. 1]*

Mellon, **Rockefeller** have universities named for them, to say nothing of **Leland Stanford**, **Elihu Yale**, and **John Harvard**. State universities, you'd think, would use different criteria, for example buildings and other facilities named for the university's leaders and its most distinguished scholars and scientists. With all due respect to the admirable philanthropy of **Irwin Jacobs** (and others), it pleases me that UCSD is (not) yet called Qualcomm Unical, though that seems to be the direction in which we are moving.

Is this trend part of the increasing sanctity of "privatization" and the corresponding decline of tax-supported institutions? Isn't there something ominous that in an enormously wealthy state like California the legislature must recurrently plead poverty while private donors support a billion-dollar fund raising drive? For decades, the university's lobbyists in Sacramento were successful in persuading the legislature that generous appropriations to the university were a sound investment in the state's future. We of course know some of the reasons that have made taxation anathema, and bottom-line mentalities must be respected to some extent. But at what financial point will the University of California cease being a "state" university? Why are there so few voices raising these questions?

Bennett M. Berger
Professor Emeritus of Sociology

*[**Langley** from p. 1]*

representation on stage including faculty, students and staff, so please don't impute an overarching theme or trend to a single event.

Like you, I worry that our success in fund raising might cause the state to retreat from its core commitments but the sad fact is that state support has dwindled to but 14 percent of our budget during a decade when student enrollment is climbing from 20,000 to 30,000 which, in turn, necessitates the hiring of no less than 500 additional faculty. If we do not secure other sources of support in this crucial period, we risk a diminution of quality and a squandering of a great legacy. We continue to press our elected officials for greater public support while pursuing other sources of support.

However, we are not so desperate to raise money that we are willing to sell our soul. For instance, we have a faculty committee in place which reviews all proposed "naming opportunities." If they are in any way uncomfortable with affixing a particular name to a particular facility, we will decline the gift. In addition, we do not solicit corporations for naming gifts. We believe that the facilities should be named for individuals only and that these individuals must pass muster with our faculty. I have turned down gift offers where I thought the donor wanted too much recognition for the proposed gift or where I believed that we could not associate the university with a particular source. When I arrived at UCSD, for instance, I was distressed to see Health Sciences accepting money from Metabolife. In that instance, I thought, Metabolife's motive for giving was to establish credibility for a questionable product by attaching itself to a prestigious university. I directed that no subsequent gifts be accepted despite repeated entreaties from their executives. Since then, the danger of that product has been well-documented.

As a scion of an Irish immigrant family and one who received his education at public universities with the help of the GI Bill, I have committed my career to advancing the mission of public universities. I believe the Morrill Act of 1862, establishing land-grant colleges, including the University of California, was one of the most enlightened and significant legislative acts in the history of this democracy. Public universities play an indispensable role in expanding opportunity and strengthening the democratic franchise. I wouldn't sacrifice that for all the money in the world. I would not be motivated to serve a public university that sought to relinquish that precious responsibility.

But yes, we should worry about the loss of our public identity. Our campaign, however, is not the culprit. It is not moving us toward privatization; we are asking private partners to preserve and protect our public mission until such time that the leadership of this state realizes that it is in our collective best interest to more fully support public higher education.

I agree that too few people have raised these questions. I applaud you for doing so. I believe we share the same values and concerns.

James M. Langley, Vice Chancellor, External Relations

*[**Berger** response]*

Dear Vice Chancellor **Langley**,
Thanks for your reply to my letter to **Marye Anne Fox**. At least it's not a canned PR response — which I half expected. It seems thoughtful and sincere and I'm grateful for that. You will pardon me if I still think that the university's resources in prestige and persuasive argument should be increasingly directed at the legislature and the taxpayers themselves — efforts to convince them that their investment in UC has paid large dividends for decades and, with their help, will continue to, even when private wealth no longer fixes its watery eyes on us.

Bennett M. Berger

Let Roger Speak for Himself

—by Walter Munk

Remarks at the 40th Anniversary Celebration Symposia of the founding of Revelle College, 11 January 2005.

In 1991, **Roger Revelle** received the National Medal of Science from President **George Bush** I "for his pioneering work in the areas of carbon dioxide and climate modifications." In Roger's words, replying to a reporter, "I got the medal for being the grandfather of the Greenhouse Effect."

Roger Revelle

It is fitting that a Revelle College celebration should combine a symposium on Global Warming with a tribute to Roger the man.

In the spring of 1953, the Scripps ship *R.V. Horizon* pulled into the harbor of Pango-Pango (now called Pago Pago) in the Samoa Islands. She was homeward bound from having participated in Operation Ivy Mike, a 10.4 megaton thermonuclear explosion (the largest ever) in the Pacific Proving Grounds at Eniwetok Atoll. Scripps Director Revelle was expedition leader; our participation in the nuclear test had paid for the four months of science on the way home. At the time, American Samoa was a U.S. territory. Waiting on the dock was a representative from the Governor's office. "Do you want to visit a native village?" he asked. "We will be received by the High Chief of the village, and the Talking Chief," he explained to Roger. "In accordance with Samoan tradition, the Talking Chief will do all the talking, the High Chief remains silent. We need to follow custom, so I will be your Talking Chief."

After we were greeted and seated on the ground, the Samoan Talking Chief asked some very sensible questions about the Scripps Capricorn Expedition, and received only feeble replies from the Governor's representative. I was sitting next to Roger, who was getting more and more agitated. He finally burst out: "That's not what we do at all. Here is what we are doing . . ." Chancellor **Fox**, I regret to have to tell you that from this moment on, the prestige of Scripps within the Samoan Islands Archipelago, in fact the standing of *any* member of the UCSD community, was forever tarnished.

A decade later, following a tumultuous meeting with Regent Chairman **Ed Pauley**, Roger was passed over as candidate for UCSD chancellor. (The job went to **Herb York**, whom Roger greatly admired, and they became close friends.) Roger went to Harvard as Richard Saltonstall Professor of Population Policy. (Among his undergraduate students was the future Vice President **Albert Gore.)** Roger and **Ellen** greatly enjoyed their ten years of life in Cambridge, but in 1975 they returned to La Jolla where Roger was appointed Professor of Science and Public Policy.

Three months before Roger's death in 1991, **S. Fred Singer** came here to ask him to review the Singer manuscript, "What to do about Greenhouse Warming; Look before you Leap," eventually published in the *Cosmos Club Journal.* As a courtesy, Singer included Roger as an author (we know that Roger was not happy about this but he was too ill to make a fuss). The paper included the sentence: "The scientific basis for Greenhouse Warming is too uncertain to justify drastic action at this time."

This sentence became an issue at the presidential election of 1992. In his campaign for the Vice Presidency, Gore had quoted Roger in support of a proposed protocol for limiting the emission of greenhouse gases. The Republican candidate objected (quoting the above sentence), noting that Roger had changed his mind. Years later at a memorial ceremony (*Science with a Human Face; in Honor of Roger Randall Revelle*) held at the Harvard School of Public Health, I said, about the campaign incident: "Roger did not need a Samoan Talking Chief to explain the goals of the Scripps Capricorn Expedition; he did not need Fred Singer to tell us about the appropriate response to global warming; let Roger speak for himself." By this time Fred Singer, who was in the audience, was on his feet to protest. But the fact is that just a month prior to Singer's visit, Roger had attended a joint meeting in London of the Royal Society and the American Philosophical Society where he voiced the urgent need for certain types of atmospheric measurements. Roger's strongly held conviction called for *informed activism*, a combination of scientific research and public policy action, a view he held at the time of his death.

Not much has changed. Fred Singer is still a leader among the climate change skeptics, and Presidents still doubt the need for action. This fall, Russian Prime Minister **Mikhail Fradkov** presided

over a heated parliamentary debate on the Kyoto protocol. And just a few months ago, **Tony Blair** reported to Parliament that "apart from a diminishing handful of skeptics, there is a virtual worldwide scientific consensus on the scope of the problem [of man-made global warming]." I read the Prime Minister's detailed discussion with amazement; we are not accustomed to hear Heads of State speak in so informed a manner on science issues.

In 1968, when Roger received the Bowie Medal of the American Geophysical Union, I wrote in the citation: "Roger Revelle belongs to a nearly extinct breed of scientists called naturalists. He has pursued the study of the planet Earth with romantic attachment and dogged determination. On problems concerning a balanced judgment of its geology, chemistry, biology and physics, he is probably without peer." But Roger did not need **Munk** to speak for him. In his response, Roger said: "My chief feeling is how lucky I have been. Lucky to have been an oceanographer instead of a geologist, so I didn't have to get scared to death climbing precipices. Lucky to have become an oceanographer at the time I did, when even a poorly educated and not overly bright geologist could find out interesting and important things about the Earth beneath the sea. Lucky, above all, in the people I worked with."

Emeriti Website

The UCSD Emeriti Association maintains a website, http://emeriti.ucsd.edu/. Under the rubric NEWS, PROGRAMS & MEETINGS past issues of ***Chronicles*** are available.

Anecdotage

—by Sandy Lakoff

A Shanghai Institute of Higher Education recently put out a ranking of the world's top 500 universities. It's being circulated by someone at Stanford, which is understandable inasmuch as Stanford came in second, behind Harvard. UCSD finished pretty well too — thirteenth, just behind Cornell, and ahead of such venerable academic siblings as Tokyo University, UCLA, Penn, and Michigan, along with the other 483. The url for the complete list is ed.sjtu.edu.cn/ranking.htm.

◆◆◆

Mention of Cornell brings to mind a song parody several of us wrote for the La Jollywood Revue produced by **Connie Mullin** a while back, based on the famous Cornell anthem that starts, "Far above Cayuga's waters." The parody grows more apt every day. Here's half the first stanza:

High above the blue Pacific
Stands a school that's great.
Values there are quite terrific
— at least in real estate!

◆◆◆

And then there is the story they tell in the woodsy wilds of Ithaca. It seems that when **Ezra Cornell** got the idea to found the university, he told his friends it would be the world's greatest, with the most sought after faculty and student body. Best of all, he added, it would be small. But if it's going to be that attractive, they asked, how are you going to keep it small? "I haven't told you where I'm going to put it," Ezra is said to have replied, no doubt with a faraway look in his eye.

◆◆◆

That paper from New York may have "all the news that's fit to print," but give the *London Daily Telegraph* a toast for what might be described as "inventive journalism" for printing a cheeky spoof claiming that "binge drinking" is named for the Hon. Christopher Binge, supposedly a bibulous eighteenth century aristocrat. He is also said to have served as Admiral of the Fleet until he was forced to resign after leading a bombardment of Lisbon. He claimed in his defense that he had been intending to bombard Dieppe, as ordered, but the two places looked much the same on the map, and any way what difference did it make? And oh, yes — this purported report adds — "bingo" started life as "binge," so named because it was designed as a pastime for those "whom alcohol had rendered incapable of sustained thought." Right, and the first publisher of the *Telegraph* was actually **Samuel F. B. Morse**, from whom we get the word "morsel," as in a morsel of truth consisting of a tissue of lies. . . .

◆◆◆

And finally, for all you fans of cryptic crossword puzzles, a clue: In Southern California city, men have what it takes, i.e., gonads! (3, 4). Hint: Look for the anagram.

Mark Your Calendar!

UCSD Emeriti Association Meeting

Wednesday, March 16
4:00-5:00 PM

Price Center
(room to be announced)
Harold Simon, M.D.
"UC Health Care and Other Welfare Issues: An Update"

Frontiers of Medicine

Advances in Neurosurgery

—by John Alksne

Stereotactic Brain Stimulation and Radiosurgery

Two very important advances in neurosurgery — Brain Stimulation and Radiosurgery — involve a similar technique called "stereotactic," a term which means that the surgery is performed with the help of a precise guidance system based on MRI or CT images of the patient's own brain anatomy.

For decades neurosurgeons have been placing needles in the brains of patients in an effort to improve symptoms of disorders which are not responding to medications, such as Parkinson's Disease and Intractable Pain. In the past these needles were used to destroy nerve cells or nerve fiber pathways that evidence suggested were contributing to the symptoms. The damage was usually created by heating the needle tip with an electric current, though some neurosurgeons have also used mechanical means such as inflating a balloon or rotating a loop of wire. One major disadvantage of these procedures has been that the damage once produced is irreversible.

Currently, with a combination of creativity and improved technology, neurosurgeons are moving to Brain Stimulation as an alternative. By using smaller needles and weaker electric currents, the stimulation can activate or block nerve transmission without causing damage. Therefore, the treatment is reversible, so that if the desired effect is not obtained the current can be altered or turned off and the needle moved to a new location if appropriate. In addition, the parameters of stimulation can be adjusted very specifically to the symptoms of the patient. Therefore, stimulation can be used like a medicine, and tailored to the patient's needs and intensified if the symptoms get worse with time. As a result, stimulation has both reduced the risk to the patient and improved outcomes. It has also opened the door to attempt treatment of more complex conditions such as epilepsy and psychiatric disorders.

If the target for either destructive lesions or stimulation is deep in the brain, the electrodes are inserted stereotactically. Therefore, the new treatment is frequently referred to as Stereotactic Deep Brain Stimulation, or simply Deep Brain Stimulation. Stimulation can also be applied to the surface of the brain which is then called Cortical Stimulation.

The second technique is called Stereotactic Radiosurgery. It was developed in the early 1960's by Dr. **Lars Leksell** in Stockholm. His concept was to be able to create a lesion deep in the brain without having to cut the skin, drill a hole through the skull, or pass any metal object into the brain. He achieved this goal by utilizing highly focused and very powerful gamma ray radiation aimed stereotactically at the intended target. In order to obtain a high dose of radiation at the target with a non-injurious dose at all other parts of the brain and scalp, his team developed a steel helmet containing 201 pencil-lead-sized sources of radioactive cobalt distributed throughout the helmet, but meticulously engineered with the help of trigonometry so that they are all aimed at the center of a theoretical sphere. Therefore, the only target that receives a significant dose of radiation is the focal point where all the beams converge. Using the same principles as were used for stereotactic needle placement, he was able to position the target at the focal point and the physicists were able to calculate how long the patient should be held in that position to received a prescribed dose of radiation. Subsequently, other methods of providing Stereotactic Radiosurgery have also been developed.

Currently, Stereotactic Radiosurgery is rarely used for Functional Neurosurgery, Parkinson's Disease, and pain, because Deep Brain Stimulation is safer and has better outcomes, but Stereotactic Radiosurgery has blossomed as a highly effective and minimally invasive treatment for small brain tumors and vascular malformations. As a result, many patients with small tumors or vascular malformations in difficult-to-expose locations can be treated without open surgery. The most common of these are Acoustic Neuromas, which arise from the nerve passing from the inner ear to the brain, Skull Base Meningiomas, which arise from the skull lining under the brain, and Metastatic Cancers to the Brain originating in other organs. All that is required is the ability to visualize the abnormality on an MRI or CT scan so that the targeting can be accomplished. The size limitation is a function of the total dose of radiation required for treatment and the risk of damaging adjacent structures. Recently, Stereotactic Radiosurgery has also become popular for the treatment of Trigeminal Neuralgia, an extremely painful affliction of the face. The nerve is easily visualized with an MRI scan, and a focal dose of radiation can quiet the hyperactive nerve.

What If . . . It *Had* Happened Here?

Philip Roth, *The Plot Against America* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2004), 391 pages.
—by Sandy Lakoff

Philip Roth, who made his debut with the comic novels *Goodbye Columbus* and *Portnoy's Complaint*, has grown more serious with age. Now he has turned out a work of fiction in a genre known to historians as "counterfactual" or "allohistorical" — or in other words, "What if?" What if, Roth wonders, isolationist forces in America had defeated **FDR** in 1940 and elected **Charles Lindbergh** president on a platform of peace through appeasement?

Roth spins out the consequences for a lower middle-class secularized Jewish family like his own — or mine. He grew up in Newark, New Jersey, at the same time I did across Newark Bay in Bayonne. In the novel, the Roth family's father is a grade-school-educated insurance salesman named Herman, as — in all respects— was mine; the elder son is named Sanford (better known as Sandy); and the younger son, the narrator, Philip — my younger brother George's middle name. The family's maternal grandparents are said to have come from Kiev in the 1890's, as did our paternal grandparents. These uncanny coincidences suggest Roth's sure feel for his characters, as does his convincing reconstruction of time and place and the fantasies, hobbies, and mischief of adolescent boys.

As reviewers have pointed out, the theme is not unprecedented and the premise is not altogether far-fetched. In 1935 **Sinclair Lewis** had gone even further in imaging a fascist takeover, in *It Can't Happen Here*. In 1940, isolationism was as powerful a force as it had been twenty years before when **Woodrow Wilson** met defeat trying to sell the country on the League of Nations. Just as Wilson had promised in 1916, FDR pledged "a-gain and a-gain" that he would keep America neutral. He had been elected to cope with the Great Depression, not to embroil America in foreign quarrels. But when war broke out in 1939, he set out to persuade Americans that a defeat of Britain and France would threaten our own security, and some of his critics, including Lindbergh, claimed that sinister Jewish influences were trying to push the U.S. into a confrontation with Germany.

The actual role of Jews in American government at the time was pathetically limited but easily exaggerated because of the prominence of a few leading figures, mainly well-assimilated Jews of older, German-Jewish stock (like **Brandeis**, **Frankfurter**, **Morgenthau**, **Lehman**, **Lippmann**, and **Baruch**). Compared to other interest groups, Jews as an ethnic minority had little if any political clout. In 1939 their clerical spokesmen pleaded in vain for the admission of 20,000 refugee Jewish children. Fearing that it would be a divisive issue, FDR refused his support. Even in December 1942, when Rabbi **Stephen Wise** came to the White House with incontrovertible evidence of the Nazi plan to exterminate Europe's Jews, neither FDR nor the State Department made so much as a public statement about it, and Congress refused to loosen restrictions on immigration.

FDR was sympathetic but afraid to stoke the fires of anti-Semitism. In the 1920's, **Henry Ford**, then the most popular man in America, had circulated a version of *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, the forgery detailing a Jewish plot to dominate the world. Ford was among the supporters of America First, formed in 1940 (at the Yale Law School, no less) to mobilize anti-war sentiment, and "Lucky Lindy," the "eagle of the USA," was its most forceful spokesman. In speech after speech, Lindbergh warned that "the Jewish race," through the "powerful elements" in control of "much of the machinery of influence and propaganda," was promoting war with Germany for its own interests, "for reasons which are not American."

Lindbergh's attacks on the Jews drew strong rebukes but reflected a widespread supposition. **William Allen White**, the renowned Kansas editor, reproved him for "injecting the Nazi race issue into American politics." Secretary of the Interior **Ickes** called him "the No. 1 United States Nazi fellow traveler." The newspapers owned by the isolationists **Hearst** and **McCormick** repudiated the effort to single out the Jews. But the idea that they were manipulating the government was anything but unthinkable. The New Deal was sometimes caricatured as "the Jew Deal" and **Roosevelt**'s real name was rumored to be Rosenfeld. The German-American Bund campaigned for "a free Gentile-ruled United States." In 1941, Congressman **Rankin** of Mississippi, who frequently peppered his remarks on the floor of the House with references to "kikes" and "niggers," denounced "Wall Street and a little group of our Jewish brethren" for trying to get us into the war. **Burton K. Wheeler** of Montana, a Democrat who supported FDR in 1932, broke with him over foreign policy and aligned himself with open anti-Semites. Roth has him picked to be Lindbergh's Vice President.

When the Japanese struck Pearl Harbor and **Hitler** honored the Axis Pact by declaring war on the U.S.,

America First dissolved overnight. Even so, hostility to Jews remained virulent. The historian **Leonard Dinnerstein** found that it was more widespread during the war years than before. In 1942, Father **Coughlin**'s weekly *Social Justice*, with a circulation of 1.2 million, ran 102 anti-Jewish articles, among them one that accused Jews of starting the war. And as late as April 1945 — when it was finally withdrawn under protest — an Armed Forces correspondence course for soldiers included the statement that "the genuine American is essentially Nordic, preferably Protestant . . . The Jew is an offensive fellow unwelcome in this country."

With such feelings rampant, Roth depicts a Lindbergh administration immediately signing "Understandings" with Germany and Japan, "making the U.S. a party to the Axis alliance in all but name," appointing Henry Ford to replace Ickes, and setting up an "Office of American Absorption." The mission of the OAA is to remove Jewish boys from their own families and put them to work as field hands and day laborers with farm families hundreds of miles away. The goal is to create an Americanized Aryan monoculture purged of Jewish influence. Later comes "Homestead 42," a program to relocate whole families of Jews, which some suspect is the prelude to their sequestration in concentration camps. In several cities mobs attack Jewish homes and synagogues in imitation of *Kristallnacht*. The columnist/broadcaster **Walter Winchell**, who speaks out against Lindbergh, is assassinated.

The novel describes the family's anguish, caught between the old America they knew and loved, and the pressure to adapt to the new order. The re-education program sets children against parents. A few neighbors flee to Canada. Some in the family collaborate, out of opportunism and acceptance of the official line that the aim is to "incorporate" Jews into American life, not to deprive them of their civil rights, as in Germany. Others resist, fearing that Jews are being lulled into accepting a plan that will end with their destruction by Hitler, with Lindbergh's connivance. The resisters hope that liberal forces will somehow regain control. But matters go from bad to worse until Lindbergh's luck runs out and he disappears, apparently because of an airplane accident, and a tumultuous aftermath ends with the reelection of FDR. The Japanese then attack and history is back on its actual course.

In reality, of course, Lindbergh was rejected in 1940 as the Republican nominee in favor of **Wendell Willkie**, who was defeated by FDR, and Pearl Harbor made a scapegoat of Japanese Americans rather than the Jews. And the fact that Americans had fought and died to defeat the Nazis, coupled with the discovery of the horrors of the Holocaust, helped make open hostility to Jews disrespectable. By 1956, a sociologist found that organized anti-Semitism was confined to the lunatic fringe. Quotas in colleges and universities and residential restrictive covenants were overthrown — thanks in no small part to champions of toleration and human rights like **Roger Revelle**. Since then, surveys have shown a continuing decline in negative stereotypes of Jews and a corresponding rise in acceptance, as was evident politically in 2000 when the candidacy of **Joseph Lieberman** helped rather than hindered the **Gore** campaign. Still, it is sobering to think what might have happened had history taken the different spin Philip Roth has given it.

A photo taken by **Lea Rudee** in 1991 depicting illegal immigrants running past the fence by the Tijuana River. It is included in an exhibit Lea has organized that includes more of his images of the Tijuana River, as well as contributions by **Phel Steinmetz** of UCSD's Visual Arts Department and **Paul Ganster** of SDSU. The exhibit, titled "Border Lands," is on display in the Geisel Library until March 20.

UCSD Emeriti Association
214 University Center, UCSD
La Jolla, California 92093-0002

RETURN SERVICE REQUESTED

Inauguration of the Chancellor March 3, 2005

Chronicles

Newsletter of the UCSD Emeriti Association