President’s Letter

A Place of Our Own . . . and Soon!

By Jack Fisher

Professor Emeritus of Medicine
and President, the UCSD Emeriti Association

My title is only slightly misleading. The “Retirement Center” announced last spring by my predecessor, Mary Corrigan, is soon to become a reality! In it, for the first time, the Emeriti Association will have what Virginia Woolf famously said every woman needs: a room of her own – though ours, of course, will be coed. The Center won’t be ours exclusively. We will share it with the Retirement Association. This arrangement will not only give us a place to hang our hats, keep our records, and meet, but also the major benefit of sharing administrative staff with the RA, which has a large membership and whose talented Executive Director, Suzan Cioffi, runs a tight ship.

Mary started the ball rolling last spring, and I can report some amazing progress this past summer. Chancellor Marye Anne Fox honored us with a very fast response – inside of two weeks – after Bob Oakes, current RA President, and I submitted our proposal. Both the concept and the particulars were then discussed at a meeting of Vice Chancellors, and we were asked to work out the details for enacting the plan with VCs Marsha Chandler and Steve Relyea at summer’s end.

Our proposal calls for an entirely new administrative unit that combines budget lines currently held by Human Resources and the Academic Senate. Because we are following precedents established at several other UC campuses, Bob and I are optimistic that the necessary details can be quickly ironed out. How very convenient that my RA counterpart in selling this venture to the administration is a former UC budget officer!

And what about that “place of our own?” To get a preview of the Center we believe will come into existence sometime next spring, look behind the Cashier’s Office in University Center. There you will find offices for the UCSDRA (Bldg #400) and next door, the office for CAPE, the outfit that reports on classroom teaching. When CAPE moves elsewhere, the RA space will be expanded to include room sufficient for both associations.

I thank Peter Farrell, our liaison with the RA, and Mel Green, for their help putting the proposal together. We’re still looking for a name. “Retirement Resource Center” is the current working title. We invite your comments on it and any suggestions for an alternative.

While all of this is evolving, UCSD emeriti can look forward to all of our usual activities next year with only slight modifications. At least four issues of Chronicles will be published and distributed this year. This is our most important service to emeriti because each issue reaches the largest number of members. Our regular programs will continue to be held on the second Wednesday of the month at the Faculty Club except when speaker limitations necessitate an alternate date or site. Watch your e-mail for notices 14 days in advance. The first program will be held Wednesday, October 11. The Board meets in advance from 2:30-3:30. Board meetings are open to all members. Refreshments will be served from 3:30, announcements will be made at 3:45, and the speaker will be introduced at 4:00. At least thirty minutes will be reserved for Q & A. Joe Gusfield and his Program Committee are currently inviting speakers; please forward any suggestions to him.

A major emphasis for the coming year will be the expansion of our mentoring program for students, new faculty, and staff. Mel Green has agreed to take on the project. I plan to delegate my space in the next issue of Chronicles to Mel so that he may explain what he has in mind for our consideration and active participation.

Hoping that your summer activities were as enjoyable as mine were, I look forward to seeing as many of you as possible in October at our first meeting of the year.
La Jollywood Revue: Celebrating a Twentieth Anniversary

By Constance Mullin Branscomb

In the early 1900s, on the isolated grounds of SIO – where cows lounged on the beach – there wasn’t much in the way of entertainment. The living room of Director William Ritter on the second floor of the old Scripps Building, with its piano and collection of books, was the social center of the fledgling campus, and play readings were popular. In the 1950s, however, staffer Madeleine Miller Mahken wrote and produced several original musical shows about travel adventures and many faculty, students, and staff participated. By 1985, when UCSD was well established, the natives got really restless. Oceanid Sally Spiess suggested that funds be raised for a scholarship fund by presenting a dinner and variety show to be called the “La Jollywood Revue.” I was dragooned into being the producer. Evelyn Lakoff agreed to be the piano accompanist, and Lila Butler, Mary Carol Isaacs, and Sally and Fred Spiess played significant roles in organization. And importantly, Ralph Lewin, algologist at SIO, agreed to write some material. As a result, La Jollywood Revue of 1986 was held in the small auditorium of La Jolla Congregational Church (“La Cave aux Jolles” for that evening), with many old-timers in attendance.

Several numbers from the show are particularly memorable. Who could forget “Three Little Deans from School” featuring Stan Chodorow, Harold Ticho, and Joe Watson daintily prancing and singing in their academic robes? Or the UCSD Raincoat Dance with David Miller, Barney Rickett, and David Ringrose with their Sun God paper-bag hats? Sandy Lakoff’s witty solo, “I am the Very Model of a Modern Departmental Chair” brought down the house, especially with its inspired chorus:

I am the very model of a modern departmental chair:
I rule my lair with perfect flair by sitting on my derriere!

The highlight of the evening was the “Ucsd Song” with lyrics by Ralph Lewin to Pooh Bah’s tune in the Mikado, sung by Hugh Bradner, Mike Mullin, Fried Spiess, and John Stewart which became the signature tune for subsequent revues. The first stanza went:

Some places have an acronym
Like suny, cal and mit
They’re good to shout, you spell them out –
The letters seem to fit.
But by some sad perversity
We’re clearly out of luck:
Our noble university
Abbreviates to ucsd!

For the finale, the cast did a new version of the 1920s song “In San Diego,” with a specially added stanza written by Sandy Lakoff:

S for the students at UCSD,
A for their absent-minded faculty,
N for the nudists on the beach nearby,
D for the deep blue sea and open sky,
I for the ideal beaches by the sea,
E for the eucalyptus on our malls,
G for the good times that we all enjoy,
O for Oceanids, ahoy!

Such was the success of the first revue that I was prevailed upon to produce a Medical School version sponsored by the Medical Center Auxiliary. Again, Evelyn Lakoff, accompanist, Ralph Lewin, poet and lyricist, and Mike Mullin, music director, volunteered. The “Medical School Alum” to the tune of Gaudeamus Igitur, was a big hit. Drs. Roland Blantz, Joe Ramsdell, and Duke Johnson joined in. One of the five verses went:

Cogito, et ergo sum
San Diego med. alum
Intellectus et urbanus
Noziz elbow fromizanus
Officem et clinicum:
San Diego med. alum.

The completion of the UCSD Faculty Club was cause for great celebration – and “La Jollywood Revue of 1988,” again sponsored by Oceanids, was the opening event – showing off the design of architect Robert Mosher, the delicious dinner by the catering department, and the wit and
talent at UCSD. The event on January 30 had been sold out for a week. We set up a stage along the draped windows to the courtyard, brought in a piano, and used the courtyard as backstage.

New and delayed acquisitions of the Stuart Collection were an easy target. A rhymed skit, “Talking Trees,” by Bob Boynton featured Jim Arnold and David Miller. Between several acts Barney Rickett and Lea Rudee hurried across stage carrying large signs each with a pair of words such as FAITH: GLUT; CREATIVITY: PLAGIARISM; and CHARITY: LUST.

Bass Philip Larson, accompanied by pianist Cecil Lytle, did a bravura rendition of “La Jolla,” to the tune of “Maria” from West Side Story:

Oh boya, I just paid my rent in La Jolla,  
And suddenly I see how soon my check can flee!

Sheila MacDougall again choreographed a dance number – this time to “There’s No Business Like Show Business.” The UCSDancers (Lila Butler, Jean Eppeley, Barbara Fitzsimmons, Joy Frieman, Molly Wagner, Portia Weiss, and Sheila) dressed in leotards, black tights, short skirts, and bright feather boas, flounced, kicked, and wiggled their way across stage.

Murray Goodman, newspaper in hand, assumed the role of stand-up comic in a take-off of Mort Sahl, and Ralph Lewin, dressed in a black academic robe with a 12” inflated globe as an egg atop his shoes, read his poem “Penguins.” I appeared as a French waitress to sing “Faculty Club” with words remembered by Mike from faculty shows at the University of Chicago. The first verse:

I came to the faculty club to earn an honest penny  
And partake of the scholarly atmosphere;  
When I found there wasn’t any,  
I thought I could eavesdrop on chit-chat intellectual  
But talk that scholars enjoy at lunch  
Is almost always sexual…

By 1991 enthusiasts again started asking when the next “Jollywood” would occur. To accommodate the anticipated sell-out crowd, the Oceanids committee decided to sponsor two performances – again at the Faculty Club. All the original principals were enthusiastically involved. With our past experience, we were not concerned about having only one all-cast rehearsal – the evening before “opening night.” Charlie Perrin, the evening’s Master of Ceremony, skillfully segued one act into another. Ralph Lewin gave a signature introduction to “A Little Night Music” (à la radio host Karl Haas). After an all-encompassing description of Salzburg, salt mines, and young Mozart, Evelyn Lakoff had just time enough at the end of the “broadcast” to play four measures of the piece.

Music by Sir Arthur Sullivan was again a popular source of material: SIO Director Ed Frieman was featured in “When I was a Lad,” and John West, in “When I Was a Student.” The finale, “We’d Rather Not Go to Sea” (to the tune of “I am a Pirate King”), was sung and acted with great gusto by Colin Bloor, Hugh Bradner, Joe Reid, and Fred Spiess. The first of the four Lewin verses:

For exploration we’ve not much urge.  
We don’t like swells and can’t stand the surge.  
We never relish the pitch and toss  
We’re more of a stone that’ll gather moss  
We’d rather stick with our garden soil.  
Than rock on the ocean with bilge and oil,  
With diesel fumes and smell of swill  
We’re happier far where ground is still,  
So I’d rather not go to sea – no, no  
Whatever you think of me,  
For it doesn’t appear to agree with me  
Whenever I’m out at sea.

These are just some of the highlights I remember. What fun we had! And what university-wide conviviality! Then one day, at a memorial for Sally Spiess, Ralph Lewin asked me about producing another show – this one to coincide with the 100th Anniversary of SIO in 2003. But that story will have to wait for another issue.
By Lola Romanucci-Ross
Professor Emeritus, Family and Preventive Medicine and Associated Faculty Anthropology


How did I come to write this book? I had been thinking about a project on what became the title of my last chapter, “Logics of Discovery, Chance, and Scientific Evidence in the Court Room.” First, I needed someone to research certain court decisions, the sort of job lawyers are trained to do. Larry Tancredi, a practicing psychiatrist in Manhattan, agreed to take on the assignment. Then, I needed the inspiration to begin. This presented itself in a case, incandescent to avoid the wrath of the Church. Long frustration of those early culture heroes, under the root of modern scientific thought and the urgency and structural similarities; I do this in the first chapter with regard to the role of legal and scientific medicine as systems of thought, each with its own language, its own history and rules of inference and “truths,” and the difficulties that must inherently ensue when these two subcultures address the same problem in a court of law. However, they have different goals, one seeking “truth” in scientific accuracy, the other, to convict or exonerate the accused within the limits of proper interpretation of the law.

Anthropologists invariably compare primitive societies with our own, seeking structural similarities; I do this in the first chapter with regard to the role of legal and medical systems in other cultures. “The Romance of Science and Medicine” traces the trajectory of the merger of these two fields, emphasizing the beginnings of modern scientific thought and the urgency and frustration of those early culture heroes to avoid the wrath of the Church. Long

Patterns of Culture: Brentwood and Beyond

of thought and modes of investigation, systems which in turn influence and shape each other. As a cultural/medical anthropologist and fieldwork veteran, I watched, studied, researched, and sometimes videotaped the Simpson trial, thanks to Court TV, and also reviewed news reports, books, op-ed pieces, pundit pronouncements and letters to the editor as they occurred during the trial and beyond. When I was scheduled to lecture at the university, I recorded, and continued my “virtual field work” on weekends or evenings from the taped episodes.

This particular “trial of the century” had many informative facets, all of cultural significance. Actually, there were two simultaneous trials, one in Judge Ito’s court in Los Angeles, the other in the “court of public opinion,” and the latter had the stronger influence. Poll after poll indicated that only 4% of the U.S. population followed the trial as it unfolded in the courtroom, with a much smaller number in that 4% following all of it. Yet, after the jury decision, almost all respondents had a very strong opinion about the outcome: 80% of whites thought Simpson guilty, and among blacks the same percentage thought him innocent.

Most who judged him guilty gave as the reason for their opinion “OJ’s DNA.” As for the formal trial, defense lawyers Barry Scheck and Peter Neufeld and their formidable team of scientific experts emphatically out-lawyered and out-scientificed the prosecution team, reducing to rubble the “mountain of evidence” presented by the prosecution. But the court of public opinion did not seem to take note of that, or perhaps did not understand the discourse of the scientific evidence. Those convinced of Simpson’s guilt tended to think that he was exonerated because he hired the best team money could buy, ignoring the fact that, the prosecution, with the awesome power of the state and state coffers behind it, spent well over twice as much.

About DNA and its uses in the trial, much is said in this book. (Thanks here to John Ross Jr. who, for the past ten years, has been steeped in molecular medicine in his research. He also provided me with valuable counsel on other aspects of modern medicine and laboratory science, which served me well throughout the other chapters. As the song goes, “It’s so nice to have a man around the house.”)

Other chapters consider law and scientific medicine as systems of thought, each with its own language, its own history and rules of inference and “truths,” and the difficulties that must inherently ensue when these two subcultures address the same problem in a court of law. However, they have different goals, one seeking “truth” in scientific accuracy, the other, to convict or exonerate the accused within the limits of proper interpretation of the law.

Anthropologists invariably compare primitive societies with our own, seeking structural similarities; I do this in the first chapter with regard to the role of legal and medical systems in other cultures. “The Romance of Science and Medicine” traces the trajectory of the merger of these two fields, emphasizing the beginnings of modern scientific thought and the urgency and frustration of those early culture heroes to avoid the wrath of the Church. Long
interested in the science and medicine of Italy in the late 13th and early 14th centuries, I refer to a secret society called "i fedeli d'amore" (those faithful in love) whose goal was to promote the study of nature and natural processes. These famous authors and scholars (Dante and Giordano Bruno among them) used codes and symbols and wrote in poetic form both to communicate with each other and in their literary works, so that they might escape detection. To accomplish this, they used the metaphor of love to describe the passion of the intellect in pursuit of knowledge.

Three chapters concern case studies of selected topics currently litigated in the courts, which test the admissibility of evidence, including the science of DNA evidence, use of brain imaging technology in analyzing criminal behavior, and the science of confinement of sex offenders. Tancred researched the cases cited in these particular chapters, and I saw my role in them as writing sections that would provide continuity with the other materials in the book.

The remaining chapters discuss the four major Supreme Court decisions on the admissibility of scientific evidence, from the Frye Rule of 1923 which required general acceptance by the scientific community, to several recent decisions relying more heavily on the Federal Rules of Evidence, and the ruling that the judge of the trial be the gatekeeper for scientific evidence admissibility (a development that Chief Justice Rehnquist said can lead only to mischief). The four decisions are presented fully in the Appendix. The last two chapters (on the Simpson case and on science in the court room) reflect a number of the themes discussed in earlier chapters.

I sent this book to the publisher with fear and trembling, wondering how it would be categorized. The publisher must have had some doubt, since it was sent to five reviewers from several different disciplines. I guess it passed the test. One of those blessed reviewers wrote, "The book bridges several disciplines, most directly law and medicine, by drawing on the strength of an important umbrella discipline – anthropology." That was what I set out to do.

**Behind the Scenes: the Dramaturg**

Mary Corrigan, Professor Emeritus of Theatre, interviews Shirley Fishman, Associate Artistic Director and Dramaturg of the La Jolla Playhouse.

**First of all, tell us what a dramaturg is.**

"Dramaturg," from "dramaturgy," or theatrical production, has come to be a fancy title for a researcher. For our recent production of *Mother Courage*, I studied the life and theories of Bertolt Brecht and the Hundred Years War. Last year, we put on a musical called Palm Beach framed in the 1930s, so I did research on how the Great Depression bypassed affluent enclaves like Palm Beach while it was devastating the rest of the country. Andre Serban, the famous director and my mentor at Columbia, taught me to try to absorb information about the subject of each play and bring it to bear on the production, so that's what I do.

**Do you do this for the Director?**

Yes, but often the Director does his or her own research as well and the set or costume designer will ask for pictures and information. Or the prop shop or one of the set designers will call if there is something they need to know. We work as a team.

**With translations, do you choose the one to use?**

For *Mother Courage*, the Director, Lisa Peterson, asked to see all the various translations. We loved David Hare's, because it was so contemporary, so alive, fresh, and dynamic. But there were a lot of Britshisms in the text so we substituted American usage in places, and Hare's agent agreed to let us make the changes. I think it's the function of the theatre to present historical plays in terms that will be vivid to contemporary audiences without distorting what the playwright is trying to convey about past events.

**How would you define the mission of the Playhouse?**

Since 9/11, there has been a huge movement to escapist entertainment. The only time I can compare it to is the '60s and '70s during the Vietnam War. That's a major reason we did *Mother Courage*. Brecht wrote this play in 1939, during the rise of Nazism, but the effects of war on society are once again a critical concern. We think theatre should address such concerns and not just offer relief from reality.

**Would you say the atmosphere here is similar to Joe Papp's Public Theatre in New York? You worked there before, didn't you?**

Yes and so did Des McAnuff and former Artistic Director Michael Greif, a graduate of UCSD. In fact he has just opened a show there. We are all members of the same tribe and our interests in theatre are similar. The Playhouse has a unique and wonderful relationship with the UCSD Theatre Department. We have students in Stage Management and the Costume Shop and the students have Residencies at the Playhouse. We have UCSD actors in our shows every year. This year we have four of them in plays – two in Zhivago, one in The Wiz, and one in *The Farnsworth Invention*. It's been enormously rewarding watching them grow and develop because they are working with a professional team of actors and they mature by leaps and bounds.

**What happens when you have a smash hit like Jersey Boys that makes huge amounts of money? Where does all that money go?**

We’ve had quite a few hits. Rent wasn’t home grown, but *Tommy* was, and so were Big River, Dracula, and Who, the musical. These productions were conceived

*Continued on p.6*
**Anecdotalist**

By Sandy Lakoff

*The Two Cultures.* One day in 1980, at the National Humanities Center in North Carolina, the Director, Bill Bennett, received a disturbing report from the custodian. It seemed that every day at noon, two suspicious-looking characters would drive into the parking lot of the Center, which is located in Research Triangle Park, home to many high-tech companies. They would park a while, then leave. Bennett decided to investigate. It turned out the regular visitors were engineers employed at the nearby IBM research lab. They readily confessed that they drove to the Center’s parking lot every day during lunch break to smoke pot. “But why here?” Bennett asked, “Why not go somewhere else to smoke pot? This is the Humanities, isn’t it?” they replied.

But Some Nerds Are More Imaginative. Peter Farrell passes on this item from a Chemistry exam at the University of Washington:

**Bonus Question:** Is Hell exothermic (gives off heat) or endothermic (absorbs heat)?

Most students wrote answers relying on Boyle’s Law (gas cools when it expands and heats when it is compressed) or some variant. One, however, answered somewhat more originally:

First, we need to know how the mass of Hell is changing in time. So we need to know the rate at which souls are moving into Hell and the rate at which they are leaving. I think that we can safely assume that once a soul gets to Hell, it will not leave. Therefore, no souls are leaving.

As for how many souls are entering Hell, let’s look at the different religions that exist in the world today. Most of these religions state that if you are not a member of their religion, you will go to Hell. Since there is more than one of these religions and since people do not belong to more than one religion, we can project that all souls go to Hell.

With birth and death rates as they are, we can expect the number of souls in Hell to increase exponentially. Now, we look at the rate of change of the volume in Hell because Boyle’s Law states that in order for the temperature and pressure in Hell to stay the same, the volume of Hell has to expand proportionately as souls are added.

This gives two possibilities:

1. If Hell is expanding at a slower rate than the rate at which souls enter Hell, then the temperature and pressure in Hell will increase until all Hell breaks loose.
2. If Hell is expanding at a rate faster than the increase of souls in Hell, then the temperature and pressure will drop until Hell freezes over.

So which is it?

If we accept the postulate given to me by Teresa during my Freshman year that “it will be a cold day in Hell before I sleep with you,” and take into account the fact that I slept with her last night, then number 2 must be true, and thus I am sure that Hell is exothermic and has already frozen over.

The corollary of this theory is that since Hell has frozen over, it follows that it is not accepting any more souls and is therefore, extinct, leaving only Heaven and thereby proving the existence of a divine being, which explains why, last night, Teresa kept shouting “Oh my God.”

PS. This student received the only “A.”

**Bathroom Humor.** “The toilets at a local police station have been stolen. Police have nothing to go on.” (“Ronnie” Barker, late British comedian.)

**Articles of Faith.** Definition of Unitarianism: the fatherhood of God, the brotherhood of man, and the neighborhood of Boston.” Noah Feldman in The New Republic

Anagrammatic Clues in recent cryptic crossword puzzles. Clue: Monkeys write. Answer: New York Times. Which is where the puzzle appeared! And an even better one from in the Times of London: Clue: Church people converting Britney Spears (13 letters). Answer? If you can’t figure it out, e-mail me (Reference “Hard Knox”).

**Word Play**

I planted some bird seed. A bird came up. Now I don’t know what to feed it.

I had amnesia once – or twice.

I went to San Francisco. I found someone’s heart. Now what?

Protons have mass? I didn’t even know they were Catholic.
All I ask is a chance to prove that money can’t make me happy.
If the world was a logical place, men would ride horses sidesaddle.
—Anonymous of the Internet

+++

Bio-Impressionism. Van Gogh’s painting “L’Arlesienne,” part of an extraordinary collection put together by a couple of pediatricians, Harry and Ruth Bakwin, was auctioned recently. The New York Times reported that in the 1930s the couple was visited in their country home in Ossining, N.Y. by the artist Diego Rivera, who told them a story about the paternity of Maurice Utrillo, an artist they also knew well and collected: “He told them that after Maurice was born illegitimately to Suzanne Valadon, she went to Renoir, for whom she had modeled nine months previously. Renoir looked at the baby and said, ‘He can’t be mine, the color is terrible!’ Next she went to Degas, for whom she had also modeled. He said, ‘He can’t be mine, the form is terrible!’ At a cafe, Valadon saw an artist she knew named Utrillo, to whom she spilled her woes. The man told her to call the baby Utrillo: ‘I would be glad to put my name to the work of either Renoir or Degas!’” From The New York Times April 22, 2006.

+++

My Fifteen Seconds. Speaking of auctions: one evening my wife Evelyn, who collects teddy bears, insisted that we had to watch a program about them on the Discovery Channel. It described the origins of the fad, the dispute over whether the first bears were designed by a Brooklynite or invented in Germany by the Steiff Company and only later called Teddies. The documentary then noted that the little stuffed critters had become so popular, they were being auctioned. To illustrate, the camera panned over an auction at Christie’s in London. And lo, to our astonishment, the cameraman focused on a member of the audience who turned out unmistakably to be me! We had forgotten that Evelyn had dragged me to that auction a couple of years earlier while we were enjoying a month in London, not to bid, but just out of curiosity. Soon, the telephone began ringing from others who had also seen the program. Ah, fame! It comes when you least expect it and vanishes just as quickly.

+++

One Good Pun . . . At an SD Early Music Society concert at St. James by-the-Sea, I got off a rather good pun, if I say so myself. String players who perform early music often say they spend most of their lives tuning their instruments. At this event, the renowned lutenist Paul O’Dette was tuning and tuning and tuning his temperamental twanger and couldn’t seem to get it right. Turning to the critic Jonathan Saville, who was seated in the pew behind me, I stage-whispered, “O’Dette, where is thy string!”

+++

. . . Disserves Another. When the late Warren Brigham was our dentist, he indulged me – even just for a cleaning – by fitting me with a Walkman and a hookup to nitrous oxide so I could listen to classical music and get pleasantly high while being worked on. I got to actually look forward to going to the dentist. The dental assistant, who did the scraping and polishing, was his beautiful young wife Susan. After one cleaning Warren came in to give me a checkup and Susan gave me a good report, saying: “He’s doing very well with his home care.” “No, no,” I interjected, “it’s you and the nitrous and the music!” Fortunately Warren was old enough to remember Cole Porter and got the reference. He had to explain it to Susan.

+++

And Just One More. At a Passover seder (celebrating the Exodus from Egypt to the promised land), I warned our guests that the horseradish being served with the gefilte fish was fiery hot. Manny Rotenberg agreed: “Yes,” quoth he, “it’ll clear the Sinai.” This is the same Manny Rotenberg who recently sent our word to friends not to use Viagra during Passover. Why? Because, of course, all leavening agents are forbidden for the holiday!

Remembering Allen Kaprow

“It is ironic that Allan Kaprow will be remembered for a form of art whose point, perversely, was that it should not be remembered. In October 1959, Kaprow gathered a group of friends – John Cage and Robert Rauschenberg among them – in the Reuben Gallery in New York. On cue, this group moved around the gallery, pausing to squeeze oranges or play music on toy instruments. There was no word to describe this kind of art, no such thing having been done before. Its creator had called it “Eighteen Happenings in Six Parts,” and the term stuck. From then on, Kaprow was The Man Who Invented The Happening; an honorific he grew to hate, and which overshadowed his later career.”

From an obituary for Professor Kaprow in The Independent (London)
Mark Your Calendar!

Bennetta Jules-Rosette
Professor of Sociology

will speak to the Emeriti Association on her forthcoming book

Josephine Baker: Her Life and Work
She will accompany her presentation with DVDs and visual materials from an exhibition of which she will be curator.

Wednesday, October 11, 4:00 p.m.
The Green Faculty Club