

POLITICAL ECONOMY OF JOHN KENNETH GALBRAITH

Glimpses of His Eclectic Academic Life

By

**Andrew Felton Brimmer
President
Brimmer and Company, Inc.
Economic and Financial Consultants**

Who is Also

**Wilmer D. Barrett Professor of Economics
University of Massachusetts-Amherst**

Before Joint Session

Of The

American Economic Association

And

North American Economics and finance Association

Chicago, Illinois

JANUARY 5, 2007

POLITICAL ECONOMY OF JOHN KENNETH GALBRAITH

Glimpses of His Eclectic Academic Life

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>SECTION</u>		<u>PAGE</u>
I.	Introduction	1
II.	Into the Citadel: Report of the Visit to the Department of Economics	4
III.	Planning For The Committee's Visit	9
IV.	Structure of the Department	11
V.	Departmental Atmosphere	19
	Undergraduate Instruction Program	24
	Graduate Instruction Program	26
VI	Controversy Over Radical Economics and The Scope of Economics at Harvard	29
VII	Affirmative Action Program	36
VIII	Concluding Observations	38
IX.	Post Scripts: Vignettes of Academic Life	41
	Return to Academia	41
	Commencement Day, 1999	44
Appx.	Chart A: Harvard University Overseers Committee to Visit the Department of Economics Membership, 1973-1974	48

POLITICAL ECONOMY OF JOHN KENNETH GALBRAITH

Glimpses of His Eclectic Academic Life

By

Andrew Felton Brimmer*

I.

INTRODUCTION

I knew John Kenneth Galbraith for 54 years. My acquaintance with him began in September, 1952, when I entered Harvard University and enrolled in the Ph.D. Program in Economics. It ended upon his death on April 29, 2006.

Over the years, my contact with Galbraith at Harvard were quite varied. I was one of his Graduate Students, a fellow Researcher into subjects of common interest, and a Senior Faculty Colleague. I saw a great deal of him through my long-term participation in the University's Governance Process.

During my half century of acquaintanceship with Galbraith, I saw his role as an Academic Economist. Even then, however, he was not content to devote his time to Teaching and Critiquing Conventional Economics. He was also firmly committed to opening up the sanctified cloisters of the economics profession and to welcome both new ideas and excluded participants – especially women and members of minority groups.

* Dr. Brimmer is President of Brimmer & Company, Inc., a Washington, D.C.-based Economic and Financial Consulting Firm. He is also Wilmer D. Barrett Professor of Economics at the University of Massachusetts-Amherst. He is a Former Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. Dr. Brimmer was the Founding Chairman of the District of Columbia Financial Control Board, which the U.S. Congress created to save the Nation's Capital from Bankruptcy.

Through numerous personal encounters with Galbraith over the years, I was able to observe him closely in pursuit of these goals. One episode, in particular, served to reflect and to magnify the breadth and dept of his commitment to the task of returning the Discipline to its roots as Political Economy-concerned primarily with the implement of Human welfare. That episode was the meeting of the Overseers Committee to Visit the Department of Economics held in December, 1973.

In my capacity as a Member of the Board of Overseers, I chaired the Meeting. However, given the composition of the Visiting Committee, the topics on the Agenda, and the extensive discussions with all segments of the Department – the meeting turned out to be an Evaluation of Economics at Harvard by its Peers. The results of the Evolution were not encouraging.

The Committee found the Department of Economics under a great deal of stress, and it left with considerable concern for its future effectiveness. The Committee observed some disagreements within the senior faculty, but the major division appeared to be between the latter as a group and perhaps half the graduate students. The factors giving rise to this division were numerous and complex, but one element stood out above all others: a substantial proportion of the graduate students were convinced that the senior faculty had little interest in teaching them and was not concerned with their welfare. A strong sense of alienation pervaded the Department, and the frustration was evident on the part of a significant number of nontenured faculty members as well as among graduate students. On the other hand,

the undergraduate concentrators seemed to be much more contented than they were a few years ago.

The Committee was deeply troubled about this state of affairs — because on previous visits it had found a far different situation. For example, in its Report for the academic years 1969-71, it concluded:

"... The Department of Economics is in excellent condition. In addition to first-class leadership and fine internal condition, it enjoys the best of reputations. Its graduate school received the top rating in the recent canvas made by the American Council on Education. As we were able to see for ourselves during the visitations, the standard of teaching is very high and the work produced impressive...."

Against that background, the condition of the Department at the time of the 1973 Visit was particularly disturbing. A significant proportion of the members had served on the Committee during previous visits, and they were able to compare the present atmosphere to that which prevailed on previous occasions. For them, the sharpness of the deterioration in attitudes and relationships within the Department was particularly distressing.

The issue of "Radical Economics at Harvard was a matter of considerable interest to a number of Committee Members. (Several of the Junior Faculty Members had been denied Tenure, and the Department's action generated a great deal of controversy). Some critics (including several Senior Faculty members) charged that the failure to promote them was based on their orientation as "Marxist Economists." Because of that interest, the topic was given a high priority on the Agenda.

Several other specific issues had been identified in advance, and I took steps to make sure they were not overlooked. Among these were: (1) the Quality of

Undergraduate Teaching; (2) the Quality of Instruction in the First-year Graduate Courses, and (3) the Department's Affirmative Action Program.

During the Visit, the Committee met representatives from all levels of the Economics Department. They included Senior Faculty, Junior Faculty, Teaching Fellows, Graduate Students, and Under-graduate Students.

Among Senior Faculty Members, Galbraith was the most active participant in the Visiting Committee Activities.

Finally, there were two events which occurred following the Committee's 1973 visit that provided additional examples of the pioneering roles which Galbraith played in the evolution of Economics at Harvard. These were (1) the successful effort made to arrange my Appointment to the Senior Economics Faculty at Harvard in 1974, and (2) the University's awarding me Doctor of Law (Honorary) Degree in 1999.

Against the foregoing background, we can now turn to a fuller account of the meeting of the Overseers Visiting Committee in December, 1973.

II
INTO THE CITADEL
Report of a Visit to the Department of Economics
1973

The Overseers Committee to Visit the Department of Economics is a basic element in the organization of Governance at Harvard University. The Board of Overseers is one of two bodies which share oversight of the Institution. The other is the President and Fellows of Harvard College (also known as the Harvard Corporation).

The Overseer's full name is the Most Honorable and Reverend Board of Overseers. It was created by the General Court of the Colony of Massachusetts Bay in 1642. That date was six years after Harvard College was founded in 1636. The original Membership of 30 was composed primarily of Ministers of the Congregational Church plus a few Officials from the Colonial Government. Members of the Board of Overseers are elected annually by holders of Harvard degrees. Five new Members are elected each year to six-year terms.

The duties of the Overseers have evolved over many years – and are still doing so. Essentially, the Overseers' responsibilities are three-fold: (1) to visit Harvard's Schools and Departments in order to assess the quality of their programs and to recommend improvements; (2) to consent to certain acts of the Corporation; and (3) to provide advice and counsel to the University on a wide range of issues of importance to Harvard's future.

The Harvard Corporation was established on June 9, 1650. That is the date on which the Colonial Legislature (the Great and General Court of Massachusetts) issued it a Charter. While the origins of the Corporation are clear, the motivation behind it is obscure. However, some Historians have suggested that it was mandated as a condition for receiving financial aid from the Colonial Government. Apparently, the Church Ministers were not very adept at Business management and had allowed Harvard College to spend itself to the edge of bankruptcy. To prevent a recurrence of large deficits, the Corporation was vested with power to oversee the College's Fiscal Affairs. The authority included control of all Property, Revenue, and Expenditures.

The Membership of the Harvard Corporation is composed of Five Fellows, the President and the Treasurer. The Senior Fellow is the equivalent of the Chairman, and the President is the Chief Executive Officer.

Over time, the Corporation acquired the authority to approve all major contracts. The latter includes making Faculty appointments (Tenured and Non-tenured) and setting the compensation of those appointed. While the Senior Faculty Members of the various Colleges and Schools set Academic Policies (under the President's guidance), the Corporation is the real Gatekeeper with respect to the economic and financial life-blood of the Institution. It owns all of the Real Estate as well as Harvard's Multi-billion Dollar Investment Portfolios. Guided by the principle of "Every Tub on its Own Bottom," the individual Faculties and Schools do have some assets earmarked for them. But, the rate and pace at which they can withdraw down investment income for annual operating purposes are fixed by the Corporation.

The foregoing differential roles played by Harvard's two Governing Boards should be kept in mind when we turn to an evaluation of the performance of Harvard's Department of Economics. As indicated above, special attention will be given to Galbraith's own performance in the context of his Home Department.

Next, we should review the composition of the Economics Visiting Committee (EVC) in 1973-74. The membership is listed (alphabetically) in Chart A.. in the Appendix p.48.

There were 21 persons on the Committee in 1973-74. I became a member of the Committee in 1966, two years before I was elected to the Harvard Board of Overseers in 1968. In 1973, I was a member of the Federal Reserve Board, where I served 8½ years between 1966-1974. Also shown are my degrees from the University of Washington in 1950 and 1951. I received my Ph.D. (in Economics) from Harvard University in 1957. I was awarded an LL.D (Honorary) in 1999. I was elected to the Board of Overseers for two six-year terms: 1968-74 and 1987-93.

A similar, brief Biographical sketch is shown for each of Other Visiting Committee Members. The number in parenthesis (x) following each name indicates the number of years the member had served on the Committee during the period 1970-74 (which was the focus of the Visit.) The letter (a) indicates that the Member did not attend the 1973 Committee Meeting.

The letter (H) following a name indicates that the person held a Harvard Degree. Those with B.A.'s (4) were Bernstein; Solow, Stone, and Tobin. Those with M.A.'s (3) were Rivlin, Solow, and Tobin. Those with Ph.D.'s (6) were Brimmer, Hauge, Rivlin, Solow, Tobin, and Zwick. Those with MBA's (2) were Diebold and Stone. One person (Mier) had an LL.B., and one person (Cobbs) had one year of Post-Graduate study at Harvard.

All of these Degree-Holders had studied Economics or related subjects at Harvard. Consequently, they could draw on their own experiences in evaluating the Economics Department's performance.

Ten of the Committee Members had held Presidential (Executive Level) appointments in the U.S. Government. They were: Brimmer (U.S. Department of Commerce and Federal Reserve Board); Bendetsen (Under-Secretary of U.S. Army); Blumenthal (Dept. of State and Secretary of U.S. Treasury Dept.); Cohen (Secretary of U.S., HEW); Hauge (White House Assistant to the President); Rivlin (Asst. Sec., HEW; Dir. Congressional Budget Office; Dir., OMB; Vice Chairman, Federal Reserve Board); Roosa (Under Sec., U.S. Treasury); Solow (Sr. Economist, Pres. Council of Economic Advisers); Tobin (Member, Pres. Council of Economic Advisers), and Zwick (Dir. U.S. Bureau of the Budget).

All of these former Presidential appointees had participated in making or implementing National Economic Policies during their tenure in Government. Harvard's Economics Department prided itself on being the "premier place" for the training of top-level Economic Policymakers. However, the Visiting Committee Members could call on their own experiences to help them judge the relevance of the Department's Programs to the preparation of Graduates to meet the challenges they would face in their future assignments.

Among the Members of the Visiting Committee were nine (9) persons who had spent substantial parts of their career in Academia. They were: Brimmer (Harvard, Michigan State U., and U. of Pennsylvania – Wharton School); Cohen (U. of Michigan); Coleman (Harverford College); Newell (Wellseley College); Ostry (U. of Toronto); Rivlin (Brookings Ins. and Harvard); Solow (MIT); Tobin (Yale U.), and Zwick (Rand Corp.).

Among these, Brimmer, Rivlin, Solow, and Tobin could compare and evaluate Economic Education at Harvard with that provided at their own or previous Institutions.

Finally, there were three (3) female Members of the Committee. They were: Barbara Newell, Sylvia Ostry, and Alice Rivlin. Each of these women was able to draw on her personal experiences in discussing and evaluating Harvard's Affirmative Action Program. This University-Wide effort was devoted to opening up opportunities for women and members of Minority Groups at the highest levels of the Faculty and Administration. However, the Economics Department's failures in this area were particularly striking.

III.

PLANNING FOR THE COMMITTEE'S VISIT

The Committee met in Cambridge on the evening of December 10 and all day December 11, 1973. Eighteen of the 21 Members of the Committee were present for all or a substantial part of the visit. An Agenda identifying the main topics to be covered — along with supporting material — had been distributed in advance.

As noted above, the issue of "Radical Economics" at Harvard was of particular interest to a number of Committee Members. Reflecting this interest, a number of contemporary items of information were circulated. In addition, an excerpt, "Much Ado About Economics," from former Harvard President James B. Conant's My Several Lives was sent to Committee Members. In this chapter, Dr. Conant discussed the controversy evoked by the report of the Committee which visited the Department of Economics in 1950. In its public report, the Committee (through its chairman) criticized the Department for a lack of "balance with respect to the viewpoints of its members." In essence, the Committee at that time found that the Department had a number of

"Socialists," "Keynesians," and "advocates of Government control of the economy"; but it found no one on the faculty with opposing views. It concluded that the situation should be corrected. The criticism against the Department which attracted the present Committee's interest was the charge that political bias on the part of senior members of the faculty influenced the decision not to give tenure to one or more younger members identified as "radical economists." So, while the specific facts were different, the basic issues were quite similar.

Moreover, while the Committee began its meeting with considerably pessimistic expectations, they agreed with my own more hopeful assessment. I stressed that the Department of Economics at Harvard remained at the very forefront of the economics profession. For instance, at the time of the Committee's visit, a Senior Member of the faculty (Wassily Leontief) was absent — because he was in Europe to accept the 1973 Nobel Prize in Economics, thus joining two other colleagues in the Department who had received this signal honor. In a number of fields (especially in Economic Theory and Econometrics), the Department was at or close to the apex of the profession. Its Members were also conducting first-class work in most of the applied fields. Moreover, as discussed more fully below, the Department had appointed a number of committees to re-examine its program. The expected recommendations — if adopted — would undoubtedly correct some of the deficiencies noted in the Committee's Report. Thus, while economics at Harvard was going through a number of strains, it was by no means on the edge of dissolution.

During its visit, the Committee met separately with representatives of the Tenured and Non-Tenured faculty. It also met separately - with undergraduates. The Committee was

invited to a specially - called meeting of the Graduate Economics Club, and a number of faculty members also attended. Several of the Committee Members also attended some of the classes which were then in session. On the basis of these contacts, the Committee formed a number of impressions and reached a number of conclusions. These are discussed in following Sections. The Committee also made several suggestions to the Department, and some of these are indicated in the text. Finally, the Committee weighed several recommendations, but agreement could not be reached on some of them. The outcome of that discussion was reported in the final Section of the Report. At my request, several of the Committee Members prepared written accounts of their impressions, and others communicated orally with me following the visit. Then I, as Chairman, drew extensively on these accounts — as well as on notes taken during the visit - in the preparation of the Committee's Report.

IV STRUCTURE OF THE DEPARTMENT

In 1973, the Department of Economics at Harvard was a fairly large organization. As shown in Table 1, there were 131 persons holding appointments. Fifty-two of them had primary appointments in the Department, and seven held joint appointments with other units of the University. Three were visitors from other institutions. There were also 70 teaching fellows, all of whom were graduate students. There were also 11 persons from other faculties offering instruction in the Department. Four of these had their primary appointments in the Kennedy School and two in the Business School. (These arrangements should be recalled when we discuss below my accepting a Senior Faculty position in the Harvard Business School.)

Table 1

Faculty of the Department of Economics Academic Year, 1973-74

Economics Faculty		Other Faculty Offering Instruction	
Professional Chairs	10	<u>Kennedy School</u>	
Professors	10	Professors	2
Associate Professors	6	Associate Professors	1
Assistant Professors	14	Lecturer	<u>1</u>
Lecturers	<u>12</u>	Sub Total	4
Sub-Total	52		
<u>Joint Faculty</u>		<u>Business School</u>	
Professors	5	Professors	1
Assistant Professors	<u>2</u>	Assistant Professors	<u>1</u>
Sub Total	7	Sub Total	2
<u>Visiting Professor</u>		<u>Other School</u>	
Professors	2	Professors	3
Assistant Professors	<u>1</u>	Associate Professors	<u>2</u>
Sub Total	<u>3</u>	Sub Total	<u>5</u>
Total	<u>62</u>	Total	11
Teaching Fellows	<u>70</u>		
Grand Total	132		

The size of the Department had been fairly stable in recent years — following a noticeable expansion during the first half of the 1960's. For example, in the Fall of 1959-60, there were 55 members; by the Fall of 1966-67, there were 118. So the 132 in the Department during 1973-74 represented a gain of 12 per cent over the last seven years. It should be noted, however, that all of the members reported do not devote full time to the Department. The average teaching fellow spent about one-third of his time in the class - room while the remainder was devoted to research (primarily in the preparation of dissertations). Most of the

Assistant Professors taught roughly half time and were involved in some variety of research for the remainder. Those members holding joint appointments were also engaged in on-going research for a significant part of their work load. Finally, during any given period, a number of the members would be on leave to pursue independent projects. For the 1973-74 academic year, eight faculty member were scheduled to be on leave for the full year. Three others were to be absent in the Fall term and four others during the Spring. A number of faculty members also had reduced teaching loads because they had bought off a fraction of their time via research grants. The figures in Table 2 show the number of faculty members on a full-time equivalent basis for each rank.

As indicated in Table 3, roughly half of the Economics Department's faculty (excluding teaching fellows) had tenure. However, quite contrary to the impression frequently gotten by casual observers--the tenured members of the Department carried a sizable share of the teaching load at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Moreover, as shown in Table 4, the proportion of undergraduate courses taught by the tenured faculty had risen significantly

Table 2.
Number of Economics Faculty Members on a Full-Time Equivalent Basis, By Rank

Academic <u>Year</u>	Full <u>Professors</u>	Assoc. & Ass't. <u>Professors</u>	<u>Lecturers</u>	Teaching <u>Fellows</u>
1973-74	15.71	11.05	4.25	21.6
Estimate for 1974-75	14.25	12.00	2.00	19.1

Table 3
Tenure Status of the Economic Faculty Academic
Years 1970-71 and 1971-72

Academic Year	Total Faculty	Tenured Professors		Non-Tenured Professors	
		Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
1970-71	71	29	41	42	59
1971-72	53	25	47	47	53

Table 4
Number of Economics Courses Taught, by Status of Faculty,
Selected Academic Years

Term and Status of Faculty	Number of Undergraduate Courses(Exc. Junior & Senior Tutorials)			Number of Graduate Courses		
	1953-54	1962-63	1971-72	1953-54	1962-63	1971-72
<u>Fall Term</u>						
Tenured	6	8	14	23	25	21
Non-Tenured	<u>8</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>12</u>
Total	<u>14</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>37</u>
Tenured as per cent of total	43	57	56	82	83	68
<u>Spring Term</u>						
Tenured	7	6	15	24	29	27
Non Tenured	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>11</u>
Total	<u>17</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>38</u>
Tenured as per cent of total	41	35	58	83	85	71

over the last ten years. In contrast, the proportion of graduate courses taught by the senior members had declined somewhat. During the 1972-73 academic year (not shown in Table 4), tenured faculty taught 20 of the 36 undergraduate courses offered. There were 18 tenured

members in residence during the year, and 16 of them taught at least a one-semester course offered primarily for undergraduates. Moreover, all of them were available to advise on theses and to supervise independent work. Nevertheless, teaching fellows still carried a significant share of the total teaching load in the Department.

Trends in Enrollment

Undergraduates: The Department had continued to attract a substantial proportion of all undergraduates to its courses. For example, it was estimated that nearly half of all undergraduates were attracted at least to Economics 10 - the introduction to economics. Fall term enrollment in this course in recent years is shown in Table 5.

Table 5
Fall Term Enrollment in Economics 10

<u>Year</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Number</u>
1965	774	1970	553
1966	828	1971	570
1967	734	1972	706
1968	732	1973	987
1969	535		

These figures indicate that enrollment in the introductory course had surpassed the previous peak set in the Fall of 1966. In fact, while enrollment declined by over one-third between 1966 and 1969, the recovery in enrollment since the low point *was* reached amounted to more than four-fifths through the Fall of 1973.

The Department continued to attract about 7 per cent of all undergraduates as concentrators. Trends over recent years are shown in Table 6.

Table 6
Undergraduate Enrollment

Academic Year	Number of Economics Concentrators (3 years)	Pre cent of All Concentrators	Harvard/ Radcliffe Ratio	Course Enroll. Below 300 Level (Student Sem.)	Economics as Per Cent of Arts & Sciences
1968-69	346	7.4	4.4	3,510	6.4
1969-70	293	6.4	5.5	3,437	6.4
1970-71	288	6.2	4.2	3,588	6.8
1971-72	301	6.4	4.5	3,542	7.0
1972-73	315	6.7	3.8	N.A.	N.A.

These results had been achieved in the face of expanding competition from new concentration options offered elsewhere in Harvard and Radcliffe Colleges. The Department's share of concentrators had been rising somewhat in recent years. However, it still remained well below what it was in the past — for example, 9.8 per cent in 1953 and 8.6 per cent in 1966. Moreover, economics continued to appeal substantially less to Radcliffe students than it did to those in Harvard College. Thus, the figures reported above suggest that men were about four times as likely to concentrate in economics as were women. This situation had existed for many years, and the presence of several women on the economics faculty seems not to have enhanced the Department's appeal to women undergraduates. In the years ahead, the Department planned to place special emphasis on broadening enrollment of Harvard and Radcliffe undergraduates.

The figures presented above also show that the Department's courses above the introductory (but below the graduate) level had been competing reasonably well in comparison with other undergraduate offerings.

Graduate Students: The figures in Table 7 show trends in graduate student enrollment and doctorates granted in recent years.

Table 7
Graduate Enrollment and Doctorates' Awarded

Academic Year	Graduate Students	Doctorates Awarded
1968-69	159	28
1969-70	183	28
1970-71	171	33
1971-72	151	37
1972-73	161	28
1973-74	158	--

These data suggest that roughly one-sixth to one-fifth of the graduate students enrolled completed the requirements and received the doctorate each year. As a rule, the typical Ph.D. candidate spent about two years taking courses and in other ways preparing for the generals examinations--normally taken toward the end of the second year. The next phase of the work involved the preparation of a dissertation and a special examination. The median time covered by this phase was in the neighborhood of 32 months for the group completing the Ph.D. degree in 1964-65, compared with 57 months for those doing so in 1954-55. Since the mid-1960's, the median time probably had been shortened further.

As shown in Table 8, the range of specialization of those completing the Ph.D. in economics at Harvard continued to be quite wide. Among the various fields, however,

Economic Development continued to be the most popular field. It accounted for about

Table 8
Fields of Specialization of Ph.D. Recipients, Selected Year

Special Field	1965-66	1967-68	1971-72	1972-73
Total	29	35	37	28
1. Agriculture	1	1		
2. Chinese Studies	1	1		
3. Comparative Economic Systems			1	
4. Economic Development	4	12	6	6
5. Economic Growth	2			
6. Economic History	1	2	3	1
7. Economic Theory	2	1	2	3
8. Econometrics		4	5	3
9. Environmental Economics			1	
10. Health Economics	1			1
11. Industrial Organization	1		1	3
12. Input-Output Economics	2			
13. International Trade	3	2	2	1
14. Labor Economics	2	2	3	
15. Managerial Economics			1	
16. Mathematical Economics		2	1	
17. Money and Banking	1	3	4	4
18. Public finance	2	2	1	1
19. Public Utilities				1
20. Regional Economics	1	2		
21. Socio-Economics Structure				1
22. Soviet Economics	1	1		
23. Statistics	1			
24. Transportation	2		1	1
25. Urban Economics			4	2
26. Water Resources	1			

one-fifth of degrees granted during the four years shown. Money and Banking and Econometrics (the next most popular fields) each accounted for about one-tenth of the degrees awarded. Several of the traditional fields (such as Economic Theory, International Trade, Labor Economics, and Public Finance) each accounted for about 5 per cent of the total number of degrees. The emergence of several newer fields of interest - such as Urban Economics, Environmental Economics, and Socio-econometric Structure - should also be noted.

V

DEPARTMENTAL ATMOSPHERE

As I indicated above, the Committee encountered a greatly disturbed environment. James Tobin, Professor of Economics at Yale University who had participated in several previous visits) took special note of the strengths as well as the weaknesses within the Department: He presented his evaluation in a letter he wrote to me following the visit.

"...As for the divisions in the department, the major one by far is between the senior faculty and about 50% of the graduate students. This is the problem that particularly distressed me, and the one which really threatens the future effectiveness of the department. There are, to be sure, disagreements within the senior faculty on issues dramatized by the decision (not to grant tenure to Professor Samuel Bowles). But I do not, believe that — absent the unrest of the graduate students—they are beyond normal academic expectations or outside the capacity of the department for accommodation and compromise. Within the senior faculty there is still the civility and mutual respect needed for a functioning, self-governing department. I say this partly because I have recently visited another economics department where this condition does not obtain,

"The undergraduates seemed reasonably content with the program. ... A minority of them are concerned about the loss of radical economists, but there was not as strong an undergraduate voice on this issue as might have been expected. As elsewhere, undergraduate radicalism is much weaker than it was five years ago.

"The complaints of junior faculty seemed to me much the same in kind and intensity as on previous visits. They have to do with the impersonality of the place, the lack of community, the inaccessibility of senior faculty, the division of the department into research empires which communicate very little with each other. In addition, junior faculty often express sympathy with the complaints of graduate students about the curriculum and the quality of instruction. At the same time, junior faculty do recognize the very great advantages of the Harvard environment for their own research and intellectual development. And they also participate with devotion and enthusiasm in the teaching programs of the department, and in the work of the various committees for curricular reform.

"The critical problem is the alienation of the graduate students. The most distressing thing is not that there are radicals among them, but that the general shortcomings of graduate instruction have alienated so many students of all persuasions. The radicals have evidently been able to capitalize on this discontent to make recruits among successive waves of students. Otherwise it is hard to understand how a movement, which has waned rapidly in economics on other campuses and in other departments, at Harvard continues to be so strong. It may also be true that some of the appeal of Bowles et. al. was that they cultivated a solicitude for students in contrast to the indifference perceived in "straight" faculty.

"In my own department radical dissent regarding the methodology of economics, the organization of our program, and the substance of economics has been expressed with emphasis but almost never with hostility and distrust toward the faculty as individuals or as an institution. So I found the tone of hostility and distrust at the Harvard (Graduate Economic Club) meeting very distressing. And of course I was quite impressed that about half of the graduate students were there, and that among them only one person said he was having a really good educational experience. I realize that the 50% present were not representative, but that's a lot of students in itself and evidently, the satisfied students didn't have strong enough feelings to show up.

"The criticisms of first year courses are not new. We heard a couple of years ago that the theory course was a heavy dose of technical mathematics with no attempt at elucidation of basic economic content. Since then the course has shifted teachers again (frequent shifting is one of its problems), but remains a problem. It is much too large (maybe 80) for effective teaching. For the richest university, that is disgraceful.

"The general reputation of the senior faculty is that they are inaccessible, unapproachable, that they know and see only the few students who have gained access to their empires. No one serves for graduate students the functions performed by junior faculty for undergraduates, as teachers, advisers, tutors, friends. This really must be changed, even at some expense in research output and in outside activities of faculty. As things stand,

I would not advise a bright ... senior to go to the Harvard department unless he was of such specialized interest and talent that he clearly could become a student protégé of one of the giants of the Harvard Department.

"Perhaps the reduction in size of the graduate student body and the appointment of more non-tenure associate professors who will be active in graduate instruction will improve the situation. But that will not be enough. The senior faculty seems to me overly complacent about the situation, perhaps because they have been so close to it so long that they have forgotten what a decent and civilized community of faculty and graduate students is like.

"Unfortunately it will take time to recreate one at Harvard even if the faculty tries to do so. I don't think it takes a drastic reformation of the curriculum so much as greater dedication to teaching, the use of smaller classes, assistants in first year courses, etc."

Still another member of the Visiting Committee, Robert M. Solow of MIT, addressed himself to the atmosphere in the Department:

"...At the very outset, I think (one must not get) the impression of a deeper split within the senior faculty than actually exists. The division of opinion over Bowles involved only a small minority (not--by the way--a bloc that would hold together on many issues) and represented the sort of difference of opinion that any large faculty must expect to have. Had it not been for the size and intensity of the reaction from graduate students, nothing much would have followed from the Bowles decision. The real split in the department is between most of the senior faculty and a substantial fraction of the graduate student body. That, in turn, is a compound of radical dissidence and much broader student discontent with the teaching and conduct of the graduate program. The most striking aspect of the situation, in some ways, is how little the senior faculty seems to care. To give a clear picture of the department, I think (one must note) the contrast between the turbulence down below and the disaffection of some assistant professors on the one hand, and the fact that at the top things are really quite serene, large amounts of excellent, research are getting done, and the faculty is justifiably pleased with its place and performance in the profession. That dichotomy is very important. The Overseers should realize that actions taken to fix some of the bad things may have unexpected effects on the good things...."

In a letter written following the visit, Peter L. Bernstein (another member of the Committee) also captured the essence of the prevailing conditions:

"... The distressing morale situation in the Economics Department shook me profoundly. I know enough to recognize the normal level of gripes and the special pleadings to which one is always open in such a situation, but the reactions of the various academic people on the Committee and that Law School professor at the (Graduate Economics Club) meeting confirmed to me that things are really bad.

"... The argument about the radical professors probably pinpoints the entire problem, which is one of alienation between the tenured faculty (most of them, anyway) and all the rest of the department — faculty and students. There is a feeling that nobody cares.... Add to that the clear and unhappy failure to cope with the challenges it must meet (and perhaps was itself the cause of these problems), and the impatience and frustration of the younger people with the conventional ... 'received doctrine' is only natural.

"... I have never heard the word 'disappointment' used so often. One shocking comment at the lunch with the non-tenured faculty was that, 'It's almost impossible to get a senior faculty person to read our research papers, but that's easy in comparison with getting them to look at a reading list of a course we are preparing.' The conscious and persistent rejection of discussion or Socratic teaching techniques in the classroom is hardly the proper way to help students to master a complex and essentially analytical rather than descriptive subject.

"The contrast with my days as an undergraduate is striking. We knew, took classes with, and spent time with all the great stars of our time - Hansen, Williams, Schumpeter, Mason, Leontief, Chamberlin, Haberler, Machlup.. etc. All but the largest classes were full of active discussion and argument. The younger faculty was in ferment about Keynesianism and was just jamming it down the throats of the older faculty—who listened, argued, and clarified. I have never stopped going back to my class notes or the annotations in our books. The whole thing has never lost its relevance, fascination, or utility over the ... years. This is what Harvard should do and must do to justify its reputation and importance, but that is precisely what it is not doing now."

Walter E. Hoodley of Bank of America (who has visited the Department on several other occasions) focused on another impression shared by a number of others on the Committee. Following the visit, he wrote:

... For the first time (in several years of) visitations (they were annual prior to the recent innovation)... I feel that the department is in great need of leadership. This conclusion is the result of a number of factors. Among them:

- "1. While the department is unquestionably the finest in the country, the aura of leadership stems primarily from research activities. Teaching is another and a considerably spottier story. While the samples we observed were highly selective, they were not good.
- "2. The furor over the radical economists does not seem to me to be related nearly as much to the facts as to the way in which the situation has been handled. That Harvard is alone among all universities in being in this position would tend to support this conclusion.
- "3. The Harvard Economic Research Institute was a device for channeling research funds to the department. *It has* been allowed to run down completely. As much as faculty members may like the idea of additional funds being available, there seems no plan for replacing this source. Without such a plan and organized approach, it seems unlikely to me they will be replaced.
- "4. I gather Ed Mason's international activity is about to go out of business. I do not know the full story.
- "5. The feeling persists among students (and this is not new) that the Economics Department lacks a "personality" and interest in the student as an individual. As a result, the feel at sea.
- "6. The impression I had from the students, at least is that the number of socially relevant policy courses is limited (probably wrong) and that it is only the radical economists who are interested in teaching them (probably also wrong) and that these are the kinds of subjects on which students want to spend their time (with which *I* completely sympathize). If the students are right, this is a bad state of affairs. The fact that this is their perception of reality also seems to me a poor state of affairs.

"I am sure that each of these has its rationale and history. Yet, however much each requires the kind of careful handling one normally associates with management of professional staffs, none of these situations is necessary. Taken together, they worry me. My impression is that if we had time to study the issues truly important to the department's future we might well find they lacked the kind of forceful handling they should have...."

Dr. Barbara W. Newell, President of Wesslesley College (a new member of the Committee), in a letter to me, gave her assessment of the Department:

"... My impression of the concern expressed by both the undergraduate and graduate students was threefold: (1) radical economics; (2) 'relevant' courses; and (3) a demonstrated concern for and interest in teaching and students. It seemed that the 'radical' economists were

lecturing on topics of great interest to the student and were good, concerned teachers. Thus, I would like to emphasize that the Department not only broaden its course offerings but make evident, in a visible, systematic and continuing fashion that a priority function is teaching undergraduate and graduates..."

Again, it must be emphasized that the Committee's exposure was necessarily short, and it may not have gotten a fully rounded picture of the prevailing situation. On the other hand, the fact that Committee members who had seen the Department over several years got the same impression must be given a great deal of weight.

Undergraduate Instruction Program

The Committee encountered few criticisms with respect to the undergraduate program offered by the Department of Economics. This was in noticeable contrast to the situation just a few years ago. At that time, students complained about the quality of tutorial programs and the lack of an opportunity to pursue joint majors with other substantive fields. During the 1972-73 academic year, the Department greatly expanded the amount of instruction provided on an individual or small group basis. As part of the initial effort, 20 sophomores received individual tutoring with highly favorable results. As a consequence, individual tutorial would become a permanent option — while group instruction would also be available for those students who prefer it. All concentrators had the option to participate in junior tutorial, and the option was being elected by an increasing number of such students. A senior thesis workshop had been in operation for more than a year. This program (led by a senior faculty member) provided an opportunity for seniors pursuing honors to explain and defend their research proposals well in advance of the date on which the theses were due.

For the last few years, the Undergraduate Instruction Committee (UIC) had circulated questionnaires in all undergraduate courses in Economics to permit students to evaluate each course. The questions had focused on matters such as (1) the lecturer's ability to hold interest; (2) overall evaluation of lectures; (3) overall evaluation of

reading material; (4) helpfulness of sections; (5) preparation of section leaders; (6) fairness in grading; (7) attainment of initial expectations, and (8) overall impression of course. Each of these elements was rated on a scale of 9 for excellent, 7 for good, 5 for average, etc. The mean evaluation of undergraduate courses (weigh by enrollment) taught in the Fall term of 1971-72 was 6.65. (The standard deviation was 1.63.) The highest score was achieved by junior tutorial groups, and several intermediate lecture courses followed fairly closely behind. A rough summary of the students' evaluation of course taught in the academic year 1972-73 (un-weighted by enrollment) suggest that the overall assessment was about the same as in the previous year.

During the Committee's visit, however, representatives of the Undergraduate Instruction Committee made two recommendations affecting the undergraduate program. The first related to the procedures of the Faculty Subcommittee on the Undergraduate Curriculum. The UIC expressed apprehension over the possibility that the Faculty Subcommittee might recommend major changes in the objectives and curriculum of the Economics Department without providing an ample opportunity for economics concentrators to discuss the proposals. The UIC strongly urged against such a course. After the meeting members of the Visiting Committee reported this concern to the chairman of the Faculty Subcommittee. They were assured that no definitive action would be taken without proper consultation with undergraduate concentrators.

The second recommendation concerned the place of "radical" economics at Harvard. The UIC stated that:

"...it is clear to the committee that the Department of Economics should provide opportunities for undergraduate study in all major areas of economic theory. 'Radical' (Marxist) economic theory, as taught by Professors Bowles, Gintis, MacEwan, and Marglin, is a major alternative to neoclassical economic theory. The possibility exists that none of these faculty members will be teaching

at Harvard during the academic year 1974-75. In light of this fact, this committee urges that the Department of Economics make certain that "radical" professors of economics be present on the Harvard Department of Economics faculty for 1974-75."

Dr. Alice Rivlin (of the Brookings Institution), in assessing the status of the undergraduate program, wrote to me as follow::

"... The undergraduate program seems to be in better shape, perhaps because some of the assistant professors and teaching fellows are, against all odds, devoted to teaching. It seems to me that there is a genuine issue to be faced in the (recommendation)... I have only little sympathy for the notion that "radical" or Marxian economic theory deserves a major place in the curriculum. But I do think that a department that goes in one or two years from a complement of four actively teaching radicals to none is in grave danger of violating a legitimate expectation of continuity held by students. If any number of undergraduates were attracted into the field by the hope of doing some specifically "radical" courses and research, then it is perhaps unfair to them to withdraw that opportunity so suddenly. If that is the content of the UIC recommendation, I think there is merit in it. There may be a similar point to be made on behalf of graduate students."

The Visiting Committee assured the representatives of UIC that their recommendations would be included in its report.

Graduate Instruction Program

The Visiting Committee heard the most vocal expressions of discontent from graduate students. The strident tone of these comments was new--even to persons who had been on the Committee for several years. In explaining the apparent sharpness of the changed environment, one must give weight to the observations made by the Professor James S. Dusenberry, Chairman of the Department of Economics: since the Committee did not meet during the 1972-73 academic year, it perhaps had not kept abreast of emerging graduate student attitudes. Moreover, when the Committee visited the Department during the last few years, the "radical"

students had boycotted the Committee's meeting with graduate students. This time they chose to participate in the discussion through the Graduate Economics Club (G.E.C.).

In fact, the special meeting called by that organization (and to which the Committee and faculty members were invited) was the best session of the entire visit — at least in the opinion of several members of the Committee. The co-chairman of the G.E.C. had obviously worked hard to organize the meeting, and a substantial proportion of the graduate students enrolled participated. Three key issues were listed on the agenda: (1) the first-year program (including the Economic History requirement, theory courses, mathematics instruction, class size, and teaching quality); (2) curriculum content and the "firing" of radical professors, and (3) the structure and control of the Department. The presentations were crisp, and the discussion - while full - was highly focused.

The meeting took place against the background of considerable student unhappiness over the graduate program. One expression of that attitude is embodied in a long letter prepared by the Graduate Economics Club and addressed to entering graduate students. The opening section of that letter sets the general tone:

"The Graduate Economics Club is an organization open to all economics graduate students, whose purpose is to represent, and provide a forum for, the views of students in the department. We are writing to welcome you to the Economics Department. We only wish we could report that it was a more pleasant experience. In general, most of us have found that the first year at Harvard was the worst year of our lives. The teaching is often terrible, the professors distant and uninterested in new students. Many of us found that we were forced to work extremely hard at courses that were poor by any standard. The department makes little attempt to ease new students' adjustment to Cambridge, so many entering graduates find the initial months are alienating and lonely. Student-faculty relations are often

poor, in part as a result of academic and political disputes which have riven the department in the last three or four years.

"Harvard can be a very exciting place *to* work. Cambridge is a lively, stimulating city: the intellectual and cultural resources available here are extremely broad ranging. Once they come to know the department and the city, most students find Harvard an enjoyable place to study. It is largely the first few terms here that prove so difficult. In an effort to make the first year somewhat better for you than it was for us, a fair number of students have discussed how we might have treated our first year here differently. This letter is an attempt to condense what we know that might help you. Not all of us agree with all of what is included, but most of us agree with most of it...."

The letter then took up three main subjects: (1) the formal academic requirements and the older students' collective judgment as to the best way to handle them; (2) housing and living arrangements, and (3) an account of the "political" conflicts evident in the Department of Economics in the last few years. The first and third of these subjects were also dominant themes of the G.E.C.'s meeting in which the Visiting Committee participated.

The formal requirements for the Ph.D. established by the Department of Economics specify that candidates must pass examinations in five fields: Economic Theory, Economic History; Quantitative Methods and two "special" fields chosen by the student. By long-standing practice, many students "wrote-off" the Economic History and Quantitative Methods requirements by taking specified courses. An additional requirement was enrollment in one working seminar in which a paper had to be prepared.

These requirements--and the way in which they had been administered - had engendered numerous complaints by graduate students. In response, the Graduate Instruction Committee had been instructed by the faculty of the Department of Economics to review a number of aspects of the doctoral program and to recommend improvements. Six curriculum review committees (which included student members as well as both tenured and non-tenured faculty) were established for this purpose. These were: (1) Committee on

the Structure of the Doctoral Program and Examinations; (2) Committee on the First-year Program; (3) Committee on Economic Theory and its History; (4) Committee on Economic History; (5) Committee on Special Fields, and (6) Committee on the Relations Between the Economy and Society. The Graduate Instruction Committee prepared several memoranda to give guidance to the various review committees and to identify the main issues and questions on which it was hoped the latter would focus. At the same time, however, it was made clear that the review committees should not feel constrained by such memoranda but should feel free to define the scope of their own deliberations and recommendations.

It was thought unnecessary and unduly complicated to require formal coordination of the work of the various review committees. However, consultation among them was encouraged. This was especially true of the committees dealing with the structure of the doctoral program and the relations between economics and society. Most of the committees were asked to report during the Fall term. The tasks were well underway at the time the Visiting Committee was at Harvard, and the Department expected to consider the various recommendations before the end of the 1973-74 academic year. It was generally expected that significant changes would be recommended in several of the areas under review.

VI
CONTROVERSY OVER RADICAL ECONOMICS AND
THE SCOPE OF ECONOMICS AT HARVARD

As indicated above, the debate over Harvard's receptivity to the presence of "radical" professors on the faculty and the inclusion of "radical economics" in the curriculum held a

great deal of interest for members of the Visiting Committee. Background material on the subject had been shared with Committee members in advance, and a considerable amount of time during the visit was spent on the issues involved.

To put the matter in perspective, it might be well to summarize the emergence of the debate in the Economics Department in recent years. Apparently in the mid-1960's, a number of younger faculty members and graduate students concluded that conventional training in economics (in which Harvard was in the forefront) did not address most of the social problems of the day which they thought important. Acting on this conviction, they began to work within the Department for a reform of the curriculum. Some of the senior faculty members were sympathetic with these goals. Partly as a result of these efforts, students were added to the Graduate Instruction Committee (G.I.C.), first two students and then three on a committee of 13 members. Evidently these changes did little to resolve the student's discontent. It was reported that recommendations by the G.I.C. favorable to students were not endorsed by the faculty as a whole.

In the generally unsettled atmosphere at Harvard during 1969-70, graduate student protest over the economics curriculum also rose considerably. To meet the criticism, the form of the general examination requirements was relaxed somewhat. Yet, many students still found the content of the curriculum unsatisfactory. Again, it seems that some faculty members (not all of them without tenure) shared this feeling. By the Spring of 1971, this continuing disappointment led the Graduate Economics Club (GEC) to pass "... a resolution calling for full democratization of the economics department. As the first steps towards implementation the GEC demanded equal representation on the Graduate Instruction Committee and the non-tenured faculty committee...." The faculty (after what was apparently

a vigorous debate) turned down these propositions in late March, 1971.

In the wake of this outcome, discussions were held among small groups of students and faculty which focused on the general examination requirements and on the graduate program generally. One of the committees formed at that time addressed itself to the role of "socio-economic structure" and Marxist theory in the curriculum. These two subjects were later approved by the faculty (in the Spring of 1971) as special fields in the Ph.D. program. However, no major changes were made in the content of the generals examinations, and no commitment was made to invite any Marxist economists to join the permanent faculty. Also in the Spring of 1971, the student representatives left the Graduate Instruction Committee - protesting what they considered token representation and lack of influence. Finally, in the Fall of 1971, the Graduate Economics Club adopted a resolution specifying that "... a Marxist theorist shall be hired to teach a curriculum in Marxist theory, to begin no later than the Fall of 1972...."

The faculty made no immediate response to this resolution. However, the issue came into sharp focus during the early months of 1972. At that time, a debate got underway over the question of the tenure of Associate Professor Samuel Bowles--a question which the Department had to answer by the end of the calendar year. The term appointment of Assistant Professor Arthur MacEwan was also moving to the stage at which a decision with respect to his future status would have to be made by the same deadline. These two men were viewed by the students as "... the last two remaining non-tenured radical faculty members...." A campaign to win tenure for them was launched by both undergraduate and graduate students.

As part of this effort, a petition urging that they be retained and that more radical economists be brought to Harvard was circulated in the Spring of 1972. More than 700 persons signed the petition. In the Fall of that year, a substantial proportion of Professor

Bowles former students (reportedly 75 per cent of them—virtually all of those who could be reached) orally or in writing supported the effort to obtain tenure for him. But, after a long (and apparently sometimes divisive) debate, the majority of the Department voted against a tenure appointment for Professor Bowles. A few weeks later, Professor MacEwan's term appointment was not renewed, and he was not promoted to Associate Professor. Previously two other "radical" economists (Herbert Gintis and Thomas Weisskopf) had failed to receive promotions.

Immediately, these decisions were attacked as "politically" motivated by many of the students and some of the faculty. These charges of bias were denied vigorously by members of the senior faculty. However, the reverberations of those actions reached well beyond the boundaries of Harvard University. For example, at the annual meeting of the American Economic Association (AEA) in Toronto in late December, 1972, a resolution was proposed condemning the action of the Harvard economics faculty.

Professor James Dusenberry, the Chairman, and other representatives of Harvard spoke against the resolution which was not adopted. However, a modified version was approved. It held that:

1. The American Economic Association urges that hiring decisions in economics departments be free of political bias. The Association strongly condemns political discrimination in hiring decisions against radical economists or any others.
2. The American Economic Association urges all departments to set up university procedures whereby allegations of discrimination on the basis of political differences can be systematically investigated.
3. The American Economic Association strongly opposes discrimination in government grant allocation on the basis of political views.

As indicated above, strong voices inside Harvard's Department of Economics were heard on both sides of the debate over the Bowles appointment. The formal view of the faculty majority was given by Professor James Duesenberry, Department Chairman. In his report covering the 1972-73 academic years:

"... Our pleasure... was marred by criticism, from students and others, of the department's failure to recommend Associate Professor Samuel Bowles for a tenure appointment. The non-tenure associate professorship is a new rank at Harvard and Professor Bowles was the first person appointed to it and therefore the first to reach the time at which a decision as to a tenure recommendation had to be made. There was perhaps some misapprehension as to the likelihood of tenure appointments for associate professors. There are at present six associate professors and it is a source of regret that only a fraction of this extraordinarily able group of economists can be offered tenure appointments. In Professor Bowles' case it was alleged that the Executive Committee's decision was biased because of Professor Bowles' 'radical' views. Since bias like beauty is in the eye of the beholder, That is a difficult charge to answer. I can only say that in my twenty years on the Executive Committee the primary consideration has always been the search for persons who could be expected to maintain and enhance the outstanding professional position of the department. Failure to recommend a particular associate professor for a tenure appointment is not an indication of bias unless it can be alleged that the person in question has scholarly abilities and accomplishments which are obviously superior to those of any other persons — at Harvard or elsewhere--who might be appointed.

"Alternatively it might be argued that 'radical economies' should receive more attention. The department already has one 'radical' full professor (appointed before his conversion to be sure, but here none the less). The amount of weight to be given to any subfield or approach in our discipline is always a matter of opinion and dispute, but it does not seem obvious that the accomplishments of the relatively new radical approach are so overwhelming as to outweigh the many other claims on our limited number of appointments...."

Several other senior faculty members who thought Bowles should have been given tenure - although their reasons differed--have also spoken on the issue. Professor Stephen A. Marglin (a member who was voted tenure before he began to identify with the "radical" economists) urged his colleagues to give Bowles a tenure appointment--and also to

bring more radicals to Harvard. By so doing, he thought radical economics would have a chance to develop.

Professors Kenneth J Arrow, John Kenneth Galbraith, and Wassily Leontief were also willing to give radical economics an opening. They, too, supported tenure for Bowles. Professor Arrow had been quoted as saying that Bowles' appointment would broaden the Department, and he felt that his work was "good enough" judged by standards that "hardly had anything to do with radicalism."

Partly as a response to this debate, Herbert Gintis (who was lecturing in the School of Education after he failed to win reappointment three years earlier) was invited back to the Department of Economics as an Assistant Professor, with the understanding that he would be recommended for promotion effective with the 1974-75 academic year. Beginning in September, 1974, Gintis and Bowles (along with two other "radical" economists — Stephen A. Resnick and Richard Wolff) were slated to go as a team to the Economics Department of the University of Massachusetts at Amherst.¹ With their departure, Stephen Marglin would be the only "radical" economist with tenure—in a Harvard community numbering more than 60 economists. Moreover, he was scheduled to be on leave for the 1974-75 academic year.

Aside from the debate over the role of radical economists at Harvard, a number of faculty members (both tenured and non-tenured) were concerned about the scope and content of the curriculum and thought it should be broadened considerably. The curriculum review committees discussed above were appointed for this purpose. Several tenure

¹ * Subsequent to the Committee's visit, it was learned that Ginti might remain at Harvard. As the Committee's report was being written, the matter was uncertain. Ultimately, Gintis did go to Amherst.

appointments would become available to the Department in the next few years, but opinions differed as to how they should be filled. The Department Chairman, in his report covering the 1972-73 academic year, identified the fields of labor, industrial organization, economic development, and economic history as ones in which additional strength was needed.

More fundamentally, however, at least a few senior faculty member apparently believed that the differences in view with respect to the content of the economics program were so wide that a basic reorganization of the Department might be in order. But, in December, 1973, Professor Galbraith was the only one to have expressed his views in writing. However, Professors Kenneth Arrow, Albert Hirschman, Wassily Leontief, and Stephen Marglin were reported to have thought - during the Spring of 1973 - that the possibility of forming a new department or a separate track within the existing Department was worth exploration.²

By late fall 1973, Professor Galbraith (who chaired the Committee on the First-Year Graduate Program) had in circulation a proposal to establish an Experimental Program and Committee within the existing Department of Economics. If adopted, this program would provide students an alternative path to the Ph.D. paralleling the more traditional route. Under the umbrella of the new faculty Committee which would oversee the alternative route, appointments would be made, and associated research would be conducted. Subject matter of interest to faculty and students working in the Committee's area might include problems of the arts, discrimination, income maintenance, and poverty. It was thought that perhaps one-quarter of the graduate students might elect to pursue this new track. The proposal also visualized that the committee would have the right to recommend appointments — tenure and

² ** A member of the Visiting Committee (Robert Solow) thought the Report should note that this group of senior faculty "... is the group that supported Bowles, and that it is in fact a group that has very little else in common. Galbraith's and Hirschman's view of economics has very little overlap with Arrow's and Leontief's, and Marglin is his own kind of (man). This appears to be more an alliance based on political attitude and temporary happenstance than a genuine current of thought."

non-tenure — about in proportion to its share of the teaching load (both undergraduate and graduate). While the Executive Committee of the Department would vote on such recommendations, there would be a broad presumption that the Committee's recommendations would be accepted.

At the time the Visiting Committee was in Cambridge, this proposal had generated considerable reaction. It had apparently won strong support among some of the senior faculty as well as among the non-tenured group and graduate students. But it apparently had also encountered strong opposition — especially on the part of some of the tenured members. Since a version of the proposal would probably be submitted to the Graduate Instruction Committee in the Spring of 1973, it was expected that the Department might have to vote on it before the end of the 1973-74 academic year.

VII

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PROGRAM

The Visiting Committee made a special effort to appraise the effort being made by the Department of Economics (in keeping with University policy) to recruit women and members of minority groups. The subject was discussed primarily with the Department Chairman, but other senior members of the faculty also contributed. The non-tenure recruitment procedures used during 1972-73 were described by Professor Dusenberry as follows:

"The Department of Economics normally plans to hire 4 or 5 assistant professors each year. In the 1972/73 recruiting season, the non-tenure appointment committee obtained names and short vitas of prospective new Ph.D.'s from over twenty leading departments of economics. Additional names were supplied to us on an informal basis by a number of smaller graduate departments. Members of the committees and other members of the department then contacted department chairmen, placement officers, and others to develop a shorter list of the outstanding prospects from this year's

Ph.D. crop. In making these inquiries chairmen and placement officers were pressed as to the availability of women and minority candidates. At the time of the 1972 Christmas meetings of the American Economics Association the "short list" included 40 names of which 6 were women. There were no minority candidates who seemed suitable for our department. At the AEA meetings members of our department interviewed all candidates on the short list who could be contacted, as well as others who requested interviews.

"On the basis of interviews and further correspondence with other universities, a number of candidates were invited to Cambridge to give seminars. Two women were included in these invitations. In the end five offers of assistant professorships were made and accepted through these procedures, of whom one was a woman. It may be worth noting that it was necessary for us to make a considerable effort to find a post for her husband at another university in the city in order to obtain the services of the one woman we have recommended for an assistant professor appointment.

"In addition to the appointments made through these procedures, we have recommended that two persons now holding lectureships in the university be appointed assistant professors. One of these is our head tutor who had been teaching in Social Studies but will now undertake an important teaching assignment in our department. In his case we feel that he should assume professorial status. Because of the importance of continuity in his post as head tutor, we have not considered any other candidates.

A second appointment has been recommended for a lecturer in the School of Education who has previously taught in our department but who will now switch the bulk of his teaching from the School of Education to the Department of Economics.

We have also recommended two associate professor appointments. One of these is to be promoted from assistant professor upon completion of his term. We had no women assistant professors reaching the review point this year. The other recommendation is for an appointment to associate professor in the field of labor economics as a stop-gap replacement for Professor John Dunlop. An extensive search by a special committee did not reveal any women or minority candidates who could be seriously considered for this position."

On balance, several members of the Visiting Committee thought that the Department's procedures (while clearly aimed in the right direction) did not show the kind of vigorous effort required to achieve the Harvard goal. Dr. Wilbur J. Cohen (Professor of Education at the University of Michigan) thought that the Department's efforts fell

appreciably short of those made by several other institutions—which had also been much more successful in competing for an admittedly scarce supply of women and minority group economists.

Dr. Alice Rivlin (who I had asked to give special attention to the matter) observed as follows:

"... The first evening ... we discussed ... Affirmative Action Plan. But I had a strong feeling that it was a farce. The message seemed to be: Look how hard we've tried. We've done everything we could, but there simply aren't any qualified women or blacks. As (another member) said to me informally, they *really* seem to believe women are inferior. That member of the Visiting Committee would urge a much stronger effort to recruit women at the assistant professor level so as to increase the number in the pipeline for higher level positions later...."

VIII

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

At the conclusion of its visit - and after considerable discussion - the Visiting Committee decided not to draw up a list of specific Recommendations. Instead, it chose to describe as fully as possible the situation it encountered in the Harvard Economics Department. It was assumed that the Harvard faculty itself is best suited to cope with its own problem. Instead it was decided to conclude the Report with several general observations which summarized the Committee's conclusions.

In the first place, it was obvious to virtually every member of the Committee that the curriculum being offered by the Department of Economics was greatly in need of

reformation.³ The subject matter ought to be broadened to provide greater scope for students and faculty to work on problems — and search for solutions to them--that are not easily encompassed within the corpus of traditional economics as taught at Harvard. It was realized, of course, that the Department of Economics at Harvard is far less narrow than almost any other department in the forefront of the profession. Yet, a number of the men who have provided this broad thrust over the years have recently retired, and others were scheduled to do so in the near future. Consequently, the Visiting Committee thought it was vital that the upcoming opportunities to make tenure appointments be used to assure that Harvard's historic concern for economic welfare (broadly defined) be kept alive in the years ahead.

The Visiting Committee refrained from expressing a judgment on the appropriateness of the decision not to give tenure appointments to specific members of the faculty identified as radical economists. The reason was simple: in the final analysis, the faculty itself has to decide who will be given status and the right to enjoy its privileges and carry on its responsibilities. On the other hand, the Committee felt strongly that "political" bias or other forms of discrimination should have no weight in judging candidates for tenure. Again, however, these judgments have to be made by the faculty.

³ A member of the Committee (James Tobin) noted that "... the Harvard curriculum is not atypical for university departments aspiring to high status in the profession's pecking order. So it is a problem of the criteria by which the profession judges, not specifically of the Harvard Department. Nevertheless, there may be good reason for Harvard to assume some leadership in searching for a broader curriculum. Of course, there may be no good answer...."

But one long-time member of the Visiting Committee (Nat Weinberg) also felt strongly that some kind of machinery should be created that would enable some outside body (perhaps even outside the University) to review faculty decisions in which those affected adversely feel they are the victims of discrimination--"political" or otherwise. Two or three other members of the Committee expressed some sympathy with this general view--although not necessarily with the specific elements outlined. On balance, however, the Committee decided not to endorse the proposition or transmit it as a recommendation.⁴ Nevertheless, everyone was sensitive to the difficult issues involved. Several members thought that the general position on political bias embodied in the resolution adopted by the American Economic Association (reported above) was one the Harvard Economics Department might well adopt as its own.

The Committee was deeply impressed with the criticism of the graduate curriculum which it heard. For that reason, it was pleased to note the work then underway in the various review committees to reassess the program. It appears that a number of important recommendations would be made to the faculty — which if adopted could significantly enhance the appeal and usefulness of the program to graduate students. At the same time, it was also obvious that the senior faculty members in the Department must devote far more time directly to the education of the students who look to them for inspiration and guidance.

⁴ The tone of the opposition to the proposal was captured by Vice Chairman John Diebold. He wrote: "...I have my doubts about any proposal for outside review.... Appointments may in fact sometime be made on a discriminatory basis, and I would be interested in suggestions for protective machinery. I fear, however, that the solution mentioned here may be so open to abuse as to be worse than the problem. I wish I had a better alternative to suggest...."

Finally, the Committee was convinced that a much greater - and far more systematic - effort should be made to seek out promising women and members of minority groups as potential faculty members. The Committee was under no illusions that this would be an easy task. But, unless the Department's procedures are revamped and more resources devoted to the assignment - it appeared doubtful that the Department of Economics would make a significant contribution toward helping Harvard University achieve the goals established in its Affirmative Action Program.

IX
POST SCRIPTS
Vignettes of Academic Life

I have had two additional encounters with Galbraith which provide further illumination of aspects of his Academic Life. The first relates to his role in my joining the Economics Faculty of Harvard University in 1974. The second relates to his role in Harvard's awarding me the Doctor of Law (Honorary) Degree in 1999.

Return to Academia

In January, 1973, I was trying to decide how to respond to a potential offer of a Senior Appointment in the Department of Economics at Stanford University. The holder of an Endowed Chair in Monetary Economics was scheduled to retire, and I had been recommended for the position by a Former Federal Reserve Board colleague who had returned to his post at the University of California-Berkeley. I had been interviewed by the Stanford Search Committee during the meeting of the American Economic Association in New York City in December, 1973.

In January, 1974, my Former Federal Reserve Colleague called me with a message: “The Stanford Search Committee was prepared to nominate me for the Senior Faculty position in Monetary Economics, and the Committee Chair was confident the recommendation would be approved by a large margin. However, since the Faculty vote would be split, the Chair wanted to know whether I was likely to accept the offer”. I replied that the opportunity was attractive, but I needed a few days to think about it.

A few days later, I attended a presentation which Wassily Leontief made in Washington, D.C., on some of his latest work on his UN-sponsored Global Input – Output Model. While giving him a ride to the airport, I told him about the prospective offer from Stanford. I told him that, since I had been away from my previous Faculty position at the University of Pennsylvania for a long time, I had not kept up with the Status of Economics at Stanford. So, I asked Leontief for his opinion of the Stanford opportunity. He responded: “The Chair in Monetary Economics at Stanford would be an excellent appointment. But, if you are thinking about leaving the Federal Reserve Board – I think you should – you ought to come back to Harvard.” I replied: “Thank you for the compliment. But I must reply to Stanford within the next week.” Leontief: “I will be back in Cambridge tomorrow, and I will start work immediately on getting you back with us.”

About 4:00 p.m. the next day, Wassily called me. His report was succinct: He said: “Andy! Good News! I bring you an offer! I began working on the job by calling Ken Galbraith first. He was delighted by the prospect of our coming here. He and I then took the idea up with Jim Duesenberry. Jim was also pleased, but he said that he had funds in the Department’s

1974-75 budget for only a quarter-time appointment. I then talked to Don Price (Dean of the John F. Kennedy School of Government). Don said he had a Slot but no money to fund it. I next talked with Derek Bok (Harvard University President). He was thrilled. (By the way, he sends his regards). He said he could allocate a Stat to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences for down streaming to the Department of Economics. But he could not give Jim Duesenberry additional money. Next, I talked to Larry Fouraker (Dean of the Harvard Business School). Larry was also delighted. He said that he had an Endowed Chair that you could fill for the next three years. It carries top pay and all of the other benefits available to Senior Faculty. If you are interested, Larry is standing by to call you.”

After complimenting Wassily on the swiftness of his action, I thanked him for his effort to move the Harvard Establishment to such a successful conclusion. I told him that I would like to talk to Dean Fouraker as soon as possible.

Within the next hour, I received a call from Dean Fouraker. He repeated the story which Leontief had told me – with amplification. He said that, after talking to Leontief, he had discussed with his Executive Committee his proposal to offer me an Appointment. He said they were enthusiastic about the prospect and readily approved. He then offered to come to Washington, D.C., early the next week to describe the proposal more fully and to work out details.

On Tuesday, January 29, 1974, Dean Fouraker arrived in my office around 10:00 a.m. By 11:30 a.m., we had settled the arrangement. I resigned from the Federal Reserve Board on August 31, and I joined the Harvard Business School by September 1, 1974.

Commencement Day 1999

My last substantive contact with Galbraith in his Academic role was at the Harvard University Commencement in June, 1999. It began when I received a short note from him (dated May 27 of that year) which started with one of his typical greetings:

“Andy! Congratulation on being awarded an Honorary Degree by Harvard. You not only deserve it – but it is long overdue!

Two other Economists are being Honored: Ken Arrow and Alan Greenspan. This will be an HISTORICAL EVENT. Honoring two at the same time would be unusual. Citing three is truly Remarkable!! As you know, for many years, I have hosted a Garden Party following Commencement. This year, I will dedicate it to the three of you. I hope you can stop by. A number of your old friends and colleagues will be there – Jim Dusenberry, Henry Rosovsky, Paul Samuelson, Bob, Solow, and Les Throw – among others..

I look forward to Honoring You!”

Ken

Having read the letter, I immediately called Galbraith and assured him that I would come to his Party! How did Ken know the names of the three Economists who would receive Honorary Degrees? After all, Harvard University tries hard to keep the List secret – and it succeeds more often than it fails.

Early on Commencement Day, June 10, 1999, the University’s official newspaper published all the names:

HARVARD GAZETTE ARCHIVES

Eight Will Receive Honorary Degrees

One woman and seven men will receive honorary degrees at Harvard's 348th Commencement Exercises this morning.

In alphabetical order, the recipients are **Kenneth J. Arrow**, *Doctor of Laws*; **Bernard Bailyn**, *Doctor of Laws*; **Herbert Block**, *Doctor of Arts*; **Andrew F. Brimmer**, *Doctor of Laws*; **David Roxbee Cox**, *Doctor of Science*; **Alan Greenspan**, *Doctor of Laws*; **Julia Kristeva**, *Doctor of Laws*; and **Mario Vargas Llosa**, *Doctor of Letters*.

Biographical sketches (particle) follow:

Kenneth J. Arrow

Doctor of Laws

Kenneth Arrow is Joan Kenney Professor of Economics *Emeritus* and Professor of Operations Research *Emeritus* at Stanford University. A graduate of the City College of New York, he received his M.A. and Ph.D. from Columbia University and for nearly 20 years he taught economics, statistics, and operations research at Stanford. In 1968 he came to Harvard, where he became a leader of a large and vibrant group of economic theorists, and in 1974 he was named James Bryant Conant University Professor. He returned to Stanford in 1979, teaching until his retirement in 1991. An economist deeply concerned with social justice, Professor Arrow has contributed to the logical foundations of economic theory, as well as to its applications. In 1972 he received the Nobel Prize jointly with Sir John Hicks "for their pioneering contributions to general economic equilibrium theory and welfare theory."

Andrew F. Brimmer

Doctor of Laws

President of Brimmer & Company Inc., an economic and financial consulting firm, Andrew Brimmer also serves as the Wilmer D. Barrett Professor of Economics at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst. Educated at the University of Washington and Harvard, where he received his Ph.D. in 1957, Dr. Brimmer was the first African-American to serve as a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, a position he held from 1966 to 1974. A teacher and scholar whose interests include monetary policy, international finance, and economic development in the African-American community, he was the Thomas Henry Carroll Visiting Professor at the Harvard Business School from 1974 to 1976. From 1995 to 1998 he chaired the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority. Chairman of the Tuskegee University Board of Trustees, and twice elected a Harvard Overseer, he received the Harvard Medal in 1995.

Alan Greenspan

Doctor of Laws

Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System since 1987, Alan Greenspan has guided U.S. monetary policy during the nation's longest economic expansion in the postwar era. Educated at New York University and Columbia University, Dr. Greenspan served for thirty years as chairman and president of Townsend-Greenspan & Co. Inc., an economic consulting firm in New York City. From 1974 to 1977 he was chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers under President Ford, and was chairman of the National Commission on Social Security Reform from 1981 to 1983. Dr. Greenspan also served as a member of President Reagan's Economic Policy Advisory Board, and as a consultant to the Congressional Budget Office. His many honors include the Thomas Jefferson Award, presented to him by the American Institute for Public Service in 1976.

Some time after Commencement, I was able to piece together at least a partial answer to my question as to how Galbraith had gotten prior knowledge of the prospective award of Honorary Degrees to the three economists. From sources in the Overseers' Office, I learned that the Department of Economics – in response to a request for suggestions – “had submitted the names of Arrow and Greenspan.” At a later point in the same conversation, I was told “Galbraith was asked for his assessment of Arrow, Brimmer, and Greenspan, and he helped with the drafting of the Citations.”

Whatever the specific role Galbraith played in the discussions, it is clear that he was consulted as to the appropriateness of Harvard University's awarding Doctor of Laws Degrees to three Economists on the same day. It is also obvious that he recommended me strongly.

Appendix

CHART A

HARVARD UNIVERSITY
Overseers Committee to Visit the Department of Economics
Membership, 1973-1974

1. Andrew F. Brimmer. Chairman (8)* {H}**
Member
Federal Reserve Board, 1966-74
U of Wash., B.A., 1950, M.A., 1951
Harvard U., Ph.D., 1957, LL.D., 1999
(Member, Board of Overseers: 1968-74
and 1987-93)
2. John T. Diebold, Vice Chairman (3)* {H}**
The Diebold Group, Inc.
Management Consultants
Swarthmore Coll., B.A., 1949
Harvard U., M.B.A., 1951
Member, U.S. Sec. Labor
Adv. Com. Manpower and Automation
3. Karl R. Bendetsen (4)* {a}***
Chmm. & CEO
Champion International
Stanford U., B.A., 1929; J.S.P., 1032
Under Secretary of U.S. Army, 1952
4. Peter L. Bernstein (1)* {H}**
BLB, Inc.
Investment Banking
Harvard U., SB (Econ.) 1940
5. W. Michael Blumenthal (1)*
Chmm. & CEO
Bendix Corporation
U. of Calif., At Berkeley, B.Sc., 1951
Princeton U., M.A., 1953, Ph.D. (Econ.) 1956
Dep. Asst. Sec. of State, 1961;
Spec. Rep. for Trade, 1963-67' Secretary of
U.S. Treasury Dept.
6. John L. Cobbs (4)* {H}**
Editor, Business Week
Stanford U., B.A., 1939, M.A., 1940
Harvard U., Postgrad., 1940-41
Member, Vis. Com. Econ. 1970-76
7. Wilbur J. Cohen (4)*
Prof. of Education, U. of Michigan
U. of Wisconsin, Ph.D., 1934; LL.D., 1966
Former Secretary, U.S. Dept. of HEW
8. John R. Coleman (1)*
President, Haverford College
U. of Toronto, B.A., 1943
U. of Chicago, M.A., 1949, Ph.D., 1950
Chmm., Bd. of Director, Fed. Res. Bd., Phil.,
1973-76

Appendix

CHART A
HARVARD UNIVERSITY
Overseers Committee to Visit the Department of Economics
Membership, 1973-1974
(Continued)

- | | | | |
|-----|---|-----|--|
| 9. | Gabriel Hauge (4) * {H} **
Chmm. & CEO
Mfrs. Hanover Trust Co.
Concordia College, G.A., 1935
Harvard U., M.A., 1938, Ph.D., 1947
Admin. Asst. for Econ. Affairs to Pres. of U.S.,
1953-56 Spec. Asst., 1956-58. Counsel, 1959-69 | 12. | Barbara W. Newell (1) *
President, Wellesley College
Vassar College, B.A., 1951
U. of Wisconsin, M.A., 1953, Ph.D. 1958 |
| | | 13. | James J. O'Leary (3) *
Vice Chmm., U.S. Trust Co. of N.Y.
Wesleyan U., B.A., 1936; M.A., 1937
Duke U. Ph.D., 1941 |
| 10. | Walter E. Hoadley (4) *
Ex. Vp. & Chief Economist
Bank of America, San Francisco, CA
U. of Calif., G.A., 1938, M.A., 1940, Ph.D., 1946
Harvard U. Mem. Bd. Overseers Vis. Com.,
(Econs.) 1969-74
Chmm. Fed. Res. Bk. of Phil., Mem., Pres. Task
Force On Econ. Growth, 1969-70,
Task force on Inflation, 1974 | 14. | Sylvia Ostry (1) *
Chief Statistician of Canada
McGill U., B.A., 1948
Cambridge U., Ph.D., 1954
Dir. Economic Council of Canada, 1969-74 |
| 11. | William J. Meir, Jr. (4) * {H} ** {a} ***
Harvard U. LLB, 1928 | 15. | Alice M. Rivlin (2) * {H} **
Senior Fellow, Brookings Institution
Bryn Mauer College, B.A., 1952
Harvard U. (Radcliffe Coll.) M.A., 1955,
Ph.D., 1958
Asst. Sec. Planning and Evaluation,
HEW, 1966-69
Dire. Congl. Budget Office, 1975;
Director of OMB; Vice Chairman of Federal
Reserve Board. |

Appendix

CHART A
HARVARD UNIVERSITY
Overseers Committee to Visit the Department of Economics
Membership, 1973-1974
(Continued)

- | | |
|---|--|
| 16. Robert V. Roosa (2) * {a}***
Partner, Brown Bros., Harriman & Co.
U. of Michigan, B.A., 1939, M.A., 1940, Ph.D., 1942 | 19 James Tobin (4) * {H}**
Sterling Prof. Econs. , Yale University
Harvard U., A.B., 1939; M.A.; 1940; Ph.D.,
1947
(Soc. Fellows, 1947-50)
Member, Council of Econ. Advisers, 1961-62 |
| 17. Robert M. Solow (4) * {H}**
Institute Professor, Mass. Inst. Tech.
Harvard U., B.A., 1947, N.A., 1949, Ph.D., 1951
(Sr. Fellow, Sec. of Fellows, 1975)
Sr. Economist, Council of Ec. Adv., 1961-62; Cons.,
1967-68, Pres. Com. on Income Mant. 1968-70 | 20 Nat Weinberg (3) *
Research Director, UAW
UN Consultant on Multinational Corp.'s
Impact on Dev. and International Relations |
| 18. David B. Stone (4) * {H}**
President, N. An. Mgmt. Corp.
Harvard U., B.A., 1950, M.B.A., 1952 | 21 Charles J. Zwick (1) * {H}**
President, Southeast, Banking Corp.
U. of Conn., B.S., 1950; M.S., 1951
Harvard U., Ph.D., 1954
Director, U.S. Bureau of the Budget, 1968-69 |

* Number of Visiting Committee Meetings in which the Member participated during the period 1971-74.

{H}** Member with a Degree from Harvard University.

{a}** Member did not participate in the Committee Meeting in December 10-11, 1973.