

Foot- notes

Remember you saw it here in May: George Bush will win the Presidential election in November. We happen to know that because a historian with a pretty good record of calling these things says so.

Allan Lichtman, a professor of history at American University, predicted Ronald Reagan's 1984 landslide—in April 1982. Some weeks before the 1986 Congressional elections, he successfully picked 90 per cent of the individual races and said the Democrats would win back the Senate.

Mr. Lichtman's predictions are based on a 13-point system he borrowed from a Soviet scientist who specializes in forecasting earthquakes. Based on the historical patterns of past elections, he has drawn up a list of 13 factors that figure significantly in the success or failure of a Presidential candidacy: incumbency, scandals, the record of the party in power in effecting major policy changes, the presence or absence of a recession in the election year, the presence or absence of charisma in either of the major candidates.

The 13 points are posed as Yes-or-No questions pertaining to the party in power. If six or more of them go against that party (six or more No's), its candidate will lose; if four or fewer go against, its candidate will win. If there are exactly five No's, Mr. Lichtman forgoes his forecast.

"It's the world's only do-it-yourself prediction system," he says.

America's First Ladies can hardly be characterized as feminist proselytizers, but they somehow managed to convert Paul Boller.

Mr. Boller, an emeritus professor of history at Texas Christian University, is a specialist in American intellectual history, particularly of the 19th century. A few years ago he embarked on a different kind of historical research, the gathering of personal anecdotes about the Presidents—a project that resulted in two books, *Presidential Anecdotes* and *Presidential Campaigns*. Last month he brought that effort to its logical conclusion with the publication of *Presidential Wives*.

Studying the First Ladies opened his eyes, he said. "I found it fascinating because I knew so little about the subjects themselves. I really saw myself in a way getting into women's history."

The thing he found particularly poignant about his subjects, he said, was that so many of them seemed to be struggling to maintain some sense of identity apart from their roles as wives, mothers, and First Ladies. Louisa Adams, wife of John Quincy Adams, for example, kept a diary she called "Adventures of a Nobody."

"Eleanor Roosevelt, of all people, had that same feeling," Mr. Boller said.

"I think I understood the whole women's movement," he added, "better than I ever did before."

Scholarship

Humanities Institutes Signal Resurgent Interest in Field

Centers are intellectual home to many scholars

By SCOTT HELLER

IRVINE, CAL.

To scholars doing interdisciplinary research in the humanities, the traditional academic department is a necessary shelter: inflexible but safe.

Many, however, find their true intellectual homes in the humanities institutes and centers that have been proliferating on campuses around the country.

"There's a tremendous underground rumbling all around the university about the structure of humanistic education," says Murray Krieger, a professor of humanities based at the University of California at Irvine. "Centers are the creative way to do the humanities these days."

Loosely structured like think tanks, research institutes are where faculty members spend time off from teaching to work on their own projects. On many campuses, they're meant to raise the profile of the humanities through lecture series, symposia, and other public programs.

Once popular but out of favor by the late 1970's, they are a major part of the resurgent interest in humanities scholarship today.

True Community of Scholars

The University of Illinois at Chicago believes its Institute for the Humanities, founded in 1983, has drawn significant outside funds and prestige. Campus fellows have produced more than 20 books, with eight more accepted or under contract.

Michael Lieb was one of the first scholars to spend a semester as a fellow, in 1983. His work on biblical prophecy has led to a Guggenheim fellowship and a forthcoming 600-page book.

"It is a true community of scholars," says Mr. Lieb, an English professor. "The

scholar is made to come out of his solitary situation, to share his research."

Places where humanities scholars can gather to think are hardly a new thing.

The Center for Twentieth Century Studies, based at the University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee, is 10 years old. Starting in 1975, the University of Southern California's Center for the Humanities held colloquia and brought scholars together to share research in progress. The center faded and finally was eliminated in 1984, soon after a new university administration took over.

Why, then, the resurgence?

Paul T. Brockelman, acting director of the Center for the Humanities at the Uni-

versity of New Hampshire, senses a swing of the pendulum. "We've been in the past 10 years in a kind of neglected, if not demoralized position, *vis-à-vis* the sciences," he says. "It's time we in the humanities begin to develop ourselves."

"Centers and institutes are ways of stirring waters that might otherwise become stagnant," adds Bliss Carnochan, director of the Stanford Humanities Center, which began in 1980.

Irvine's Mr. Krieger, director of the new University of California Humanities Research Institute, sees a larger movement.

"We are facing a revolutionizing of the academic curriculum," he explains. "The



Marjorie Garber: Harvard's humanities center has helped to recruit graduate students.

The Not Entirely Magnificent 'Ambersons': Orson Welles Bears Responsibility

By ANGUS PAUL

URBANA, ILL.

One of the most famous "ruined" masterpieces in cinema history is Orson Welles's *The Magnificent Ambersons*.

Many people have long believed that RKO Pictures, in allowing *Ambersons* to be edited in Welles's absence, was to blame for the film's failure.

Robert L. Carringer, now completing a book with the working title "*The Magnificent Ambersons*": *A Reconstruction*, believes otherwise.

Welles himself, troubled by psychic wounds from childhood, bears much responsibility for the *Ambersons* debacle, says Mr. Carringer, a professor of English and film at the University of Illinois, who expects his argument to be controversial.

The Magnificent Ambersons was based on Booth Tarkington's acclaimed 1918 novel of the same name.

Depicting the effects of modernization on a fictionalized Indianapolis, it appealed to Welles in part because it echoed his own early experiences in the Midwest.

Shifts of fortune dominate the story. As



In the original ending to "The Magnificent Ambersons," Eugene Morgan (Joseph Cotten) visited Fanny Minafer (Agnes Moorehead) at a boarding house.



PHOTOGRAPHS FOR THE CHRONICLE © 1988 STEVE WILLIAMS
Murray Krieger: "Centers are the creative way to do the humanities these days."

disciplines are being undone, redone, amalgamated in new ways by questions the humanities weren't asking only a few years ago."

Breaking Hardened Boundaries

Stanley Chodorow, dean of arts and humanities at the University of California at San Diego, led the committee that put the system's institute in Irvine—despite bids by, among others, the Berkeley and Los Angeles campuses.

Institutes, he says, "are authorizing unofficial, rather radical configurations that are breaking boundaries that have become rather hardened."

The California institute was set up last fall as part of a \$3.5-million initiative to raise the status of the humanities in the University of California system.

With a \$1.2-million annual budget and an ambitious agenda, it aims to set itself apart from others.

For one thing, according to Mr. Krieger, the institute expects scholars working as fellows to participate in collaborative research projects. Among the topics coming up: literary and legal interpretation, and the "temptations" of applied humanities fields, such as bioethics.

Several of the newer—and wealthier—
Continued on Page A8

for the Film's Fatal Flaws, Scholar Argues

the Ambersons lose the wealth they had acquired decades earlier, Eugene Morgan becomes rich through the manufacture of a new machine—the automobile.

Against that background, Eugene renews his acquaintance with a former love, Isabel Amberson Minafer, to the distress of George Minafer, her brash son.

In the 1920's, the story was made into *Pampered Youth*, a silent movie that Welles may or may not have seen. Welles himself adapted the novel in 1939 for a radio drama.

Disastrous First Preview

The director's first film, *Citizen Kane*, opened in May 1941. He began shooting *Ambersons* in October 1941 and finished in January 1942. In February, he and his editor, Robert Wise, screened the footage that had been produced.

Welles, after telling Wise how the film ought to be assembled, flew to South America. At the request of the U. S. State Department, he was going to shoot a movie there intended to further hemispheric relations during World War II.

Ambersons was previewed on March 17 and the audience hated it. Hasty re-editing resulted in a better preview two days later, but major problems remained.

Primarily for financial reasons, RKO could not simply shelve the film for the year or so that Welles was expected to be in South America.

And a plan to send Wise to consult with Welles fell through—as it had done once before—because of wartime travel restrictions.

So the head of the studio authorized Wise to do whatever was necessary to get the film ready for release. Following to the limited extent possible the instructions that Welles sent by telegram, but ultimately exercising his own judgment, Wise undertook a major overhaul: Many scenes were cut, moved, or re-written and reshoot.

The new version ran 88 minutes, compared to 131 minutes for the original. Welles abhorred the result, but two more preview audiences liked it well enough. Most critics praised its artistry. The film
Continued on Page A10

RESEARCH NOTES

Bowel Disease; Fears of Children; War and Misperception; and More

People under stress who suffer from inflammatory bowel disease appear to be unusually susceptible to a neurotransmitter produced in response to tissue injury.

That connection is reported by medical researchers at the University of California at Los Angeles in the current issue of the *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* (volume 85, issue 9).

While doctors have long known that an individual's response to stress is a useful predictor of bowel inflammation, the U.C.L.A. finding represents the first time researchers have been able to establish a biochemical link between stress and inflammatory bowel disease. The severest forms of the disease, such as ulcerative colitis, affect nearly two million Americans.

The U.C.L.A. team, headed by Patrick Mantyh, an assistant professor of medicine, found that those who develop persistent bowel inflammations are extremely susceptible to the presence of a protein known as substance P, which is a signal to the central nervous system of tissue damage.

Bowel tissue from individuals with ulcerative colitis and another inflammatory bowel condition known as Crohn's disease, the researchers found, have 1,000 to 2,000 times the number of substance P "receptor binding" sites as does tissue from people without the diseases. As a result, they conclude, those people are more susceptible to prolonged inflammation of the lower bowel.
 —KIM McDONALD

Study Finds Loss of Parents Is Greatest Childhood Fear

Many parents believe children's greatest fear is having a new brother or sister. But children around the world say they most fear losing a parent, according to a new study.

Kaoru Yamamoto, an education professor at the University of Colorado at Denver, conducted the study by interviewing 1,814 children from six countries. He found that, of 20 potentially stressful events, "the experience of losing my mother or father" was rated the most upsetting and that of "having a new baby sister or brother," the least.

"In six out of seven groups, 'going blind' was seen as the second most upsetting," he adds.

The study included children in the third through the ninth grades from Australia, Canada, Egypt, Japan, the Philippines, and the United States. Despite the wide differences among the cultures, Mr. Yamamoto says, the close parallels in the children's answers were "amazing." He found that boys and girls had the same fears, and that no variations were evident among students in different grades.

Wider differences occurred when the children's responses were compared to those given by adults who were asked, in an earlier study, what they believed children most feared.

In that study, Mr. Yamamoto asked child experts, teachers, and college stu-

dents to rate the same 20 stressful events, which included a poor report card, losing in a game, going to the dentist, and giving a class report.

In 16 of the 20 categories, he says, adults rated the stressful events very differently from the children. Having a new brother or sister, for example, was considered by adults to be the most stressful to children, while children ranked it last.
 —K.M.

Misperception a Common Cause of War, Scholar Argues

Some misperception almost always accompanies the outbreak of war and any explanation of a war that ignores such misunderstanding is likely to be incomplete, says a political scientist at Columbia University.

Writing in a special issue (Spring 1988) of the *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* devoted to the subject of the origin and prevention of major wars, Robert Jervis notes that two kinds of misperception are most commonly linked to the outbreak of war: Countries underestimate their opponents' capability or willingness to fight and thus enter into armed conflict more readily, assuming victory will be easy; or countries overestimate their opponents' hostility and thus overlook or ignore opportunities for bridging differences.

World War II offers the clearest examples of the former, says Mr. Jervis. On one hand, the British tended to underestimate the strength of the German economy, thinking it was stretched taut at the beginning of the war. On the other hand, Hitler underestimated Britain's determination. In 1939, he doubted whether Britain would fight, and in 1940, he expected the country to make peace.

The "World War II model"—underestimating an adversary's strength and determination—partly underlies deterrence theory, Mr. Jervis says. Deterrence theory argues that, as long as a country maintains a show of strength and the enemy knows that the strength and the will are there, such underestimation—and therefore war—is much less likely.
 —ELLEN K. COUGHLIN

Roman Statues Drew Attention to Aesthetic Differences

The pairing of similar but not identical statues seems to have been popular among Romans as a way of inviting the contemplation of different sculptural styles, says an art historian at the University of Pennsylvania.

In the April issue of the *American Journal of Archaeology*, Elizabeth Bartman focuses on four statues found beneath the Via Cavour in Rome. The statues, on view almost 2,000 years ago in a town house, establish their owner "as a discriminating patron and connoisseur of art," she writes, "roundly contradicting the popular image of the Roman collector as little more than a materialistic status-seeker."

Two of the statues are copies of a
Continued on Page A8

Centers Signal Growing Interest in the Humanities

Continued from Page A5
institutes hope to invite scholars from around the country, too. They highlight research on critical and literary theory, popular culture, and social history, among other topics.

Richard Ekman, director of research programs at the National Endowment for the Humanities, estimates there are now as many as 300 institutes based at college and university campuses.

Many are involved with faculty development or teaching. Others model themselves after freestanding research centers, such as the National Humanities Center in North Carolina, as well as after such notable gathering places for scientists as the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton, N.J., and the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences in Stanford, Cal.

Dartmouth College, Vanderbilt University, and the Universities of Michigan, Oregon, and Washington have recently set up institutes or centers. The University of Hawaii and Texas A&M University have plans in the works, though they await financing.

Centers and institutes are part of what scholars call the "hidden university": structures through which academics speak to each other about questions of common interest, often from various disciplinary perspectives.

Unofficial reading or study groups, which involve both academics and non-academics, have proliferated, as well. Ralph Cohen, a professor of English at the University of Virginia, estimates there are 2,000 such groups nationally.

Still strong—and in a sense, pioneering—are women's-studies centers, such as the Institute for Research on Women at Rutgers University.

Emphasis on Collaborative Work

Traditionally, humanists needed pen and paper, a library, a desk, and peace and quiet to get work done. Oftentimes, they spent fellowship years finishing their books or other projects already begun.

Mr. Krieger wants the California center to involve scholars in new research. Based on the proposals it receives, the center will convene scholars for a conference on a given topic. If the conference is successful, a smaller working group will be invited



Julie Van Camp: Conditions conducive to work include 24-hour access to an institute's offices.

as fellows at its spanking-new offices here. Scholars from the system's nine campuses will have a role in organizing the meetings.

Says Mr. Krieger: "It's an experiment to see whether collaborative research in the humanities is possible."

"My role is to open up, open up, open up—make more dialogue than there would be, to try to find the 'voice of the other,'" he adds.

Nowadays, active scholars like Mr. Krieger—not full-time administrators—are being lured to head institutes. E. Ann Kaplan, formerly a professor at Rutgers University, was recently hired to direct the institute at the State University of New York at Stony Brook.

Ms. Kaplan—whose latest book is about MTV, the music-video channel—expects the Stony Brook institute to stimulate literary criticism and cultural-studies research using semiotic, psychoanalytic, and feminist approaches. Like many, the center aims to make a splash: Participating in its external advisory board are such literature scholars as Jacques Derrida, Fredric Jameson, and Elaine Showalter, as well as the psychologist Carol Gilligan and the art historian Arthur Danto.

"I don't want to be a brown-bag institute," says Ms. Kaplan, who will have to raise outside funds to beef up her \$130,000 annual budget. "I want to be visible nationally and internationally."

While institutes disburse funds, they also must raise money to keep

going, especially if they want to attract scholars from other campuses. Sometimes, short visits help lure faculty members permanently.

Princeton University's Joseph Frank spent a year at the Stanford center working on a volume of his biography of Dostoyevsky. "Conditions were extremely good and the atmosphere was very stimulating," he recalls.

One year later he signed on as a full professor in Stanford's Slavic-languages department. "I don't think it would have happened at all without my being here [as a fellow]," he says.

Stanford's center raises about two-thirds of its operating expenses from interested individuals and foundations. Six or seven Stanford professors—and eight to ten graduate students—receive fellowship support through the center. Eight scholars from elsewhere are chosen, too.

As part of the state initiative, the Berkeley, Davis, and Santa Barbara campuses of the University of California system have started institutes for their own faculty as well. The Berkeley center just received a \$5-million grant to set up an endowment.

Because of their locations, centers at Harvard and New York Universities can make do with smaller budgets.

So many scholars either live or spend time in the area that Harvard's Center for Literary and Cultural Studies doesn't offer fellowships, though scholars can use fellowship funds from other sources and base their stays at the center. Visiting this semester are the literary critics Jonathan Culler and Cynthia Chase of Cornell University, and Harold Bloom of Yale University.

The center sponsors lectures and conferences, as well as 14 continuing seminars that regularly bring together faculty members and graduate students from the Boston area.

Marjorie Garber, who directs the center, says it has already succeeded as a recruiting tool for graduate students, especially for Harvard's English department, which has had trouble bringing in young scholars because of long-standing disputes about literary theory and other new approaches.

Says Ms. Garber: "Every professor's dream is to be back in the classroom. This is like that."

Like Ms. Garber, other center directors see their role as countering the stagnation and competitiveness of traditional academic departments. "Life in departments is often very hard, if not unendurable, because there is always competition," says Eugene Goodheart, director of the humanities center at Brandeis University. Now finishing a year at the National Humanities Center, Mr. Goodheart praises such sites for allowing "an enormous relaxation of spirit."

Questioning Roles

With the seemingly overnight proliferation of centers have come key questions about their roles and responsibilities. For one thing, more centers mean more competition for a limited amount of money from the National Endowment for the Humanities, foundations, and other sources.

Until recently the N.E.H. didn't support campus-based centers, according to Mr. Ekman, its director of research programs. He wonders whether the phenomenon isn't something of a fad.

"The danger with some of these is that they're just as insular as the departments they're there to replace," he says.

The N.E.H. will support centers with a limited focus based on institutional strengths or the needs of a particular area, according to Mr. Ekman. Furthermore, he says, they must be part of a real commitment to the humanities, not merely be "a phone, a secretary, and a half-time director."

The N.E.H. has provided money to a University of Pennsylvania center, which is focusing on the history of the Delaware Valley, and to a University of Florida center that studies European-Indian contacts at the time of Columbus.

Too often, Mr. Ekman says, humanities departments push to set up centers or institutes because they recognize that some of their faculty members are burned out, but are unwilling to do anything about it. "If all the money will do is move the person a hundred feet across campus, you're not doing what needs to be done, which is really to break the person out of his routine," he says.

How Do You Resist Controls?

In its first year, the California center organized several conferences to discuss humanities research. Last month, 35 humanities-center directors came to its offices here to discuss whether institutes were "reorganizing knowledge" in the humanities by bringing together scholars from different disciplines.

One point was made several times. As Mr. Krieger, the center's director, put it: "If your role is essentially exploratory and subversive of institutional structures, how do you resist

falling prey to another series of controls?"

"The answer is, of course, you don't. It's a continual challenge." In pushing for scholars to work collaboratively, Mr. Krieger has already run into obstacles.

For one thing, he has come to recognize that young professors must use their sabbatical time to publish individually or else face threats to their chances for tenure.

His desire to include "the voice of the other" in collaborative research projects also drew some skepticism. Scholars questioned whether a researcher with an opposing viewpoint from the majority in a collaborative group would feel like "a Christian thrown to the lions."

A more modest challenge is establishing the conditions conducive to work. Julie Van Camp, assistant director of the California center, has begun to struggle with those details.

For one thing, the Irvine campus is on a quarter system, while many of the scholars whom the center wishes to attract are on the semester system.

The solution: *ad hoc* arrangements, with scholars coming in and out and working research groups starting and ending at various points in the term.

So far, Mr. Cohen of the University of Virginia has been the only fellow on the Irvine campus. Through discussions with him and other researchers, Ms. Van Camp has clues to what makes a fellow's work go smoothly.

"Twenty-four-hour access [to the offices] is important to these people," she says, adding with a competitive flourish, "The National Humanities Center has it, so you can bet we're going to have it, too."

Notes: Roman Statuary; Tyler Prize

Continued from Page A5
Greek statue of Pothos, the personification of Desire. One of the copies dates from the 30's or 40's A.D.; the other—somewhat different in design—from the 120's or 130's, Ms. Bartman says.

In light of the existence of other "mismatched" pendants in Roman homes, she writes, the placement of the two Pothoi side by side seems "to set one artistic style against another in an intentional aesthetic contrast."

Some scholars have argued that subject matter was the major consideration for Romans in collecting and displaying art works, she says, but that may have been more often the case for forums and temples than for homes.

—ANGUS PAUL

Swedish Meteorologist Wins Tyler Prize

A Swedish scientist who helped focus attention on the danger to the

world's climate posed by increased levels of carbon dioxide has won this year's Tyler Prize in Environmental Achievement.

Bert Bolin, professor of meteorology at the University of Stockholm and director of the International Meteorological Institute in Stockholm, was honored for his role in determining how human activities, especially the burning of fossil fuels and the destruction of forests, had drastically increased the concentrations of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. A continued rise in such concentrations could lead to sharply altered climatic patterns, including worldwide increases in temperature and changes in sea levels.

The Tyler Prize, which carries an award of \$150,000, was established in 1973 by Alice C. Tyler and her late husband, John C. Tyler, who founded the Farmers Insurance Group. It is administered by the University of Southern California. —E.K.C.

Guilt by Association.

More than 800 higher education graphic designers are guilty of associating with America's only organization dedicated to the importance of graphic design in the advancement efforts of our nation's colleges and universities.

The University and College Designers Association provides opportunities for professional growth, for peer recognition, and for the kind of creative stimulation that will be reflected in the way your campus is presented to the outside world.

Your school and your campus design professionals need UCDA. For further information and an application for professional membership call 219-288-UCDA.

UCDA

2811 Mishawaka Ave., South Bend, IN 46615
219-288-UCDA