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The 1970s, cross-registration at Bar-
subsequent female students took
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the anniversary will be held in the
necessary of coeducation at the College.
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the weak growth in leading economic indicators, the
index, they say, provides an early warning of changes
in the economy and presidential approval, as well as
summarizing the economy in an election year. “Given
victory,” they write in their paper. Although they point
out that they are using numbers from late July, they
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By Melanie A. Farmer

25 Years of COEDUCATION

Andre Solomon never ex-
epected to be a pioneer. But
that’s what she became in 1968. When she arrived on cam-
pus as part of the first class of
women entering Columbia College.
“It was exhilarating,” recalls Solomon (CC’70), now associate
dean for academic affairs at the School of General Studies. “It’s
not often in life you get to start
something from nothing and watch it flourish.”

Solomon was an original mem-
ber of the Metronotes, Columbia’s first all-female a cappella group. Her roommate founded the first so-

By Olivia A. Farmer

College Marks 25 Years of Coeducation

As other colleges opened their
doors to women—Yale was the
first all-male Ivy League school to
do so, in 1969—Columbia College
remained resolutely single-sex.
Eventually, the trend was hard
to ignore. “No one here could explain
what value there was in a Columbia

Students in 1983 hold up the Spectator issue announcing the milestone.
first Ph.D. to a woman in 1888, and
Barnard College opened its
doors for women in 1889. The
engineering school’s first woman
graduated in 1949, though she and
subsequent female students took
their non-engineering under-
graduate courses elsewhere, as the
College wouldn’t admit them. By
the 1970s, cross-registration at Bar-

Modern U.S. elections don’t get much more in-

By Bridge O’Brien

Politics 101

Markos Moulitsas Zuniga (CC’88) and
Tom Daxon (CC’88) have
launched Politicus, a

By Andrew S. Solomon
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By Clare Gib
Members of the Columbia community and area residents proved they’ve got rhythm during the second annual “StuWe Dance” program. The summer series, presented by Columbia’s Office of Government and Community Affairs, combined dance tutorials and movie screenings on an array of ethnic dance styles. Above, participants show off their moves during the Afro-Brazilian and Samba presentation on June 13 in Low Plaza.

ON CAMPUS

Electoral College

Dear Alma,

Is Barack Obama the first Columbia College graduate to run for president?

—Political Animal

Dear Political Animal,

Obama, class of 1983, isn’t the first Columbia to run, nor is he the first to receive a major party nomination. That distinction belongs to DeWitt Clinton, Columbia College class of 1786 and the Federalist Party nominee in 1812 who lost to incumbent James Madison.

In the years since, Columbia has provided its share of presidential nominees. Nicholas Murray Butler (CL’1882, Ph.D. 1884) was the long-serving president of Columbia and a political power broker through his friendship with major Republican leaders of the day, including Theodore Roosevelt. Yet his own political aspirations never bore fruit. The 1912 Republican ticket of William Howard Taft for president and Butler for vice president fell short (Butler was added to the ticket only days before the election, after the original vice-presidential pick died). In his own runs for the presidency in 1920 and 1928, Butler was unable to secure the Republican nomination.

In two bids for the presidency, Thomas E. Dewey got the GOP nomination but not the ultimate prize. A 1942 law school graduate and the three-term governor of New York from 1943 to 1955, Dewey ran against Franklin Roosevelt in 1944 and Harry Truman in 1948. The latter race sparked the famous, premature Chicago Tribune headline “Dewey Defeats Truman.”

Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm (T’C52) made history as the first African American woman to seek the Democratic nomination for president, in 1972. Alexander Haig, who took graduate courses at the business school in 1954 and 1955, and famously asserted he was “in charge” at the White House after President Reagan was shot in 1981, sought the GOP nod in 1988. Political strategist and commentator Patrick Buchanan (F’82) failed to win a spot on the Republican ticket in 1992 and 1998, but got his name on the ballot in 2000 as a Reform Party candidate. One of this year’s also-rans, former Alaska senator Mike Gravel, graduated from General Studies in 1956 with a degree in economics.

As for Columbia alumni who did win the presidency, there are three: Both Roosevelt—Franklin and Theodore—attended Columbia Law School. Dwight D. Eisenhower, elected president in 1952, had been Columbia University president since 1948. A West Point graduate, he attended Columbia Law School. Yet his own political aspirations never bore fruit: The 1912 Republican ticket of William Howard Taft for president and Butler for vice president fell short (Butler was added to the ticket only days before the election, after the original vice-presidential pick died). In his own runs for the presidency in 1920 and 1928, Butler was unable to secure the Republican nomination.

In two bids for the presidency, Thomas E. Dewey got the GOP nomination but not the ultimate prize. A 1942 law school graduate and the three-term governor of New York from 1943 to 1955, Dewey ran against Franklin Roosevelt in 1944 and Harry Truman in 1948. The latter race sparked the famous, premature Chicago Tribune headline “Dewey Defeats Truman.”

Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm (T’C52) made history as the first African American woman to seek the Democratic nomination for president, in 1972. Alexander Haig, who took graduate courses at the business school in 1954 and 1955, and famously asserted he was “in charge” at the White House after President Reagan was shot in 1981, sought the GOP nod in 1988. Political strategist and commentator Patrick Buchanan (F’82) failed to win a spot on the Republican ticket in 1992 and 1998, but got his name on the ballot in 2000 as a Reform Party candidate. One of this year’s also-rans, former Alaska senator Mike Gravel, graduated from General Studies in 1956 with a degree in economics.

As for Columbia alumni who did win the presidency, there are three: Both Roosevelts—Franklin and Theodore—attended Columbia Law School. Dwight D. Eisenhower, elected president in 1952, had been Columbia University president since 1948. A West Point graduate, he didn’t attend any of Columbia’s schools.

This time around, whichever way the election goes on Nov. 4, it’s nearly certain that someone with a Columbia connection will win up in the Oval Office. John McCain is the father of a Columbia College graduate (Meghan McCain, class of 2007).
**Forecast for China's Air Quality Is Hazy**

by Claire C. Y. Kim

That's the forecast for China's air quality now that the Beijing Olympics are over! For a clear answer, don't hold your breath.

The air quality in Beijing—or lack of it—received a lot of attention during and leading up to the Games. Amid international concern about its possible impact on athletes performing in the Olympics, the city enforced measures to mitigate the pollution, pulling millions of cars off the road and closing factories in the weeks before the opening ceremony and during the Games themselves. The plan worked; pollution levels throughout the events were at much lower levels than at the start of the Games.

But will it last? Patrick Kinney, an associate professor of environmental health sciences at Columbia University, raises a good question: "That will be a real new test for Beijing to generate revenue, there is at least one commercial online venue offering discounts on products or services in each of Intrabid’s 13 marketplace categories, and Intrabid earns commissions from the sales it generates.

In order to give students an incentive to buy from these partners, Intrabid and Witte say Intrabid will in turn pay back the purchaser 50 percent of each commission it receives.

To date, more than 900 Colombians and nearly 250 students from other universities have registered with Intrabid, and together Clemminck and Witte have invested about $50,000 in building the business. Despite the relatively small investment, however, Intrabid must attract many more users if it is to be profitable, the partners say.

The current user base is not big enough to get the marketplace running, Witte says. "We need this critical mass to have enough items there that people come back and start trading." It is especially important for Intrabid to grab the attention of all eight campuses' new and returning students this fall, and to get them accustomed to using the site. So the company has also hired teams of two to three interns from among current students at each school, to promote the site “on a local level.”

"That will be a real new test for us," Clemminck says. "No matter how great your product is, you still have to motivate people to use it. Having a great idea is completely different from having a saleable idea, and I think that is one of the tough lessons we learned in starting this business."

According to Professor Schorer, if Intrabid does prosper, it will be one of many successful businesses launched through the Greenhouse class in the past decade. By The Record found one student auctioning a free "night in heaven with—me," describing his item as "used—acceptable condition" and "priceless!" Listings are free and Intrabid does not take money from students’ sales.

The result: Intrabid, an auction-service networking site (www.intrabid.com) where anyone with a Columbia e-mail address can sell an unwanted item, seek a desired item, and post or discover interesting events aimed at the campus community.

Intrabid was founded in the business school’s fall 2007 Launching New Ventures course and further developed in the spring 2008 Entrepreneurial Greenhouse master class—both under the guidance of Entrepreneur in Residence and adjunct professor Clifford Schorer. The site is one of 14 new ventures at seven more schools, including Michigan State University, New York University, University of Pennsylvania and Virginia Tech.

"Intrabid has evolved into a place where students today can deal on anything," says Clemminck, recalling his first year at Columbia in 2007. It was not unusual for him to receive more than 100 such e-mails a day just from other B-school students, he says. "Yet for people sending it, it’s an inefficient way to reach out, he adds, because the message is flooded with spam. Every day, students are plagued with—me," describing his item as "an unwanted item, seek a desired item, and post or discover interesting events aimed at the campus community."

Intrabid has evolved into a place where students today can deal on anything.

"Intrabid has evolved into a place where students today can deal on anything."

"Intrabid has evolved into a place where students today can deal on anything."
Columbia has come out with redesigned maps that show how campus visitors with disabilities can navigate the Morningside campus. The maps are the culmination of three years of planning and consultation with the University’s Office of Disability Services, the Office of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action, and the Department of Facilities. The maps can be found online at www.columbia.edu/accessibilitymap.

The changes involved months of research, with representatives from the disability services office and facilities frequently walking the campus and neighboring streets with notepads and measuring tapes to identify accessible and inaccessible entrances, walkways, bathrooms and elevators. Other individuals on the campus were brought in for consultation.

When it was planned and built at the turn of the 20th century, the Morningside campus wasn’t easy to navigate, with its multiple levels and stairs. In continued efforts to make the campus more accessible, Columbia now regularly removes physical barriers and adds wheelchair lifts and elevators. Recently, it added an entrance to the Journalism building.

In addition to improving physical access, Columbia ensures that its programs and activities are accessible to those with disabilities.

NEW CAMPUS ACCESS MAPS PAVE THE WAY FOR THE DISABLED

By Record Staff
Poll Position: How to Read the Statistics

by Edward Epstein

As the conventions end and the campaign season moves to the main event, the voting public will be showered with polls on a daily basis. The cacophony of contrasting polling numbers, margins of error, and different slices and dices of the electorate can often leave the interested observer more confused than informed.

I therefore thought it would be helpful to convey a few simple rules that professional poll watchers rely on to make sense of the numbers, and some common errors that even media outlets that should know better consistently fall into.

Polls Are Plural, Not Singular

Never pay too much attention to any one poll—look at an aggregation of polls over time. Polls fluctuate up and down; that is their nature. Over time they may hit their mark, but any one poll may be high or low due, if nothing else, to the vagaries of chance. On Aug. 5, for instance, a CBS News poll had Barack Obama up by six points; five days later a Rasmussen poll had him up by only two points, within the margin of error. Much was made of this shift, coming as it did at a time when national energy policy and offshore drilling were headlining the news. Many pundits declared that Obama’s lead had evaporated, that the energy issue had made him (and all Democrats) vulnerable, even going so far as to declare the shift a turning point in the race.

Seasoned observers thought it unlikely that Obama’s lead had really disappeared, especially in the middle of the summer when not that many voters are paying attention to the race. Sure enough, the following day a Gallup poll had Obama up by five points, and it was the short-lived John McCain boom that dissipated.

Polls Need Context

Never give undue credence to poll questions that are not asked consistently over time. The best way to understand poll numbers is in the context of a series, not as a one-off set of responses. The fact that President Bush’s approval rating fell to the mid-20’s, for instance, is significant, since pollsters have been asking the exact same approval question for decades, and Bush’s numbers were the lowest recorded in modern history; lower even than Nixon’s during Watergate.

On the other hand, much was made of a July 16 New York Times poll that supposedly showed a large gap in racial perceptions of politics and the state of society. When asked “Are race relations in the United States generally good or generally bad?” white respondents came out 55 percent good and 34 percent bad, while black respondents answered 29 percent good and 59 percent bad. This seems dramatic, but how are we to make sense of these results? We do not know how respondents in previous years would have answered, and it is likely that whites evaluated race relations in comparison to how far the nation has come in overcoming racism, while blacks were more mindful of how far we still have to go to ensure all Americans an equal opportunity to succeed. Without context, it is difficult if not impossible to interpret the responses.

Polls Are a Snapshot of a Moving Target

Public opinion does move, and it moves fastest in close proximity to an election, especially when voters had not paid much attention beforehand. Thus, seasoned poll watchers place little value in polls taken right before an election, especially a primary. In the five-day gap between the Iowa caucuses and the New Hampshire primary, many pollsters had Obama ahead, which made Clinton’s victory all the more startling. In fact, many commentators spoke of Obama’s impending victory, putting all their faith in the polls that showed him ahead.

But a good number of voters probably made up their minds in the day or two before the primary, and there is no way a poll can accurately capture the impact of last-minute events, like Clinton’s showing emotion on television the day before the vote, or the counter-reaction to Obama’s new-found popularity. Most people I talked to considered the election a toss-up the days before the vote and were not overly surprised by Clinton’s win.

People Lie to Pollsters

Polls are statistically correct, within their margin of error, only to the degree that they accurately measure the opinions of a random sample of voters. The sample sizes are not the problem (due to the magic of statistics, a mere 1,000 voters in a random sample can accurately reflect the opinions of the 120,000,000 or so actual voters on Election Day), but everything else is.

First of all, pollsters have to guess who the “likely” voters are, and this is as much art as science. People who voted before are likely to vote again, but what about young voters who never had a chance to vote previously? Or what about young voters who never had a chance to vote previously? Or what about young voters who never had a chance to vote previously? Or what about young voters who never had a chance to vote previously? Or what about young voters who never had a chance to vote previously? Or what about young voters who never had a chance to vote previously? Or what about young voters who never had a chance to vote previously? Or what about young voters who never had a chance to vote previously? Or what about young voters who never had a chance to vote previously?

Also, a dirty secret of the profession is that people lie to pollsters. They usually lie about things that embarrass them, like whether they voted previously, for whom they voted, and whom they intend to vote for in the next election, if they think that one answer is more socially acceptable than another.

Polls, taken with a grain of salt, can help voters understand trends and movements in a fluctuating election. To keep yourself sane, though, make sure you look at many polls at a time and beware the single-shot poll questions that usually obscure rather than capture or clarify reality.

Epstein, director of the Center on Political Economy and Comparative Institutional Analysis, is a professor of political science.
the U.S. system of elections not only tolerates but actively promotes partisan supporters, the general election will force each candidate to take a stand, establish a precedent or make a promise that they could possibly keep once in office. Guess what? The primaries were just a taste of things to come: The U.S. system of elections not only tolerates but actively promotes inconsistency, evasion and a lack of clear choices on Election Day. To begin with, the first-past-the-post, winnertake-all Electoral College pushes candidates to the center of the U.S. political spectrum. Whereas the primaries encourage candidates to appeal to their partisan supporters, the general election will force each candidate to stake out the median voter. They will therefore dance the classic Texas two-step, moving back to the center and branding themselves as the candidate most capable of addressing America’s aches and pains, without ever diagnosing the ailment or providing a prescription for treating the symptoms.

Policy differences between the candidates, which seemed so vast and defining a few short months ago, will largely fade away during the general election. As the candidates vie for independent and undecided voters in the general election, they will inevitably converge around similar policies on Iraq, alternative fuel sources, the mix of economic stimulus packages for the economy, and since politicians never want to make enemies, they will offer pretty-sounding but vague solutions to issues such as the deteriorating health of America’s economy, education system, public infrastructure, technological edge, housing market and global competitiveness.

In truth, there is some product differentiation in our Kmart special of policy platforms. Senator McCain will look to simpler designs of market-based reforms, playing down the recognition that access to high-quality education and home ownership are the key determinants of economic opportunity and prosperity, both of which have moved beyond the grasp of the average American. Senator Obama prefers the layered look of regulation, skirting the fact that government intervention is rarely neutral and that raising taxes and redistributing wealth does little to create the incentives to promote investment and capital liquidity necessary to jump start the economy.

In the end, though, policy differences between the candidates will narrow, and the tightening polls suggest that the election will be won or lost not on policy positions but on personal and partisan characteristics: Who is most capable of leading the country during this challenging times? Who is returning America to the path of growth and prosperity? And which party does voters trust to make good choices that may be unpopular in the short run but benefit all in the long run?

Given the nature of U.S. political elections, the next president will take office with only a razor-thin electoral margin, with no clear mandate. Whether the candidates can lead or not will depend greatly on their ability to build bipartisan coalitions around areas of common interest. These are hard qualities for voters to judge in the best of times, and reinforcing existing inequalities. In a society that sees itself getting beyond race risks ignoring the role of racism in American life could win a presidential election. The idea that there is an African American who has garnered the Democratic presidential nomination is something that couldn’t have been imagined 20, or even 10 years ago. What’s interesting about this is that there are contradictions for African Americans: the possibility of a black man being elected president and having the political issues that directly affect African Americans living being marginalized during the election.

As a result of civil-rights legislation, particularly the 1965 Voting Rights Act, we saw blacks elected to public office for the first time and being incorporated into mainstream political institutions. Now, decades later, the process has moved toward the normalization of black politics. In many ways, Barack Obama is using a deracialized political strategy, where his campaign is emphasizing racial unity—bringing together people of different racial backgrounds—but de-emphasizing the persistence of racial inequality in American society. Of course, no candidate—black, white or Latino—who forcefully discusses the role of racism in America’s life could win a presidential election.

In the end, will this election leave the Bush years behind and in close Elections, the degree of partisan conflict and polarization.

Given the Bush administration’s record of policy failures over that of Republicans in the election, the degree of partisan conflict and polarization. In close Elections, the degree of partisan conflict and polarization. Republicans and the Senate. The parties are far apart on issues of foreign and national security policy, the most significant case that partisan politics stopped working, though, is different. Obama has a record of policy successes, but he has not won a presidential campaign, and he has been outspent by his opponents. He has a record of political competence, contrasts and gotcha-style negative campaigns that hide the underlying compatibility of the candidates’ policy positions—give them little help when making this crucial choice.

O’Halloran is the George Blumenthal Professor of Politics.
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And You Thought the Primaries Were Bad...

By Sharon O’Halloran
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The Message Behind Obama’s Candidacy

By Fred Harris

In Close Election, Campaigns Matter

By Robert Shapiro

This is a watershed moment in African American politics. The
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The Message Behind Obama’s Candidacy

Yet there are concerns about whether issues important to African Americans have been displaced by the Obama campaign’s deracialized strategy. These issues include gentrification, the role of race in the criminal justice system and issues of persistent poverty in black communities, among other issues that affect the poor and minorities.

I don’t think people appreciate the forces that led to Obama’s rise as the Democratic Party’s nominee. This has been a long process that goes back to the 1964 convention in Atlantic City, when political activist Fannie Lou Hamer challenged the all-white Mississippi delegation, which wouldn’t seat African Americans as part of its official delegation. Her group also refused a proposed compromise that would have only provided two seats for African Americans. That fight was about delegates, but it was really about inclusion for African Americans in the party. The 1968 convention, the Democratic Party developed an affirmative-action plan that changed the rules of delegate selection to include greater representation for blacks, women and youth.

It is those hard-fought gains, and later Jesse Jackson’s campaigns of 1984 and 1988, that have allowed a person like Obama to be the nominee. Jackson not only put issues facing poor and minorities on the party’s agenda, he also pushed for reforming the primary process to make it more fair for candidates.

Obama’s candidacy raises the question of whether the United States is becoming a post-racial society, in which race matters less in society than it has in the recent past. Given the persistence of racial inequality, a society that sees itself getting beyond race risks ignoring and reinforcing existing inequalities.

We have seen the decline of black civic life in recent years. Civil rights organizations like the NAACP and the Urban League have seen a crisis of leadership and are trying to figure out what their issues will be in a post-civil-rights—or post-racial—era when civil rights is one of many issues that African Americans are confronting.

A new type of black leadership—or political leaders who happen to be black—is becoming part of the American political scene. Though journalists and political pundits talk about the generational change in black leadership, what’s really happening is also a widening of class divisions among blacks, a trend in American society in general but occurring at a faster rate among black Americans. This new generation of black leaders, who feel that racism is less a potent force and who appear to be less committed to government policies targeted toward the party’s agenda, he also pushed for reforming the primary process to make it more fair for candidates.

Obama’s candidacy raises the question of which party do voters trust to make good choices that may be unpopular in the short run but benefit all in the long run?

Given the Bush administration’s record of policy failures over that of Republicans in the elections, the degree of partisan conflict and polarization.

Yet there are concerns about whether issues important to African Americans have been displaced by the Obama campaign’s deracialized strategy. These issues include gentrification, the role of race in the criminal justice system and issues of persistent poverty in black communities, among other issues that affect the poor and minorities.

I don’t think people appreciate the forces that led to Obama’s rise as the Democratic Party’s nominee. This has been a long process that goes back to the 1964 convention in Atlantic City, when political activist Fannie Lou Hamer challenged the all-white Mississippi delegation, which wouldn’t seat African Americans as part of its official delegation. Her group also refused a proposed compromise that would have only provided two seats for African Americans. That fight was about delegates, but it was really about inclusion for African Americans in the party. The 1968 convention, the Democratic Party developed an affirmative-action plan that changed the rules of delegate selection to include greater representation for blacks, women and youth.

It is those hard-fought gains, and later Jesse Jackson’s campaigns of 1984 and 1988, that have allowed a person like Obama to be the nominee. Jackson not only put issues facing poor and minorities on the party’s agenda, he also pushed for reforming the primary process to make it more fair for candidates.

Obama’s candidacy raises the question of whether the United States is becoming a post-racial society, in which race matters less in society than it has in the recent past. Given the persistence of racial inequality, a society that sees itself getting beyond race risks ignoring and reinforcing existing inequalities.
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It is those hard-fought gains, and later Jesse Jackson’s campaigns of 1984 and 1988, that have allowed a person like Obama to be the nominee. Jackson not only put issues facing poor and minorities on the party’s agenda, he also pushed for reforming the primary process to make it more fair for candidates.

Obama’s candidacy raises the question of whether the United States is becoming a post-racial society, in which race matters less in society than it has in the recent past. Given the persistence of racial inequality, a society that sees itself getting beyond race risks ignoring and reinforcing existing inequalities.

Yet there are concerns about whether issues important to African Americans have been displaced by the Obama campaign’s deracialized strategy. These issues include gentrification, the role of race in the criminal justice system and issues of persistent poverty in black communities, among other issues that affect the poor and minorities.

I don’t think people appreciate the forces that led to Obama’s rise as the Democratic Party’s nominee. This has been a long process that goes back to the 1964 convention in Atlantic City, when political activist Fannie Lou Hamer challenged the all-white Mississippi delegation, which wouldn’t seat African Americans as part of its official delegation. Her group also refused a proposed compromise that would have only provided two seats for African Americans. That fight was about delegates, but it was really about inclusion for African Americans in the party. The 1968 convention, the Democratic Party developed an affirmative-action plan that changed the rules of delegate selection to include greater representation for blacks, women and youth.

It is those hard-fought gains, and later Jesse Jackson’s campaigns of 1984 and 1988, that have allowed a person like Obama to be the nominee. Jackson not only put issues facing poor and minorities on the party’s agenda, he also pushed for reforming the primary process to make it more fair for candidates.

Obama’s candidacy raises the question of whether the United States is becoming a post-racial society, in which race matters less in society than it has in the recent past. Given the persistence of racial inequality, a society that sees itself getting beyond race risks ignoring and reinforcing existing inequalities.
Will This Be Another Messy Election?

By Nathaniel Persily

E ver since Bush v. Gore, election law experts have been on the lookout for the next electoral meltdown. We came close in 2004, but the difference in the vote totals in Ohio was substantial enough that it appeared beyond the margin of litigation. Will we be as “lucky” in 2008, or will we be haunted by another nail-biter that may expose the fragility of our electoral system?

The problems seen in Florida in 2000 and Ohio in 2004 were not unique to those states. Any state placed under a comparable microscope caused by its decisive role in the Electoral College count would have appeared similarly dysfunctional. Dangling chads and butterfly ballots were not invented in Florida, nor were long lines specific to Ohio. So while the unacceptable problems in those states received national attention, similar problems in other states would have emerged if the focus had moved to them.

In some ways, we are better off and in other ways worse off than we were in 2000 or 2004. Election technology has improved, in that punch card ballots have been replaced with more modern technology that tends to lose fewer votes. But many areas of the country are still transitioning to those new electronic DRE, or optical scan ballot systems. The security problems of DRE voting machines have now led some states to toss out their newly bought machines, and each election since 2000 has featured some notorious story of machine malfunction or voter confusion. The advent of “provisional ballots” (which voters should receive when their registration status is unclear) has led to fewer voters being turned away from the polls, but has led to a greater number of ballots that could be litigated in an election’s aftermath.

Moreover, the rise of voter identification requirements in some states has added to the burden placed on largely untrained polling place administrators, who usually play a more important role than either the law or technology in translating ballots into votes.

These familiar administrative snafus or the imperfect attempts to address them become less important in determining the outcome of an election if one state no longer proves to be the controlling factor in forming an Electoral College majority. That is likely to be the case this time, as multiple states now seem in play, unlike the last two presidential contests. In particular, Colorado, New Mexico, Iowa and Virginia are all “red” states with the potential to turn “blue,” while several other Democratic strongholds in the Midwest might be competitive for Republicans. Although the election still shows signs of being competitive in national polls, the expansion of the electoral map is one form of insurance against a result determined by one state’s ineptitude, lack of preparedness or simple bad luck.

Persily is a professor of law.
The Reading List: New Works by Columbia Faculty

**Clawing at the Limits of Cool**
By Farah Jasmine Griffin & Salim Washington
Columbia University Press

Clawing at the Limits of Cool centers on the historic collaboration between jazz greats Miles Davis and John Coltrane, and examines the ways they influenced each other and the huge impact they’ve had on American culture. Farah Jasmine Griffin, professor of English and comparative literature, with co-author Salim Washington, chronicles this partnership, from their first meeting and the Social Sciences.

**The Almanac of New York City**
EDITED BY KENNETH J. JACKSON & FRED KAMENY
Columbia University Press

Imagining America in 2033 Imagining America in 2033
By Herbert J. Gans
University of Michigan Press

Imagining America, Sociology Professor Emeritus Herbert Gans has imagined a history of the first third of the 21st century. He describes how the country tackled emerging problems and began to turn into a more peaceful, democratic and egalitarian society. At the heart of this optimistic narrative is the vision of progress with fairness on which the best of American idealism has been built. However, the book is also an analysis of today’s America and a discussion of many current economic, social, educational and other domestic and foreign policies.

**The Journey Abandoned**
EDITED BY JACOB DAVI
Columbia University Press

While conducting research in the Columbia archives, Geraldine Murphy, professor of English at the City College of New York, discovered an unfinished novel written by prominent literary critic Lionel Trilling, who taught at Columbia for more than 40 years. It had written one other novel. In The Journey Abandoned, Trilling models his protagonist on romantic poet Walter Savage Landor. His character is embroiled in a principled but somewhat absurd conflict, which complicates the lives of his admirers. Included in this book is Trilling’s preface and own commentary on this unfinished work.

**Terms of the Trading System**
EDITED BY JAGDISH BHAGWATI
Oxford University Press
In Terms of the Trading System, University Professor Jagdish Bhagwati examines preferential trade agreements (PTAs) and how their rapid spread endangers the world trading system. Bhagwati, a leading scholar of international trade, documents the growth of these PTAs and their consequences. Due to the abundance of PTAs, the world trade system is at risk, he argues: PTAs undermine the prospects for multilateral free trading, of serving as stumbling blocks and bringing back a time when discriminatory practices were prevalent.

**Law & Capitalism**
By Curtis J. Milhaupt & Katharina Pistor
Columbia Law School professors Curtis Milhaupt and Katharina Pistor examine and challenge the widespread notion that a United States style “rule of law” is vital to maintain a healthy economy. Using examples of contemporary corporate governance crises in the United States, China, Germany, Japan, Korea and Russia as case studies, they argue that a wide variety of legal systems are capable of fostering economic growth and that all governance mechanisms, including law, should be elastic and adaptable in response to the economy.

**Imagining America: A History of the First Third of the 21st Century**
EDITED BY LINCOLN A. MITCHELL
University of Pennsylvania Press

In 2003, a stolen election in the former Soviet republic of Georgia led to protests and the resignation of President Eduard Shevardnadze. He was replaced by a elected government led by Mikhail Saakashvili, who pledged to bring Georgia toward the West. Lincol Mitchell witnessed this “Rose Revolution” firsthand, even playing a role by working closely with those who brought about change. Mitchell, a leading scholar of international politics, explores the modest but indispensable role of the United States and Georgia’s failure to live up to its democratic promise.

**Don’t Peacekeeping Work?**
By Virginia Page Fortna
Princeton University Press
Virginia Page Fortna’s associate professor of political science, analyzes civil wars that have taken place since the end of the Cold War. She examines cases where peacemakers were active and shows that their missions are crucial
to severe internal conflicts in countries and regions where peace is otherwise likely to falter. Based on interviews with government and rebel leaders in Sierra Leone, Mozambique and the Darfur Region in Sudan, Fortna demonstrates specific ways in which peacemakers alter incentives, alleviate fear and mistrust, and change political procedures to stabilize peace.
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Civil Rights Giant Tackles Roma Plight

Professor Jack Greenberg, whose civil rights legal work successfully challenged racist laws in the United States, is championing another cause: equal rights and education for the outcasts of Europe, the Roma.

The Roma—colloquially known as Gypsies—have a formidable ally in Greenberg, the former director-counsel for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and Educational Fund, who for more than 35 years helped litigate some of the most important civil rights cases, including Brown v. Board of Education, the landmark school desegregation suit.

Greenberg said that no more than two percent of Roma go to college and that unemployment is 100 percent in some communities. “The Roma are despised and attacked in a way you don’t see anywhere else,” Greenberg said.

Greenberg’s interest in the Roma’s condition stems from a visit he made to Budapest in 2005, where he spoke at the European University on the issue of school integration for the Roma. The Integration of the Roma was mandated by the European Union in 2002 as a condition for the former Communist nations to join. Greenberg also visited two of the five towns in Bulgaria that had integrated their schools by allowing Roma to enroll. When he checked on the progress a year later, he said, “Nothing had happened.” That’s when he decided to help by providing research that advocates for the Roma could use to push for change.

Describing the Roma’s settlements, Greenberg said, “I’ve never seen anything that broken down and terrible. The outsides is what comes close to the South African shanty towns before Mandela.”

This past summer, he sent Columbia Law School students Mary Kate Johnson, a human rights intern; Christopher Wach, a public interest fellow; and law student Jennifer Sokoler to investigate the scope of the problem, and the successes and failures of integration so far. Wach said he found the conditions at the Roma schools “shocking,” describing schools without windows, crumbling walls and garbage-strewn schoolyards covered with graffiti. “Most Roma students at these schools are far behind students at schools outside the community,” he said. “Many Roma students do not attend the schools or drop out, while others graduate without basic reading or writing skills.”

In 2005, the post-Communist governments of the countries with big Roma populations—Croatia, the Czech Republic, Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia and Slovakia—agreed to develop national plans to address the Roma disparity in education, employment, health and housing and launched the formal “Decade of Roma Inclusion.” In its visits to Eastern Europe, however, Greenberg has found tremendous societal resistance regarding the Roma. “Even among intellectuals and educated people,” he recalled, “you say, ‘what you’re working on and they say, ‘forget it.’”

A Ray of Hope for Intense Grief

A professor at the School of Social Work has received a $1.6 million grant to study a syndrome known as “complicated grief” in older adults.

The five-year grant from the National Institute of Mental Health will go to M. Katherine Shear, M.D., the Marion E. Kenworthy Alphonse Fletcher Professor of Law, who also is a professor of psychiatry at the College of Physicians and Surgeons. Hers will be the first clinical study of the effects of various treatment models for the condition, which is characterized by the inability to accept the death of a loved one.

Grief is not an illness, and can be a healthy, normal response to loss. But in cases where a person has difficulty accepting the loss, grief can become a disability.

“IT’s very variable how people move through a period of grief,” said Shear, who has also studied anxiety disorders. While no two people grieve the same way, the same person may grieve for different people in different ways, experts such as Shear believe.

First comes an acute period of grief, in which the feelings about a person’s death are very strong, this lasts for some time, but not indefinitely. By six months, Shear said, the acute period has usually dissipated, accompanied by an acceptance of the death.

“That process, in our work, is called integration of loss and grief,” she said. “Grief isn’t gone, and it’s not that you feel sad or that you stop missing the person.” Rather, there’s “a deep emotional acceptance of something, even though you don’t like it.”

Complicated grief, however, occurs when a person has persistent, intense grief—a yearning for the person who died, often accompanied by feelings of guilt or anger about the death.

There is preoccupation with thoughts of the deceased, including a tendency to enter states of reverie, often with an opposite tendency to become upset by memories of the deceased and attempts to avoid situations that trigger these memories. “People get stuck, feeling that grief is all they have left of the person,” Shear said. They believe that “if they stopped grieving they would be betraying the person. They may have survivor guilt.”

While people of any age can fall victim to complicated grief, it can cause special problems among older adults.

“They are susceptible to ill health and compromised cognitive functioning, prone to disruption of sleep and daily routines, and many are socially isolated,” she said. Complicated grief can incite or worsen these problems.

One of the purposes of the study is to see whether psychotherapy techniques effective with younger people might help the elderly. The study will compare two models of treatment that use an interpersonal therapy framework: participants will take part in 16 weeks of treatment on an outpatient basis in the Late Life Depression Clinic at the New York State Psychiatric Institute.

In her initial research on the subject, “it seemed once we figured out how to help people with complicated grief, it could bring them amazing results,” Shear said. “It is very gratifying to help people like this get back on their feet.”
Researchers See More Links Between Diabetes, Gum Disease

By Stephanie Berger

Here's another reason to floss your teeth. While diabetes has long been believed to be a risk factor for periodontal infections, now it appears that the reverse may be true, too. According to a study by researchers at Columbia's Mailman School of Public Health, periodontal disease may itself be an independent predictor of diabetes.

The study, published in the July issue of Diabetes Care, is the first to explore whether periodontal infections can contribute to the development of diabetes. Periodontal diseases are gum infections such as gingivitis and periodontitis, which if left untreated, can lead to the loss of teeth and bone supporting the teeth. They begin when the bacteria in plaque cause the gums to become inflamed. "These data add a new twist to the association and suggest that periodontal disease may be there before diabetes," said Ryan T. Demmer, associate research scientist in the Department of Epidemiology at Mailman and the study's lead author.

Mailman researchers studied more than 5,000 participants without diabetes from a nationally representative sample of the U.S. population, 817 of whom went on to develop diabetes. They then compared the risk of developing diabetes over the next 20 years among people with varying degrees of periodontal disease—individuals with elevated levels of periodontal disease were nearly twice as likely to become diabetic during that time frame. These findings remained even after extensive adjustments for factors that included age, smoking, obesity, hypertension and dietary patterns.

"It is really relaxing."
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From his perch as economist at the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, Marc Giannoni watched Fed Chairman Alan Greenspan help avert an economic meltdown after the Sept. 11 attacks. "The Fed's dramatic intervention taught me that the economy can change abruptly," recalls the Princeton-trained economist, now a professor at Columbia Business School. "The Fed needs to respond rapidly and strongly to such shocks."

Now, as the Fed reacts to a series of shocks—record-high oil prices, the mortgage debacle and the near-collapse of several large banks—Giannoni is applying real-time research in his field. His doctoral thesis on setting monetary policy amid uncertainty is the stuff of current events, future work will harness data from oil prices, stock market performance and consumer confidence to draw further conclusions on comprehensive monetary policy. "It's an interesting time to do research," he says.

Giannoni first caught the monetary policy bug in a high-school geography class, where talk of cocoa and coffee supply and demand fascinated him. He embraced economics at the University of Geneva, intrigued by the impact of interest rates and inflation on social issues such as local buying power and job prospects. At Princeton, where he got his Ph.D., his advisers were celebrated economist Michael Woodford (now the John Bates Clark Professor) and Bern Benes (Giannoni's successor as Fed chairman). "Exceptionally smart," Giannoni calls them.

In the 1990s, at Switzerland's central bank, Giannoni gained valuable insight into how central banks handle sudden shifts in monetary policy, amid instability triggered by Germany's uniting two currencies after the fall of the Berlin Wall. He also saw how Switzerland's many banks acutely felt even slight shifts in the value of the currencies of neighboring France and Italy.

Giannoni has lectured at the Fed, Bank of England, European Central Bank and Banque de France. He is also a faculty research fellow at the National Bureau of Economic Research.

The Record caught up with Giannoni to discuss the Fed's unprecedented recent moves and the prospects for the U.S. economy.

Q. What does your research tell you about today's economy?

A. Many on Wall Street expected a market collapse and another Great Depression. What has happened recently is a new and large shock in the financial sector. That has certainly hurt many and has had important implications for the housing market, but so far it does not seem to have had an unusually large impact on the economy overall.

We are in asqueeze: I expect high and slowly easing inflationary pressures and fairly weak consumption for a few more months, perhaps a year or two. The recent lending contraction and less advantageous borrowing terms are painful, and are behind the corporate layoffs and rising unemployment rate. However, a return to more healthy savings and consumption rates are desirable for our economy's long-term health. The downturn's length and depth will depend in part on the time needed to recover confidence. That's hard to predict.

Q. Compare our economy to that of the 1970s. For its high inflation, high oil prices and deep recession. Do you agree?

A. Somewhat. Similar oil price shocks then led to stagflation, or rising inflation and unemployment as economic activity slowed. The Fed tried excessively to stimulate the economy by keeping interest rates low, which exacerbated the already high inflation.

Today's high oil prices, credit crunch and economic slowdown are also pinching consumers' pockets. The Fed lowered rates to try to avert a big slowdown. But we probably won't return to '70s-era inflation, as the Fed knows that too much lending leads to higher inflation.

U.S. monetary policy has changed much since the 1980s. Today the Fed responds much more strongly to economic changes, with frequent and calibrated interest-rate shifts to offset shocks. Unfortunately, some slowdown is necessary to offset recent excesses.

Q. How will you teach your class differently?

A. The Fed extending loans to institutions besides banks is significant. It's said to be temporary—I hope so. On the Bear Sterns bailout, the Fed had few options. A banking meltdown would have been bad for the average American. It likely helped avoid other banks going under.

Long-term, government agencies may share more information and have broader supervisory roles. Greenspan took a more laissez-faire approach by letting banks regulate themselves. That has hit a roadblock... We need some regulations. We found ourselves in a crisis without the right framework, minimum standards or procedures. Without them, the Fed had to apply emergency measures never used before. It's unfortunate, but we're now feeling the missing pieces and hopefully establishing a better framework.

Q. What do you think former Fed chairmen Paul Volcker and Greenspan bundled things? And now? What worries you most?

A. Volcker was a superhero. He crushed inflation and brought the economy back to sustainable levels. We owe much of our stability since the '80s to him.

Overall, Greenspan was also very good. He recognized higher U.S. productivity rates by the mid-'90s. That led him to loosen lending rates without endangering inflation. It was a gamble requiring a lot of thinking outside the box, but it paid off. His aggressive response to the 2001 downturn was also remarkable: The Fed lowered interest rates to offset a big downturn by inducing investments in other sectors, like housing.

But by 2005, the Fed did not sufficiently contain the rapidly growing economy. It raised interest rates only slightly instead of the bigger increases we may have needed. Lending should have been more restrictive and monitored more closely. The pain was postponed to a later date. Now it could be costly.

Inflation of 4 percent is not sustainable. People are finally paying attention to inflation again, they expect raises. That limits the ability of the Fed to stimulate the economy and hence may extend the slowdown.

The Fed has good understanding of the functioning of the economy. But it needs to strike a delicate balance between spurring job creation and consumer spending by cutting interest rates or raising them to slow down the economy.

Long term, I worry about negative savings rates, which are unsustainable in an economy with an aging population. I also hope that limited, smart regulation will prevent future excesses that could endanger the economy. Regulation would have discouraged lending to prospective home buyers with shaky loan repayment terms and ensured that prices of complicated mortgage securities properly reflected high risks. Some oversight is good, but I hope it doesn't get mixed in politics. The "too big to fail" idea carries tremendous cost for society. The Fed still needs to help maintain price stability.

Q. Will you address the interaction between the financial markets and the economy? And we'll focus on issues like interest-rate setting when economic conditions change.

A. Yes, I teach an applied macroeconomics course. The principles remain the same. But their application to current events always changes. So as we do yearly, we're reworking the class based on recent developments.

When I started in 2002, we talked about the Bush tax cuts, the 2001 recession, the implications of the tech boom and the bubble burst, fears of deflation and Social Security reform. Now, we'll address the interaction between the financial markets and the economy. And we'll focus on issues like interest-rate setting when economic conditions change.

Q. How do you think former Fed officials Paul Volcker and Greenspan bundled things? And now? What worries you most?

A. Volcker was a superhero. He crushed inflation and brought the economy back to sustainable levels. We owe much of our stability since the '80s to him.

Overall, Greenspan was also very good. He recognized higher U.S. productivity rates by the mid-'90s. That led him to loosen lending rates without endangering inflation. It was a gamble requiring a lot of thinking outside the box, but it paid off. His aggressive response to the 2001 downturn was also remarkable: The Fed lowered interest rates to offset a big downturn by inducing investments in other sectors, like housing.

But by 2005, the Fed did not sufficiently contain the rapidly growing economy. It raised interest rates only slightly instead of the bigger increases we may have needed. Lending should have been more restrictive and monitored more closely. The pain was postponed to a later date. Now it could be costly.

Inflation of 4 percent is not sustainable. People are finally paying attention to inflation again, they expect raises. That limits the ability of the Fed to stimulate the economy and hence may extend the slowdown.

The Fed has good understanding of the functioning of the economy. But it needs to strike a delicate balance between spurring job creation and consumer spending by cutting interest rates or raising them to slow down the economy.

Long term, I worry about negative savings rates, which are unsustainable in an economy with an aging population. I also hope that limited, smart regulation will prevent future excesses that could endanger the economy. Regulation would have discouraged lending to prospective home buyers with shaky loan repayment terms and ensured that prices of complicated mortgage securities properly reflected high risks. Some oversight is good, but I hope it doesn't get mixed in politics. The "too big to fail" idea carries tremendous cost for society. The Fed still needs to help maintain price stability.
that remained all-male,” says Roger Lehecka, dean of students from 1979 to 1998.

Michael Rosenthal, then associate dean of the College, calls it “preposterous that we weren’t already coed.” Rosenthal, now professor of English and comparative literature, credits Lehecka with energizing the students, and Arnold Collery, former dean of the College, with launching “the public campaign to become coed.” Collery established a committee of faculty, alumni and students to examine the possibility of turning coed.

The sticking point was how Columbia could admit women without doing damage to Barnard, Columbia’s academic sibling. After Michael Sovern became president of the University in 1980, he opened discussions with Barnard’s new president, Ellen Futter, who had been Sovern’s student when he was a law professor. “It was particularly important to be sensitive to Barnard’s needs since they had come into being because Columbia had refused to admit women,” says Sovern, whose daughter also graduated from Barnard.

“The idea of rolling over them was unthinkable.”

At first, talks revolved around the two schools sharing classes, faculty and facilities, as a way for Columbia to go coed without admitting women. Ultimately, though, Barnard declined what would have been a de facto merger.

After opening its doors to women, Columbia nearly doubled its applicant pool. In the academic year prior to going coed, 3,700 men applied to Columbia College. In the following year, according to Jim McMenamin, then director of admissions, applications rose to almost 5,800, and nearly 41 percent were female applicants.

“It was obvious to me that Columbia going coed on its own would double our applications in just a few short years, which is what happened,” says McMenamin. And then some. The class of 2011 had 18,801 applications.

Fears about Barnard, meanwhile, proved to be unfounded. It thrived with a coed Columbia next door.

Within a couple of years, it was clear the total number of women applying to both institutions was much larger than either institution expected,” says Robert A. McCaughey, a Barnard professor who has written a history of Columbia University. “And both institutions were in the happy situation of being able to be more selective.”

Getting women to apply to Columbia was one thing. Taking care of their needs once they were on campus was another. More than a year before they arrived, a committee chaired by Rosenthal was created to oversee the transition for the first class of freshmen dorm’s first women residents. Admitting women, he says, improved the College “in every possible way.”

As head resident of Carman Hall in 1983, Brian Krisberg (CC’81, LAW’84) helped usher in the freshmen dorm’s first women residents. Admitting women, he says, improved the College “in every possible way.”

“The classroom environment was more interesting, the social environment better,” adds Krisberg, now a partner at an international law firm. “The campus, in so many ways, just became more vibrant…In a lot of ways, virtually overnight, the environment as a whole changed for the better.”