

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY
ORAL HISTORY PROGRAM

Shale Stiller

Interviewed by Jennifer Kinniff

March 25, 2015

Johns Hopkins University
Oral History Program

Interviewee: Shale Stiller

Interviewer: Jennifer Kinniff

Subject: Life of Shale Stiller

Date: March 25, 2015

JK: So today is March 25, 2015. This is Jenny Kinniff, program manager of Hopkins Retrospective and I'm here today with Shale Stiller, University Trustee and Johns Hopkins alumnus. Thank you for being here today.

SS: Thank you for having me.

JK: Great.

SS: Today happens to be Maryland Day also, which is a holiday which many Marylanders don't even know about.

JK: I don't even think I know about that. It's just a state holiday?

SS: It's a state holiday but I'm not sure that all the state offices are closed. I'm not really sure, but the only celebration I know of is that there's about a ten-minute ceremony in front of the courthouse downtown and that's all.

JK: Well, at least they're remembering it, somewhere. So let's start at the beginning with you. Can you tell me where you were born and a little bit about your family?

SS: I was born in Rochester, New York. My family was not an atypical Jewish immigrant family. My four grandparents all came over from Eastern Europe between 1900 and 1906, I think, without a dime in their pockets. My father's father, whom I knew very well and my father's mother I also knew very well. My father's father was a tailor. I know he never made more than \$12.00 a week and sometimes he was unemployed.

They came from very small towns in either Poland or Russia and where life was very, very hard. I've often said that if the Russian government and the Polish government had ever realized the accomplishments of the families that they kicked out they would have had much better countries, because it was a lot of talent who came here to the United States after the assassination of the Czar in 1881 and up till World War I.

My mother's family came from Latvia and they were also very, very poor. My parents were born in Rochester. They were not born in the old country as we used to call it, and their parents just didn't have any money. Neither of my parents went to college. They were both very smart people. We only lived in Rochester for two years, because when I was two my father couldn't get a job. This was 1937, and it was still very hard to get jobs in the United States and he was offered a job in Scranton, Pennsylvania where we moved for two more years.

I don't remember living in Rochester because we moved when I was two, and I recall very little about Scranton. My father was offered a job in 1939 to come to work at Hutzler Brothers Company, which was the large department store here, as the assistant buyer in the men's clothing department, a department which Hutzler's did not have up until 1939. He did very well there. He was a highly intelligent, personable man. From assistant buyer in men's clothing, moved up to buyer and then became the merchandise manager for the entire store and the store would often send him on buying trips all over the world to buy things that came to Hutzler's, and that's what made Hutzler's one of the great stores.

We were a typical orthodox Jewish family at that time. I never had any non-kosher food when I was a kid, and I still don't eat ham and pork and Maryland crabs or indeed any form of crabs, or lobsters or all that kind of stuff. But I remember my grandparents— my father's parents especially — on Friday nights which is the beginning of the Jewish Sabbath, somehow with the little money that they had, there was always a white tablecloth and a huge meal and the family spirit was always there with singing and joy even though there was such bitterness with — not bitterness, but the fact that they were poor I'm sure it was of concern to them, but they had such joy at the Jewish holidays and raising a Jewish family.

JK: And where did you live in Baltimore? What neighborhood did you move to?

SS: Several neighborhoods.

[0:05:00]

The first neighborhood was on Alto Road which very few people today know about right near Hilton Street. It was not far from Liberty Heights Avenue. It's just south of Liberty Heights Avenue. We lived there for a few years. While I was there I went to School Number 87, which was in Windsor Hills, which was a wonderful school. Wonderful, wonderful school. Then we moved when I was probably about nine or ten to Loudon Avenue, which was in Windsor Hills, and from Loudon Avenue after a few years there probably around 1948, we moved to Pinkney Road between Reisterstown Road and Park Heights Avenue.

Also a tiny abode, not an upscale home. And from there my parents had accumulated enough money so that they could build a house in an area that was called Dumbarton near Slade Avenue and Park Heights Avenue. They built a house there. My mother, although she didn't go to college, was very intelligent but she could read plans and specifications for a building. She drove the poor builder, a guy name Ward, crazy as a result of which he lost so much money because of her making him hue to the plans and specs, he had to go bankrupt.[Laughter]

I had gone to college before we moved into the house. The house was in the process of being built when I was graduated from Baltimore City College at the grand old age of fifteen.

JK: How did you come to graduate early like that?

Female: I hate to interrupt you. I'm sorry. Mr. Stiller you're about to get a ticket on your car.

SS: Why?

Female: I guess you didn't park it properly. So someone will move it for you if you'd like or if you want to go down and move it.

SS: No, they can move it. What do you mean I didn't park it properly? It was parked right where it said visitor's parking.

Female: I don't know but Gail just came to me and said they called up and they're ready to give you a ticket so I just –

SS: What is it? A Hopkins ticket or a police ticket?

Female: Probably be a Hopkins ticket.

SS: Well I have my Homewood sticker right on the car which they –

Female: How about we check it out for you –

SS: - if they have to move it.

Female: - just in case if we have to move it. Okay?

JK: I'm so sorry about that.

Female: Sorry to interrupt.

SS: Well is that part of the interview?

JK: We're trying to rattle you. Everything good?

Male: All good.

JK: Okay. Keep going.

SS: I graduated when I was fifteen for several reasons. I skipped half of the first grade and then I skipped, I think, half of the third grade. That was one whole year. Then I went to a wonderful junior high school, Number 49 it was called. It doesn't exist anymore which gathered together capable kids to do the seventh, eighth and ninth grades in two years. It was located on Cathedral Street right across from where the Baltimore Symphony is now, and these are kids from all over the city, so it wasn't just a homogeneous group of kids.

It was called an accelerated school. That's what it was. It was great because I got to meet kids from all over. And then when I went to City in February – no, no. Wait a minute now. Yeah, this would have been February 1948, I did the tenth, eleventh and twelfth grades in two and a half years because I skipped part of the eleventh grade, so I was two and a half years ahead of myself in effect.

JK: What was your impression of Hopkins as someone growing up in Baltimore? Did you have any kind of relationship?

SS: I had no relationship with Hopkins. My parents not being college graduates had no relationship with college. The other thing, which is in one of the Barry Levinson movies is that most Jewish kids

were warned to “never go east of Falls Road or you'll get beaten up.” Now we *did* have to go to east of Falls Road to go to City, but that was on a bus. I would take two buses to get to City, but I had no knowledge of Hopkins other than that I knew that the medical school and the hospital was outstanding, but that's all I knew.

JK: Okay. And so you went to Hamilton College in New York. How did you come to be a student there?

[0:10:00]

SS: I wanted to go to a couple of the Ivy League schools but in those days they were not taking kids who were under sixteen. They had a policy for just a few years, and I had a bunch of family who lived in Upstate New York in Rochester, which was not far from Hamilton, so I ended up at Hamilton.

JK: So it wasn't as culturally different for you as it might have been because you had been visiting family up there and had connections to Upstate New York?

SS: Yeah, but I didn't see the family much. I think Rochester was probably about hundred miles away and as a fifteen-year-old kid or sixteen-year-old kid I didn't go to Rochester very much nor did the family come and see me. So this whole business about well you'll be near family, that's a reason to choose Hamilton, it proved out that that was just a lot of talk.

JK: And what was it like for you being a college student at age fifteen?

SS: If I had to over again I would not have done it. I was much too immature to go to college and I – what happened when I got to Hamilton, I wanted to be one of the boys as a result of which I got in with a bunch of kids who went out to the bars every night. I knew I was violating New York State law, but I drank huge amounts of beer the first year and didn't go to a lot of classes either because my prime aim was to be one of the boys and to be accepted. If you're fifteen and you're with eighteen-year-olds your main desire is to be accepted.

Hamilton was a bad atmosphere for me too because it was a school where probably ninety percent of the class got into the Greek fraternities, but the fraternities were overtly anti-Semitic. Well over half of them had never taken a Jewish kid. Most of the Jewish kids ended up belonging to a sort of a club called Squire's Club,

and they were isolated in effect. You weren't part of the social life. So on two scores, both my age and the fact that I was Jewish—it was just not a friendly atmosphere. Now I am told that Hamilton certainly isn't that way anymore. Some of the aspects of anti-Semitism at Hamilton were also endemic here at Hopkins in that era indeed.

I don't know whether you read an article I wrote about Professor Earl Wasserman who was here at Hopkins both as a student, an undergraduate and a Ph.D. student in the 1930s and then came to teach here in 1948. Well, from 1935 to 1938, the president of Hopkins was a man named Isaiah Bowman, whom I wrote about in this article about Earl Wasserman. Bowman was overtly a passionate anti-Semite. But this was not just Hopkins. This was Harvard, it was Columbia, it was Yale, it was most of the Ivy League schools. And fortunately that is a thing of the past everywhere.

JK: And so you had mentioned Professor Wasserman. You did actually come to Hopkins during the summers while you were at undergraduate.

SS: For two summers. The summers of 1952 when I just turned seventeen. I had already finished two years of college, and the summer of 1953. I was very interested in English Literature. Very, very interested in it and thought I might want to become an English Lit teacher in college. I didn't know anything about Earl Wasserman at all and I signed up for this course. As I recall it was given at 8:00 in the morning. It might have been 9:00 in the morning but I'm not sure, with Wasserman. The first course was one on the romantic poets, starting with Wordsworth and then going to Coleridge, Byron, Keats and Shelley, and I loved the course. Absolutely loved it. As the article I wrote said, the only college notes that I've ever kept are my notes from Earl Wasserman's courses. Wasserman was so intelligent and in effect so intimidating that I never raised my hand.

[0:15:00]

But about four weeks after I took the exam in that course, I got a letter in the mail from him which I referred to in the article – the article may have even quoted verbatim, Wasserman writing me to tell me that I had received an “A” in his course, and he said he wanted to get to know me and he would appreciate very much if I would drop by one day. But here I was seventeen years old. I was just terrified of this overwhelming intellectual giant and I never

took him up on it, which I regret so much. But I did sign up for his course the following year in the Modern English Novel which was *Portrait of the Artist* by James Joyce, *Mrs. Dalloway* by Virginia Woolf, *Point Counterpoint* by Aldous Huxley, *Sons and Lovers* by D. H. Lawrence and *A Passage to India* by E. M. Forrester.

The same thing happened. I never raised my hand. Took extensive notes, kept all those notebooks, and then I got another letter from Wasserman. I got an A in that course, but again I didn't take him up on the invitation to come and visit with him. Again, it's one of the great regrets in my life. I did summon up enough courage, because I decided at the beginning of my senior year to go to law school, that I would ask him to write a recommendation to Yale Law School – probably to Harvard Law School also, which he did.

He must have said some very nice things, because I was accepted at both Harvard Law School and Yale Law School, but everybody told me to go to Yale Law School, everybody then and today I'm always fond of telling my Harvard Law School colleagues, *U. S. News and World Report* every single year has always ranked Yale Law School number one. Harvard has never been number one. It drives my Harvard friends crazy, but Wasserman certainly helped. And he wrote to me again, and I this letter again I think is also part of that article.

He wrote to me after I was in law school wondering how I was doing in law school. He said in that letter, if law is to be your calling fine, because people who are not enthusiastic about going into English shouldn't go into English. But he wondered how a person with my type of mind was coping with law. I don't think I ever answered that letter. I mean, I was frankly, in retrospect, I was being rude to this wonderful man. I never took him up on the offers to go see him and I never responded to that letter.

JK: It sounds like you must have made quite an impression on him for him to follow up with you.

SS: I know, and as I said in the article, writing the article on the centennial of his birth was sort of a way of atonement. And then what I didn't say in the published article, but I did write in a postscript to the longer article, on the hundredth anniversary of his birth, November 11, 2013, I went to the cemetery here in Baltimore where he was buried, because I felt that was one way in which I could atone.

The other way to atone was to write this article, and I remember very well going to the cemetery where he is buried, his wife is buried and their only child who died when she was eight years old died. And the Jewish custom – I picked up some stones that were around the area and put stones on each of their markers.

JK: What do you remember about him as a teacher? Do you recall sitting in his class and –

SS: I was rapt, r-a-p-t, rapt, because Wasserman not only knew English, he knew philosophy. He knew history. He knew about what was going on in the intellectual aura of 1798 when Wordsworth and Coleridge published *The Lyrical Ballads* to the time when Keats died in I think 1821, and Shelley and Byron died shortly thereafter.

[0:20:00]

He knew all of the ferment of that era, all of the intellectual excitement, and what was going on in poetry and literature and philosophy and music and he brought all those things to bear. So for a seventeen-year-old kid, what excitement because I was interested in philosophy. I was interested in history – all those things. He was not just a pure literary person. He knew all of this and brought it to bear in understanding poetry. And the same thing the following year.

Joyce wrote *Portrait of the Artist As A Young Man* about 1915 or so and the other novels that I mentioned were over the next twenty or thirty years. But he brought into these novels what the philosophical currents were, what the historical currents were in that era, and it was exhilarating to hear a man as intelligent as Wasserman who was not a narrow person, but whose mind was as broad as can be. He understood everything. One of the great things about Wasserman was when he came to Hopkins as an undergraduate he wanted to study mathematics but he learned from someone that the mathematics department was very anti-Semitic. There was nobody in the English department who was Jewish, but Hopkins was eager to take him and they were eager to get him back as a teacher because they saw what an incredible mind he had.

JK: So he must have influenced you. So you did go into law school, but at least in the beginning you were also pursuing a masters in English, is that correct?

SS: Yes, at Yale with people like Wimsatt and Mack and Pottle and all those great English scholars but it was impossible to do all the things that I was doing at Yale. At law school, you'd probably have a thousand pages a week to read. I can't remember how many pages I was reading in the graduate department of English, which was right across the street, but there was a third activity that I was involved in at Yale. This is part of the mischief that was carried over from college. I became enveloped in the big poker game at Yale Law School.

We used to try to get a couple of Yale undergraduates into the game who were very wealthy, who had no conception of the value of money who were terrible poker players. The leader of the game in my first year was a fellow named Tom Carruthers who I think was either number one or two in his class at Princeton and was up in the top five at Yale Law School. Tom Carruthers went on to be the great corporate lawyer in Alabama and was also Harper Lee's lawyer for most of her life. Not in the last few years. I think Tom must have retired.

But these stakes and these games were enormous because these Yale undergraduates, they'd lose a thousand dollars a night. One night one kid lost his car. He threw the keys to his car in the pot. So we would play poker every night, and I was ostensibly going to law school and trying to take a masters program in English across the street with all these great teachers, Wimsatt, Mack, Pottle and so forth.

JK: So you dropped the English rather than the poker?

SS: Yes I did. And Carruthers who was a couple of years ahead of me in law school, he graduated. Then I ran this big game. I could tell you some amazing stories about this game, but if you're interested I'll tell you but I'm sure you have other things to talk to me about.

JK: So let's see, you were at Yale for two years or three?

SS: No, it was three years. Three years. From 1954 to 1957.

JK: Okay, and when you graduated you immediately moved back here to Baltimore?

SS: Yes, I did. I became a law clerk on the high court in Maryland, which is called the Court of Appeals. After that I went into a law firm here for a few months, but then I wanted to get a masters

degree in taxation, which I thought would help, which it certainly did, at NYU and that was in February 1959 until June 1959.

[0:25:00]

I never finished the masters program. I only did it for four months because one of the great law firms – one of the two or three great law firms in Baltimore at the time, which was called Frank, Bernstein, Conaway and Goldman, offered me a job beginning on June 1, 1959, but I said I'd like to finish the one-year program at NYU. They said if you don't come on June 1, we won't hire you. Well in those days the law firms hardly took anybody – maybe one associate every two or three years, and I didn't want to take a chance that the job would still be open if I waited another term till I finished the NYU program.

So June 1, 1959, I became a practicing lawyer and ever since I have been a practicing lawyer. Haven't gone into government service, haven't done anything else other than getting very actively involved at Hopkins and a lot of other charitable activities.

JK: That's right. So in looking at your biography, I don't see Hopkins show up until 1975. Is that right? Were you involved –

SS: Yes it is.

JK: - and that would be when you I think enrolled in the MLA program and also started directing the Shriver Hall Concert Series.

SS: Yeah, I thought it was 1974 but you could be right. I know I got the degree in 1977 and it was typically – you took one course a term but I thought you had to take ten course, so that would have been five years and I thought it was 1974, 1975, 1976 and 1977 because one year I took two courses in order to get it over with.

JK: Okay, that sounds right.

SS: And that was really exciting.

JK: Tell me about why you decided to take part in the program.

SS: Well, I felt then and I still feel now that if you're a busy professional whether it's a lawyer, a doctor, an accountant or whatever you may be, or a businessman, you're going to become pretty generally a narrow person, because if you're good at what you're doing you're going to focus so intensely. As a doctor, if

you're an orthopedic surgeon you're going to focus all your efforts on orthopedic surgery. You're going to want to spend your spare time reading the journal of orthopedics.

If you're a lawyer you're going to want to read the monthly law reviews that come out and write articles, which I did when I started out as a lawyer. But if you do all that you're going to become very narrow and you're not going to learn anything else. And it's very true that most of the doctors and the lawyers and the accountants and the business people that I meet, not all, but most become very narrow people. They don't know what's going on from an intellectual point of view, they don't read the great newspapers, they don't read the great magazines, and I wanted to do something even though as a lawyer I was working at least eighty hours a week. I wanted to do something that would broaden my mind because I felt it would help me be a better person.

So, I enrolled in the master of liberal arts program, I think in 1974, and that was a fabulous program in those days because many of the great teachers at Hopkins were teachers. Sometimes people from other schools would come and teach in the program and some highly intelligent people were taking those courses. I took for example a course in Dante taught by Charles Singleton who at that time was recognized as one of the two or three great Dante scholars in the world. He had just completed writing his translation and his commentaries on the *Divina Comedia* and that led to the first published letter I ever had written to the *New York Times*, which occurred in the following way.

[0:30:00]

Richard Nixon was the president of the United States at the time. About six weeks before he resigned, he was asked at a news conference by one of the correspondents. Not he, his press secretary, Ron Ziegler was asked, "We hear rumors, Mr. Ziegler, that Mr. Nixon may resign," to which Mr. Ziegler responded, "There's nothing to that at all. Absolutely untrue. Mr. Nixon would not resign until Hell froze over." So I then wrote this letter to *The New York Times* having studied Dante with Charles Singleton reading something as follows.

"Dear Editor, Mr. Ziegler stated that Mr. Nixon will not resign until Hell freezes over. Mr. Ziegler obviously is not a student of Dante or his *Divina Comedia* because if he were he would know that in the ninth circle of Hell where the worst sinners are kept for eternity, there are only four characters. One is Satan of course, but

Satan has three heads, and one of the heads he's chewing on Cassius and another head is Brutus and on another head is Judas, and Mr. Ziegler, they are all encased in ice. Mr. Ziegler, Hell has already frozen over."

So that was that. I took courses in Chinese history in the master of liberal arts program. I took a course in Goethe, Goethe's *Faust*, taught by Hugo Jantz, J-a-n-t-z. And I remember I wrote a paper for Professor Jantz called the "Transmogrification of Goethe's *Walpurgisnacht* from Early Goethe to Late Goethe." A very esoteric topic, and Jantz, I remember called me up and wanted to meet with me and talk to me about it, which I did.

Took a course taught by a great Hopkins history professor, J. G. A. Pocock, P-o-c-o-c-k. Great man that dealt with what was going on in the newspapers in England during the period of the American Revolution. Fascinating course. I forget what the other courses were but it was a thrilling experience to take those courses.

JK: Do you have colleagues or other people you've encountered in your work that have also gone through this program?

SS: Oh yes. There were two other lawyers whom I was friendly with then and I'm still friendly with – Harry Lord and Mac Plant. Both of them are great – well, Harry doesn't practice anymore but he was the Deputy Attorney General of Maryland for several years and Mac Plant has been one of the great estate planning lawyers in Maryland and is a good social friend of mine. Unfortunately, the master of liberal arts program has fallen at Hopkins because the people in charge of it believe that all programs have to earn money, and if it doesn't earn money they're not going to support it.

And frankly it is terrible what's happened to that program, because of some administrators who are myopic. And I'm one of the people who is working with Melissa Hilbish here and others to try to get people to understand that in the long run Hopkins would be much better off if it built that MLA program up again. Look, Hopkins in a sense has made money off of me.

Not from me personally, but because I was able to persuade the Harry and Jeanette Weinberg Foundation, of which I was the chairman and the president and the CEO, to make a gift to the medical establishment here, over \$25 million and to persuade the Stulman Foundation of which I've been the president since Leonard Stulman died fifteen years ago to make an \$8 million gift for the Jewish Studies program—if I hadn't been in that master of

liberal arts program, those gifts would have never been made. When I tell that to the dean who's in charge of this AAP program, under who's aegis the MLA program exists, it doesn't matter to her. It doesn't matter to her, and I've said on many occasions she just doesn't understand it. She thinks that the humanities don't get people jobs and I think it's a terrible fallacy.

[0:35:00]

JK: Yeah, well certainly an innovative program and I think it's really interesting to think about the impact that it's had on sort of the culture of Baltimore in terms of people like you who kind of got this new perspective on the world –

SS: Well, the other thing about it is I would have never become a trustee if I had not been an alumnus.

JK: That's right because you were elected as an alumnus.

SS: As an alumni trustee. My good friend Morris Offit who has done so much for Hopkins asked me if I wanted to become a trustee, if I had any interest in it. It was Morris who put my name up and got me in in 1984, but I became an alumni trustee. Had I not gone through the master of liberal arts program I would have never become a trustee.

JK: Well you're certainly a passionate defender of it. That's nice to hear. Was it a difficult decision for you to agree to serve as a trustee?

SS: One of those decisions that one makes in a nanosecond because look, I had taken those courses with Earl Wasserman. The master of liberal arts program was, to use the same word I used before in another context, was exhilarating and made me a much better person. By 1984, I knew the great value that Hopkins brings not just to Baltimore, Maryland but to the world. So it was a nanosecond, and I said to Morris “thank you very much” and I've been indebted to him ever since.

I remember a few years ago, I forget what the occasion was, when I wrote a letter to Morris, I mean even though I talk to Morris occasionally on the telephone, I wrote a letter to him and said one of the greatest things he's ever done for me was put me on the Hopkins board, because I've met people who I would have never otherwise met, been involved in discussions about issues that I

would never have known anything about, and it has broadened my intellectual outlook to an amazing extent, and all that I owe to Morris Offit.

JK: So in 1984 when you agreed to serve as a trustee, what was your conception of what that entailed. What were you hoping to accomplish as a trustee?

SS: I don't remember. I was so excited to be with these people who had achieved so much in life. Their accomplishments were all legion. I don't remember what the major issues were at that time. I could tell you a couple of funny stories about those early years. The university would meet in Shriver Hall, the main room as you walk into Shriver Hall to the right. It was a fairly small board then, and no one smoked except for the two people who symbolically should not have been smoking – the president of the university and the president of the hospital. Steve Muller was an inveterate smoker and Bob Heyssel was an inveterate smoker, but I got over that.

The other story I remember so well was I guess I'd been on the board for about a year and there must have been a series of articles in either *The Wall Street Journal* or *The New York Times*, which are two of my favorite papers even though their editorial philosophies are like alpha and omega. But there were a series of articles in both papers dealing with the fact that law schools are moneymakers. So I raised my hand at one of the board meetings and asked Steve Muller, I said to him, "Steve," who I had gotten to know very well, "I read that law schools make a lot of money for universities" and I knew that Hopkins had sort of a law school in the late '20s or the early '30s – It wasn't really a law school.

[0:40:00]

It was a law institute run by a guy named, I think his name was, Harold [Herman] Oliphant and Yntema. It only lasted for four or five years but it wasn't a real law school. "Why doesn't Hopkins have a law school? It can make a lot of money which could fund not only the law school but it could fund other parts of the university."

And I'll never forget his answer to me, which made me feel like crawling under the table. Steve – "Shale, you went to Yale Law School, didn't you?" "Yes. Yes I did. Why?" "Well you know Yale of all the big universities is the one which has the most trouble with unions." And I said, "Yes, I do know that. There is a lot of union trouble that is raised at Yale. Why?" He says – Steve then

said to me, "Do you know who the lawyers for the unions are at Yale?" And I said, "I really don't." He said, "It's the faculty at the law school. If I start a law school here and the faculty wants to emulate what goes on at your law school, I'm going to have some big union problems," and I really felt like crawling under the table.

So I don't think I asked another question at a board meeting for another year but I did become a great friend of Steve's. There were so many exciting things that happened in those years. 1985, the first year after I became a member of the board, was I think the thirtieth anniversary of the founding of the Bologna part of SAIS and a trip was arranged. Those members of the board wanted to go on this trip to Italy.

Well, it was really exciting because three professors of the art history department were going to be on this trip and basically giving a tour of art in Italy – Charles Dempsey, Liz Cropper and Herb Kessler. Well what an exciting thing to go on a trip with these three people. I remember we'd be going along on a bus going to some place and one of them would shout out, "Let's take a little diversion here. There's a gorgeous museum about a half a mile down the road – or a gorgeous church. There's some wonderful art in there." And then we would stop unexpectedly and they of course knew it.

Now I'm probably going on too long but I have to tell you another wonderful story. We get to Florence and of course everybody wants to look at Michelangelo's statue of David. I am admiring this great statue of course and then I say to Herb Kessler, who is Jewish, I say, "Herb, why is it that David, a Jewish man, was sculpted by Michelangelo in an uncircumcised way? Because David, like all Jews, especially the King of Israel at that time would certainly have been circumcised." So Herb says, "Well, I know a bit about that. He did it because it was the politically correct thing to do in Italy at that time."

But then Herb Kessler said, and I've reminded him of this several times, "Since you asked that question, Shale, and I know what kind of a mind you have, I have to tell you this story. You know you go around Italy and you see these statues of naked men and they have fig leaves over where their genitals would have been, and you must wonder why all that happened." And I said, "Yes, that is interesting. I've never really thought about it that much."

Well Herb then said, "Well let me tell you the story. There was a pope who was offended by all these statues of naked men with

their genitals out, and the pope ordered that all of the genitals be cut off and replaced by a fig leaf. And the thing that you'd be interested in is the pope ordered that all of the cut off genitals be placed in one of the catacombs. It's a catacomb that very few people go to and if you're interested I can get you in there."

[0:45:00]

I was with my dear wife and she said, "Shale, I don't want to go to that catacomb." I never did go. I think I told Morris Offit that story, and I said if Morris was going to Italy he should go.

SS: Then in 1986, Jenny, and this is where I really learned one of the many things that makes Hopkins great. 1986 was when the trustees were invited to go to the opening of the Nanjing school, which was the first American university in about a hundred years to have opened anything in China. That was really an exciting thing. There was a large group that went on that trip and those who went on the trip never forgot it. We went to Beijing, Shanghai, Nanjing and Xi'an. Going to Xi'an was incredible to see those statues of thousands of soldiers that had been created. I forget the year they had been created. Nanjing was where the university was and Beijing and Shanghai was just such impressive cities.

I'll tell you a funny story about a banquet at Nanjing, and I guess there were probably around fifty people in attendance. There were five circular tables, ten people at each table, five from Hopkins and five from Nanjing University. Well at this big banquet we're all seated and we're all given little drinks of Mai Tai. I think I may have heard of Mai Tais. I don't think I'd ever tasted them nor that I really understood how potent they were.

But in any event, we're seated with these Mai Tais and after about a minute or two one of the Chinese professors stands up, and asked everybody to give a toast and he'd toast friendship and peace between the United States and China and all those kinds of things and everybody has to down this shot of Mai Tai. Well several of the people didn't. They may have sipped a little but I had the whole shot. Then a couple of minutes later the glasses were filled up again, and I felt that it was my duty as a Hopkins trustee not to be outdone and I would have to propose a toast as well to the success of the Nanjing-Hopkins enterprise.

So I propose this toast. I stand up and probably only four of the ten people joined in this toast because the other six didn't want to take a chance at what having more than one Mai Tai might do to them. I

was ignorant. So I proposed this second toast. A few minutes pass and this Nanjing professor who didn't want to be outdone either—he proposes a third toast. At this time it was just he and I, and I didn't want to be outdone.

I was a new member of the board. I'd only been on the board for two years and I felt that I had to uphold the honor of Hopkins, so there was a fourth toast. At that point I remember the associate dean of the medical school, I forget his name now but those who have the list of who was on the trip will remember, came over to my wife and said “you better tell Shale to stop this Mai Tai business. That is potent stuff and he's going to pass out.”

And Ellen *did* tell me to stop, but I was so imbued with upholding the honor of Hopkins as I wanted to show everybody how important Hopkins was that I didn't pay attention to my dear wife. The Nanjing guy does the fifth toast, and five minutes pass and the room is beginning to revolve in my head. I stand up to propose a sixth toast and I noticed that the Nanjing professor had left.

[0:50:00]

He was gone which I pointed out just to my Hopkins friends and I said, "See? He can't even uphold the honor of Nanjing University." The end of the story though is I got sick that night. [Laughter]

JK: So were you around – you were there for the opening of the Nanjing Center. Were you on the board when they were discussing creating it or did that happen before you joined the board?

SS: I think the original creation had to have been before that, but some of the programming I think and how it was going to work—and was it going to be half Americans and half Chinese—we did talk about those things and would the American students have to know how to speak Chinese to be admitted and what were the rules on whether the Chinese students would come to Washington to be at SAIS. A lot of those policy decisions I think were discussed at the board level. I'm not a hundred percent sure but even if they weren't discussed, we did get papers on them that discussed what the policy issues were.

JK: Why do you think it was Hopkins that – I mean why Hopkins in China? Why were they the university to make that leap?

SS: It was Steve Muller. This was all Steve Muller. Steve had a universal outlook – a worldwide outlook. As you may know, Steve

was born in Hamburg around 1928, and his family had to leave. That's a fabulous story which I should tell you. That was part of an article I wrote for *The Baltimore Sun* after Steve died. Steve's father was Jewish. His mother was Catholic. But when Kristallnacht occurred on November 9, 1938, the police came and arrested Steve's father.

Steve's father was a prominent lawyer, and they put him in jail or in some sort of a camp, and the police came by not long after he was arrested and said to his mother—and Steve had a younger brother about two years younger than him – I think he was younger, not older, but there were two boys in the family—"We will let your husband out of jail if you permit us to castrate your two sons." The notion was that the two boys had Jewish blood in them and the Germans had this Aryan blood theory. They didn't want that Jewish blood to be perpetuated.

And Steve's mother said absolutely not. But Steve's father had enough friends in the law who respected him that he was able to get out of jail and, as I remember the story, Steve and his mother and his parents were given forty-eight hours' notice. You either leave now or you don't get out at all and they took them up on it and they went from Hamburg to England where they lived for about a year and then they came to the United States. The reason I know all about that story is that in the 1980s or 1990s, the Hamburg Bar Association invited Steve to come back to talk about his father's law practice and Steve spoke fluent German.

And Steve wrote a paper, but it was both in German and in English, and this little story I told you was part of that paper and he gave it to me, because by that time I'd become very friendly with Steve. And I remember at the big Passover seders that Ellen and I give every year, for several years I would have somebody read that story. People were utterly horrified by it. But Steve had a world vision. He was very active in German/American affairs – very active in German/American affairs, promoting a much closer rapport between the United States and Germany, belonged to several organizations and led many organizations that promoted close relations between Germany and the United States. But his worldview was not limited to just Germany. He was the driving force behind this rapprochement with Nanjing University.

JK: So something else – I know Steve Muller was also the driving force behind Peabody coming into the fold of Hopkins –

SS: Oh yes.

[0:55:00]

JK: Who served on the –

SS: I was on the committee but frankly I didn't have that much to do with it. Actually, I was an officer of the Peabody – I may have been the president or the chairman of the committee or the board of Peabody. So when I say I didn't have much to do with it, I may be wrong about that. I tried to find my file on that but I think it is lost. I must have had something to do with it, but frankly I just don't remember. But Steve was a multicultural man and I love music. I've been a subscriber to the Shriver Hall concerts for at least thirty or thirty-five years.

I think that the Shriver Hall programs are the best music in Baltimore, year in and year out. I've been a subscriber to the Baltimore Symphony Orchestra for fifty years and go to virtually every concert. When we go overseas, as we often do, we go to concerts in Paris and London and Berlin and Jerusalem, so I thought it was important that Peabody not be allowed to fail. Peabody from an economic point of view is a tough institution to run and to have it survive because the teachers are one-on-one. It's not one teacher teaching twenty people or thirty people or forty people. Trying to raise money is very difficult.

But Steve knew that Peabody was a treasure, and if the only way it could be saved was to bring Peabody under the aegis of Hopkins, under the umbrella of Hopkins, then that would have to have happen. And basically it was a merger where Peabody didn't have that much say, because it would have gone bankrupt. But the University has been totally fair to Peabody and under some of the presidents, and certainly Ron Daniels, Peabody has been promoted and has been helped immeasurably. Immeasurably.

JK: Peabody, in a way, has also kind of raised the international profile of Hopkins, right?

SS: Oh, absolutely. Absolutely. The cellist, the lead cellist who plays one of the cellos that [Pablo] Casals played has just been given a lot of publicity. Yes, it's very true what you said.

JK: One other big issue for Hopkins in your early years as a trustee was the governance of the hospital and the school of medicine.

SS:

Yeah, that came a little later. In my earlier years, I was the chairman of the library committee, which I was very active in because I love libraries. A story I've told many times is I have thousands of books in my house that are arranged very carefully and one year about five years ago when I began moving a lot of books into the master bedroom, my wife said to me one night, "I'm giving you a choice. It's the books or me."

We had to compromise, but I love books and I was – and actually I gave some great pieces of furniture that we had in our home to the librarian. I think they're still used in the library office, but I was chairman of that and then at some part I also became chairman of the nominations committee and the bylaws committee. But the business you mentioned of the hospital and the university and those talks, that was very exciting and you probably know that a book has been written about that. What was the name? He taught at the medical school at the University of Maryland. Was it Castin or Casin – something like that. I'm not sure exactly. Well, Hopkins had a system not unlike those that many other great academic health centers where there were two separate corporations with totally separate boards.

[1:00:00]

The university under which the medical school fell, and the hospital, which was independent, which had its own board. It used to be that at least ever since I went on the university board that the egos of the people who ran these two institutions would often clash. The medical school came under the university board. The professors at the medical school were also the surgeons, the doctors, the clinicians at the hospital and you would inevitably have clashes. I think when I joined, Dick Ross was the dean of the medical school and Bob Heyssel was the president of the hospital.

It's possible that Tommy Turner was still dean of the medical school when I first got involved in 1984, but I don't remember exactly. It was not good to have the hospital and the university at odds with each other. Not only was it not good, in many ways it helped the smooth running of the whole medical enterprise. And then when Heyssel and Ross retired and Jim Block became head of the hospital and Mike Johns became the dean of the medical school, this continued clash was very, very harmful. Very harmful. So a group of ten people was appointed to mediate the problem and to solve it and I was one of the ten.

I forget now whether I was one of the university ten or one of the hospital ten, but it was a great group of ten people. I think at most of the meetings, all ten people would come including some from out of town. I was trying to remember who was – well, you have the list. I remember Furlong Baldwin was on it, Morris Offit was on it, Don Shepherd was on it, I think Lenox Baker was on it, Mike Armstrong was on it – I can't remember all of them but we figured out – oh, Bloomberg. Mike Bloomberg. He was on it.

We figured out a way to change the whole governance structure so that there would be a considerable amount of overlap. While they still are separate corporations now, there's an enormous amount of interchange so that old clash can't occur anymore. Today the president of the university is the chairman of the executive committee at the medicine entity. Oh, there's also a new partnership that was created – Medicine – Johns Hopkins Medicine and it's a 50/50 partnership between the hospital corporation and the university, and there's an enormous amount of interaction.

For example, the compensation committee at Johns Hopkins Medicine which I've chaired now for thirteen or fourteen years, the compensation of the department chairs at the hospital who are also professors at the medical school is determined by that particular compensation committee. So it works, and it has worked beautifully. It has really worked smoothly. It's also led to some other salutary things. It used to be that the hospital corporation board was almost exclusively people who lived in Baltimore. The university board was a far more diverse board from a geographical point of view and it's gotten even more geographic.

[1:05:00]

Well, major efforts have been made and they've succeeded in getting people who were outside of Baltimore to be on the hospital board. There are also a group of people, I think it's probably about a third, who serve on both boards. I've been on both boards this whole era. But that was a very important step that was taken. I forget who appointed the members of that ten-person committee but I'm sure the book was written in – I remember Mike Bloomberg. Mike was, I think, chairman of the board of the university at that time.

Mike's solution, which we all said wouldn't work, was this. It was patterned after the way Mike operated Bloomberg, his company. Mike's offices you know don't have any walls, and there are no walls in his office. Everybody can see everybody else. So Mike

said well look, the way to solve this is to put the president of the hospital and the dean of the medical school, let them occupy the same office, but we all persuaded him and he was wise to accept our persuasion. Mike that's not going to work.

JK: Are there still sticking points between the university and the hospital you think need attention?

SS: I don't see that anymore. I think it is really gone. It really is totally gone. It has worked. It really has worked and it's been – I think when one looks back on the achievements of the boards, *that* has to rank right at the top because if you had continued to have this internecine warfare it would have dragged the whole medical establishment down. You just can't have it. Now I must say, in fairness, part of the success has been because of the personality of Ron Peterson.

Ron Peterson who is one of the most brilliant men I have ever met and whose memory is about as good as anybody's I've ever known, he is a person who looks to solve problems. He doesn't look for fights and I've never seen anybody argue with him because his logic is so impeccable. For example, when Ed Miller was the dean and the CEO of Johns Hopkins Medicine and dean of the medical school and Ron Peterson was head of the hospital they just didn't argue. They would seek a compromise. But a large part of that was Ron Peterson.

You can sometimes have a great governance structure that won't work because of the personalities. Here we had both. We had a great governance structure and we had wonderful personalities, and it's conceivable you could have a system that would work very well with a terrible structure, but if you had two people who wanted to cooperate with each other that could work, but nobody wants to take that chance.

JK: Are there any other initiatives that you worked on as a trustee that you want to bring up that were particularly significant for you?

SS: Well, right now in the compensation committee, I've been a bit of a bear, one could say, on improving the compensation of the doctors. The system we have is that—we have some extraordinarily capable administrators who, in an era of complexity beyond belief, you need. You need top lawyers, you need top financial people, you need—those people have to be great.

[1:10:00]

And the aim has always been to have their compensation pegged at the 75th percentile for administrators in our peer institutions, but we are *not* at the 75th percentile for all of our great doctors, and under my prodding the committee has taken this up. Dean Rothman, who agrees with this need, has taken it up. A committee has been appointed. They are working on a report. It would be very expensive, but he knows that if we're going to attract the best young doctors and if we're going to *keep* the best young doctors we've got to move up the percentile for the great doctors.

Now in some cases you just can't keep everybody. For example, a lot of people – take surgery. A lot of people want to be the chairman of a department. You can't have two chairmen of departments, so if we get a great surgeon who gets an offer to be the head of the department of surgery at Yale, it's hard to keep that person. If a person gets an offer from another institution, because that other institution has offered his or her spouse a great job and Hopkins can't offer that job for one reason or another, you're just not going to be able to do it. But we've got to keep up our quality and one of the ways of doing it is to compensate them fairly.

We do have an advantage at Hopkins, which I should mention. There used to be a fellow on the faculty here, I think he was on the medical faculty, named Hamilton Moses, III. Everybody referred to him as “Chip” – Chip Moses. I got to know Chip very well and Chip left Hopkins to become a consultant to most, if not all, of the great academic health centers. And about ten years ago, Chip happened to be in Baltimore and he called me up and we had lunch and he said to me, “Shale, I've got to tell you one thing. I've gotten to know all these places. The one thing that makes Hopkins unique is its culture in the medical establishment. It's a culture of cooperation, which I don't see anywhere near to the extent that Hopkins has it. Everybody is not cutthroat. They're not trying to cut everybody else's throat.

They don't have this culture of wanting to beat out everybody else at Hopkins. They *do* want to cooperate, and if you can do anything you should preserve that culture. It is so important because the other places don't have it. The research culture here is something else. The research is greatly admired here, which is not to say it's not admired elsewhere. It certainly is but the sense I have of it is that there's much more collaboration here between the clinicians and the researchers than there is at most of the other academic health centers.”

JK: - why that is? Do you think it goes back to the early days of—

SS: It's historical. Oh, absolutely. When the Big Four was here, Welch, Kelly, Halsted, Osler, they were all great researchers and great clinicians. Of course, you can't reproduce those people. Osler was an incredible man. He knew everything about medicine and wrote this textbook that was just mindboggling. He knew everything. What other big issues? Well I'm trying to think of the other —

JK: Let me pause for a second and let you know that it's 10:20 right now, so wondering if this might be a good time to stop for today. I'm wondering — there are a lot of things I'd still like to ask you about if you might consider coming back for a second interview, if we could schedule that sometime.

SS: You mean I'm so loquacious and gregarious that I've exhausted you?

JK: Not me but I know you have places to be.

SS: Well I can keep going for a half hour if you want to do it if you think so, but if your schedule would be screwed up by me, I would rather keep going rather than try to schedule something else.

JK: Okay. I wanted to make sure you were okay. All right, well we can continue.

SS: Okay.

[1:15:00]

JK: Okay, so we were talking about the medical center. Let's see, if I could circle back, you did talk about being really involved at the library committee as well. Tell me about that and kind of why you think the library is important to Hopkins?

SS: Libraries are in a sense, both the brain and the heart of a university — of a great university. Many of the issues that I had to grapple with was the problem of space. You can't just continue to collect books because there simply isn't room for the books and magazines, and the whole shift from buying every book and every journal which was too expensive anyway, and to having things online has not been easy for any library. Winston Tabb, who we have now—Winston I think is the longest serving dean who's still here.

He's been fabulous because on a national scene he's looked on as one of the people among all university librarians who understands how to do all of this, and he gets involved in all of the major copyright issues. But look, the importance of it is this. Universities are all about scholarship. Scholarship is not sound bytes that the average American reads because the average American only wants ten words or two minutes on television. A university is all about serious scholarship where you need to know the best that has been written about any particular topic, and you've got to be able to get whether it's a medical journal, a philosophical journal, an English journal, a historical magazine—you've got to have access to all of these things or you're not a great university, period.

It's expensive and you don't have space for all this stuff anyway, and a lot of people who think they are intelligent these days just don't understand what libraries are all about. The library in a sense ought to be the symbol of what a great university is all about, and it's got to be able to get accessed so that whether it's a Ph.D. student or an undergraduate, that student has access to everything that's been said about something. One of the problems of online research and computer research, and I see this in my law practice, is that the young kids have been taught their research by doing everything online and they look for key words and they focus on that word. They've lost the feat of turning pages in books.

I like to do a lot of my own research. People say to me I'm the only one over fifty who shows up in our law firm library, because I get ideas by turning pages. When you're on a computer, you're looking for the narrowest thing – words, and you don't turn pages and this is devastating. So I want people to be trained not only to use computers but how to turn pages in computers. But this is very difficult for kids who have grown up in high schools and in colleges just looking for very narrow things. But libraries are just absolutely essential. I know I'm in a minority on that but Winston Tabb has held the flag valiantly and *well* here at Hopkins in terms of that.

And it's also not easy to raise money for libraries, and for the humanities which are so important. One of my big things these days is, to get back to the MLA thing we were talking about, the number of students who major in the humanities anymore has gone so far down and it's *dangerous* – English, philosophy, history, languages, anthropology, those are the courses that make people think and it's not encouraged to that degree anymore.

Most of the kids want to be able to do well on the MCATs who go into medical school where they feel they've got to learn every fact about physics, biology and chemistry, and sure there's thinking in chemistry and in biology and in physics but they ought to be able to think about other things and how to think, and that's what the humanities do.

JK: So I want to pivot a little bit and talk about the presidents that you have served under as a trustee.

SS: Oh yes.

JK: We have thirty minutes, so Muller you've already talked about a little bit. Tell me a little bit about Muller, what you think his strengths were.

SS: He was a great public speaker, he was brilliant – brilliant, brilliant man. He was corruscating. That's a word you probably don't hear very often spelled c-o-r-r-u-s-c-a-t-i-n-g, in his delivery and his talk and his idea. He had an idea every ten seconds. I worked very closely with Steve. Look, I appreciated the man's intellect and his ability to write. He wrote a lot. He wrote papers, he wrote great speeches, and he was challenging. The faculty respected his intellect and, as I mentioned earlier, was so broadminded in creating SAIS – not creating SAIS, but building up SAIS.

I'm trying to think of some other things. I know there are other things about Steve that I could talk about. One of the highest compliments I ever got was when Steve asked me to be his lawyer. When a person of that intelligence asks you to be his lawyer, it gets the lawyer very excited and I became his lawyer and got to know his family and all those kinds of things. He knew so many different things about so many different topics and for that reason he was so highly respected. Everybody on the faculty liked him because he knew a little bit about everybody's field. After Steve was Bill Richardson who I also became a great friend of, and I became his attorney also. He was quieter than Steve but everybody liked him as well.

He understood the issues thoroughly. My recollection is that he had done a lot of work in the financing of healthcare, Bill, so he knew that that whole issue, which is the most complicated issue that faces a place like Hopkins. It's just so complicated. I've forgotten the issues that Bill had to deal with. He was only here for five years and he got this offer to head the Kellogg Foundation,

which was an offer that he just couldn't refuse—being the head of a large foundation, which I did once. I think Kellogg had \$4 billion and Weinberg Foundation which I had was "only" \$2 billion but it's exciting and it lured him up to Kalamazoo. After Bill was who? Dan Nathans?

JK: Yes.

SS: Well Dan was only here for a year and I didn't have much contact with – when I say here, in that role. He was sort of an interim president. I didn't have that much – Dan was, I don't think he was striking out on new paths for that year because he knew it was interim. He was asked if he would serve while we search for someone else because Bill Richardson's departure was not expected. It was sort of a surprise and we wanted to do a careful search.

[1:25:00]

Bill Brody came after that, and I didn't have as close a relationship with Bill as I had with Steve Muller or with Bill Richardson or as I have right now with Ron Daniels. Bill Brody was enormously talented though. He was brilliant in many ways. He was a master of classical piano. I don't know whether you knew that. He could fly his own airplane, which he often did. He was on boards of many other companies, big companies so he got to know business very, very well. He had a great business instinct. He was more of a businessman than either Steve Muller or Bill Richardson because of his experience on corporate boards. But Jenny, I just don't remember what the major issues were that came up while Bill was president. Was Bill president when the ten-man committee to reorganize the medical establishment?

JK: I couldn't say for sure. He was president from 1996 to 2009.

SS: He may have been. He may have been president then, so it was under his aegis and he certainly had to approve all these things that this ten-man committee did.

And the last president is Ron Daniels, who I think is fabulous. It's hard to compare the speech making ability of Steve Muller and Ron Daniels. Of all of the presidents that I've been with, they were the best public speakers. They were both incredible, but Ron is one of these people who I think he must get a maximum of four hours of sleep. I wake up every morning around 5:30 and there are often emails from Ron Daniels that were timed at 2:30 and the university

has gotten to be a much more complicated place than it was when Steve Muller was around.

Far more employees, far more issues to deal with, the money has grown enormously. Both of them had memories that are fabulous. Steve Muller – I'll never forget, I was at an early board meeting under Steve when somebody asked him a question, I forgot what the question was, that he could not have anticipated, because it was not on the agenda. I remember the question was in the nature of, "Steve the university has just made a statement, or you just made the statement dealing with this Hopkins policy. Could you give us an idea of what the history of that policy has been?"

Well, without losing a beat, Steve without a note, could trace Hopkins' policy on this issue from 1890 up to 1985 without one extra word, without one wasted word in perfectly chiseled English prose. Of what a master order he was. Ron Daniels, I think his memory is as good as Steve's. He never forgets anything. But the one thing about Ron that is unique among all of these people, and he made this statement when he was inaugurated in 2009 – he said he wanted to bring Baltimore into Hopkins and Hopkins into Baltimore, and darned if he hasn't done that. He really has. The whole program in East Baltimore, for example – EBDI, East Baltimore Development Company, which has gone through so many problems – political problems, racial issues, neighborhood issues, and Ron has hung in there and has overcome all these issues. It's finally turning the corner but you can't imagine the obstacles that he had to deal with.

[1:30:00]

I was on that EBDI board for a few years and it's only through his tenacity that EBDI is going to succeed and the building of that whole new school out there and the early childhood programs of – you know that new school which is called Henderson Hopkins, that was the first new public school built in the city of Baltimore in something like thirty-five years. The creation of this early childhood program, zero to five, taking kids from birth to five, bringing them into an atmosphere, a location that is physically connected to the school, having psychiatrists, having readers, having people that can help these families that don't have any help. Many of these poor families, there is no father and the mothers are betwixt and between.

Nobody reads to a lot of these kids. Well there are people who are going to be reading to them. And bringing the whole health – a lot

of these kids from zero to five would come from poor backgrounds don't have adequate healthcare. And if you're given adequate healthcare and you have people read to you from the very beginning, you're going to do much better in life. Well without Ron Daniels fomenting, creating the energy and to get over the natural resistance that people who don't like to take a chance manifested, this wouldn't have happened.

And now we're even getting a couple of restaurants in there, a grocery store, graduate housing has been up for the medical students. One of the things that Ron insisted on was one of the reasons why we may not get all of the great doctors we want or keep all the great doctors and get all of the great students that we want or that—we get the absolute highest quality but we can do even better—is that that area down there has been a slum historically. It's been a little dangerous. The slums are gone. You're going to have first class eating facilities, first class homes down there.

Ron picked a dean for the school of education, Dave Andrews, who moved down there. He bought two houses for one dollar on the condition that he improved those houses, which is exactly what he's done. And Ron's getting involved in a collaboration with the Maryland Institute College of Art, MICA, to build up that whole North Avenue area. He's bringing Baltimore into Hopkins and Hopkins in to Baltimore. People have enormous additional respect for Hopkins now.

JK: I was going to ask about it. Do you think that the city's perspective on Hopkins has changed because of those things?

SS: Absolutely. Absolutely and that has all been Ron. Ron gets these meetings with members of the city council, he meets with the mayor a lot, he invites the mayor to have dinners at his home here. I have to tell you while it may have been occasionally done under earlier presidents, that was just not part of their agenda. Ron's main aim, well one of his aims, is to see what types of social programs work in these areas. But the other thing is that it's so farsighted. If we want to make sure that the medical establishment with all these new buildings that we have down there—that it keeps up getting outstanding doctors and outstanding students, we've got to improve the neighborhood.

What we ultimately hope is to have half of the faculty live down there so that they could walk to work. That's just so important. And in addition to that Ron is just such – my wife and I have gotten to

know him very well. He is such a lovely man. He's a first class gentleman and a very good friend. I like being with him and the catholicity of his reading. I mean, he reads everything on every subject you can imagine. The one thing that I wonder is how he has the time even with only four hours of sleep to keep up with everything he has to read and to understand all these things.

[1:35:00]

He just wrote an article that's been published in some of the medical magazines dealing with the problems that NIH has these days. Fabulous article. You ought to get it and read it. It deals with the fact that NIH just isn't funding as many of the young doctors, the younger researchers to the extent that they used to, and Ron had to learn an awful lot about that in order to write that article. His background was not in healthcare. Ron had been a provost at Penn and before that dean of the outstanding law school in Canada, the University of Toronto Law School. But he has learned it, and he comes to meetings in East Baltimore that I'm either in or I'm chairing. He asks the most intelligent questions. He's many steps ahead of most of the people in the room, which is wonderful for Hopkins.

JK: So I wanted to ask if President Daniel's focus on relations with Baltimore—was that a surprise to the board of trustees or was that something he talked about during – was he hired because you were intrigued by those ideas, or was that something he developed after coming here?

SS: He developed it before he came here, because at his formal inauguration, I remember he gave this fabulous speech at his inauguration, as to what he wanted to do, and that was one of the four or five main things that he said he wanted to do. So this was something that he had in mind. My suspicion, Jenny, is that he had been provost up in Penn and had seen what Penn had done around the hospital and the medical establishment and the whole university there that had been part of an old part of town, and Penn rejuvenated that old part of town. That had to have been one of the seminal aspects of Ron's thinking.

JK: That makes sense. So are there things that you would like to see Hopkins do in Baltimore that it's not doing yet?

SS: Do in Baltimore? Look, what they're doing with collaborating with MICA is a great thing. I don't think any president before that had done that. Ron reached out to MICA. Everything that I've already

talked about in connection with East Baltimore, what other institutions could there be more collaboration? I guess there could be more collaboration with Goucher. There's no reason why, if Hopkins has a great teacher in a subject that Goucher doesn't or vice versa, that there can't be an interchange of faculty. Maybe some of that goes on now. I don't know. I may be assuming something that I shouldn't assume. What other things?

Look, the main problems in Baltimore right now are ones that Ron Daniels can't solve. It is poverty. It's the broken family. You may have seen this just a few weeks ago. Both *The Wall Street Journal* and *The New York Times* ran articles about the fact that it was the fiftieth anniversary of a talk that Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan gave in Congress on why the scourge of poverty and why it just continues on and on, and he said it's gotten worse because there is no family in well over half of these houses.

There are absent fathers in a huge number. There are, what is it? Over half of the live births are of illegitimate children. The rise of the birth control pill, where people don't understand the importance of family. Both *The Journal* and *The Times* bemoaned that Senator Moynihan's emphasis on rebuilding the American family just hasn't been followed up on, but it's a difficult topic.

[1:40:00]

I don't know what Ron or Hopkins could do about that. That is such a major thing. When I talk about family, the one – I mean this in a sense has nothing to do with Hopkins, but I can't help but talking about it. Three of our children have families and the one thing I tell them, and the one thing I tell my clients who often get involved in family battles, is the bottom line is when you get into trouble the only group you can be sure of is your family. And you've got to cultivate that family when you're a child and parents have an obligation to inculcate the importance of family into their children beginning with age four and five.

And I tell my grandchildren all the time “don't you ever – if you want to get into an argument with one of your siblings or one of your cousins just remember what I've told you.” You can argue but then continue to talk, because in the long run family is all that anybody has. But I don't know what Hopkins can do about that, and unfortunately we're faced these days with such insane political battles in this country with a whole group of legislators not wanting to do a damn thing about this issue.

JK: Well you've talked about the kind of public service work in addition to your career and your family that you've been involved with, so why has Hopkins been a priority for you? Something that you've dedicated so much time and energy to.

SS: Well, look. Hopkins is the crown jewel not just of Baltimore but of Maryland. So one's natural instincts are to become involved with and to help polish that crown jewel. Look, I've been involved in a lot of other organizations. I've been the president or the chairman of the board of the Park School here in Baltimore. I was the chairman of the board of the Jewish Family and Children's Service, a wonderful social service agency. I was president of the Bar Library and have been the president of three or four very large foundations.

But the one I think that has given me the most satisfaction has been Hopkins, because I've been exposed to ideas and thoughts and processes that I never by myself would have been exposed to and I've learned so much by that exposure. I've become a person who can help others in a much better way because my perspective is not the narrow perspective of, unfortunately, of most professionals these days. The more I'm around Hopkins the more I learn. I love going to these meetings. Sometimes I don't understand everything that goes on at these meetings. You take the meetings in East Baltimore dealing with the financing of academic health centers.

I was at a meeting a few weeks – no, this has been a couple of months ago, we were talking about how the focus of the hospital and medical center has to change from fee for services to quality control and groups, dealing with groups of people. Oh, I was also in one of the other great jobs, then I'll come back to this, I was chairman of the Health Advisory Board at the School of Public Health, which I loved. I learned a lot about public health, because when I started out that job one of the things I did that was one of the few smart things I'd really done in life, I said to Al Summer who was dean, "Al, if I'm going to take this job I should take a course. Can I audit the course in epidemiology?" which was then taught by Leon Gordis, which I did.

God did I learn a lot there—but in any event let me get back to what I was talking about. Oh, what is going on in healthcare now with the Affordable Care Act and with everything else is the most complicated single topic I have ever been involved with, legal or anything? And I was at a meeting of either the executive committee of Johns Hopkins Medicine or the finance committee a few months ago and I said to everybody, "I hear each individual

sentence that people are saying, and I understand each individual sentence, but I don't have the foggiest idea how all this ties together."

[1:45:00]

And during that meeting I said, "What I want you guys to do, and ladies, is we ought to have a four-hour meeting at which this topic is discussed and nothing else." And then, as I recall, I said, "How many of you here at this meeting feel that you understand how all this stuff ties together or you feel that you wouldn't be helped by such a four hour meeting?" Virtually everybody raised their hands. Look, part of my bias about this is that we all have our own joys, our pleasures.

One of my great joys in life is intellectual puzzles, intellectual challenges, and solving them. But this one, the financing of healthcare, is the most complicated one of all. A large part of the problems would go away if we had a single payer system, but politically it's impossible to get that through. But working within the confines of the political system, it is so complicated but we have this crown jewel and we've got to make sure that we understand it. One of the board members at Johns Hopkins Medicine, one of the top board members said to me just three weeks ago—he said, "Shale, I feel I'm not fulfilling my fiduciary duty as a board member, because when I cast votes on whether to approve these policies, I don't understand this stuff." Now this is one of the most intelligent men in Baltimore.

If I mentioned his name, you and everybody on the board knows him. He's one of the former chairmen of Johns Hopkins Medicine, but for him to say – and I agreed with him. I said I'm not filling my fiduciary duty either, because I just don't understand it. But we've all got to understand it, and the average congressman doesn't understand it. The average congressman doesn't have time to understand it. But if there's something that Hopkins could do to figure out a simple way to enable politicians and others to understand and to figure out better solutions— it would be ideal.

JK: So you have served in so many different areas of Hopkins – you know, library, public health, medicine. What do you think having seen all these places, what makes Hopkins unique as an institution?

SS: A lot of it is the collaboration between the divisions. They're not silos and this is something that Ron Daniels has absolutely emphasized, the cross-pollination and effect. The de-siloing, if

that's a word, because smart people get challenged when they meet other smart people in other areas of the university who have a slightly different perspective on what the role of the university is and how to educate and how to solve problems. You begin to think – to use this, what's become a very trite expression—you begin to think out of the box when you have to cross discipline and Ron has been absolutely dramatic in his emphasis on that. It is very, very important that this kind of thing be done.

Look, there's another way of looking at that. It goes back to a famous comment that the great English philosopher Alfred North Whitehead once uttered. "It takes an unusual mind to undertake an analysis of the obvious." Now why did I use that in connection to what I was just talking about? The problem with most professionals who stay in one field is that they sometimes don't get to see the obvious. They're so focused on things that they've been focusing on for so long that nobody challenges them or nobody with a different perspective comes in and has a different way of looking at the problem.

[1:50:00]

Hopkins has a lot of unusual minds and they could fulfill what Whitehead said, which would be to use those unusual minds so that they could find the solutions. "It takes an unusual mind to undertake an analysis of the obvious." A lot of solutions that would be obvious if only people's minds could be open, and this cross-disciplining is a good way to get there. The other thing we also have to do— and look, Ron's also has been one who has challenged a lot of ideas in academia. Some he's gone very slowly on. All great educators these days are worried about the tenure system.

Now tenure, which was originally created so that people would feel free – professors would feel free to voice their opinions on subjects. That's absolutely indispensable, but it's become a bit of a path to sinecures. People feel, well if I have tenure, I don't have to work that hard anymore and I don't have to try to re-examine the orthodoxy in my field. What we want here at Hopkins are people who are re-examining their first premises. There's a great expression that Oliver Wendell Holmes, the great judge, once said, which I like to apply to every field. This is a quote. "It is revolting to have no better reason for a rule of law than that it was laid down in the time of Henry IV."

And I apply that to legal issues and educators should apply it to issues here at Hopkins and the other great universities. Just

because we've done something, just because the university has done something the same way for fifty years or the same way for a hundred years there's no reason why it has to be continued to be done. One of the things that I find mindboggling – I haven't talked to Ron about this, but one day I will, but I just was exposed to it. One of the departments here wants to hire a person to be a professor in a certain area, and they have two fabulous candidates, both of whom are eager to come.

But in order to give the invitation, they have to go – they've already had a search, the department. They've got to go through three more steps in the academic ladder – to the provost and to this person and to another person, which will take five more months. In the meantime, both of these people who have been identified as outstanding may get picked off by other universities. And part of it is that it's been done since the time of Henry IV. Part of this— I encountered a lot of this. One of the things that you haven't asked me about but this is part of my personality. One of the things that I love doing, especially my early years was to ask people to look at all of the statutes of Maryland and to get rid of the dead wood.

In 1966, the then-governor of Maryland asked me if I would be on a commission to rewrite all the laws of Maryland dealing with estates and wills, and I accepted and we produced a body of work that had been governed by a 1798 law in Maryland that had been nibbled away at and added in an incoherent way and it was a great body of work. It reorganized, simplified, and got rid of all of the dead wood, got rid of all of these Henry IV laws. So when my very good friend who worked with me on this, Roger Redden, and I got done with getting that through the General Assembly of Maryland, we wrote an article which we said this ought to be done for every statute in Maryland and we persuaded the governor of Maryland at that time, 1969, to appoint a commission to rewrite the whole Maryland code.

[1:55:00]

What the governor did, turnabout is fair play, he appointed me and my friend Roger Redden on this commission. This has taken a long time to do it. It's just about over with. But this will have lasting impact – really lasting impact and of all the things – the other thing I love doing is, I'm a teacher also. I've broken the record at the University of Maryland Law School for the most continuous years of teaching. I just finished my fifty-second straight year, which I've taught five courses over the time – because I love teaching.

But the real reason I love teaching is sort of tongue in cheek but it's true, is this. I've gotten to the point where a lot of people who I know well are going to be very hesitant to tell me when I'm beginning to get dementia or Alzheimer's. My partners at the law firm, my good friends, my colleagues here at Hopkins. At the University of Maryland Law School where I've been teaching for fifty-two years, at the end of each term, the students have to fill out these anonymous forms where they grade the teacher based on twelve different criteria. And because the forms are anonymous, the kids can be honest, and I will know when my time has come to step down when I start getting bad marks. The only bad marks I get right now are some of the students complain that I give them too much work.

JK: That's law school, right? That's what you're there for.

SS: But I don't know how we got off on all this stuff.

JK: Let's see, we were talking about what makes Hopkins unique.

SS: Well, look. It's medical establishment is certainly unique. I wish I could say the departments in the humanities are still as top-rate as they used to be but I can't. The English department about which I have some great knowledge used to be considered one of the top two or three in the United States. The history department was the same way and a few of the other departments were as well, but one of the problems these days is that this is not just at Hopkins. It's all over. It's Harvard, it's Yale, it's everywhere. Most of the students don't want to get involved in the humanities. Kids are interested in getting a job.

There's all this business about why even pay to go to college. What do most parents say, why am I paying for my son to take a course where he studies Plato, Aristotle, Kant, and Hegel with a bit of Burke and Hume, and Locke and that seems to be the pervasive philosophy these days. So what's happened is that the quality of the departments that teach the humanities, it really makes me it's think has gone down.

I don't know how to bring that back because the pool of really capable teachers has gone down because there aren't that many kids who are in college who want to major in these things anymore. What I don't know is whether some of the smaller colleges still have the same percentage of students majoring in humanities as used to be.

I would bet it may be the same at places like Swarthmore, Haverford, Amherst, Williams, Kenyon, Oberlin, places like that. I've never looked into that but my hunch is that the percentage of kids who want to go into the humanities, while it may have gone down, hasn't gone down nearly to the extent that Harvard and Yale and Hopkins have.

JK: Is there anything else that you want to add that I haven't asked you?

SS: That's what I always ask a witness. [Laughter] I don't know. By now you must be thoroughly bored.

JK: Not at all.

[2:00:00]

SS: Look, it gets back to the same topic about my worry about specialization. What all universities ought to do is to produce the educated person, and the educated person is one who loves learning even after he or she is out of school, and that is one of my worries about the ability of a democracy to survive. Democracy is premised on an educated public but I fear that with specialization, we don't have the educated public—using the word “educated” in the sense of someone who has the much grander perspective than just a few narrow topics— I don't know how a university can go about perpetuating that thirst to be an educated man that is required to have a really great democracy.

Unfortunately, the politicians of today almost prey on the limited perspective that so many people have, the great mass of people who don't continue to be educated and they're all looking for certain answers – certainty they're looking for. Let me conclude with this. Another great saying of Oliver Wendell Holmes, great phrase, "Certainty generally is illusion and repose is not the destiny of man." "Certainty generally is illusion and repose is not the destiny of man." Think about that. The average American, I'm afraid, thinks that there are certain answers, absolutely certain answers and for most problems there aren't.

There are some who would say that all the great ideas have already been expressed by Plato and Aristotle, and they did not agree with each other at all. But, the educated person is one who accepts the fact that there are no certain answers.

One of my problems with the Tea Party types, for example, is that they are certain that they have certain answers and they can't accept the fact that repose is not the destiny of man. It's built into people to have different views on subjects, but they can't accept that. They just don't understand that part of this is the fault of Plato. Plato was the one who said there *are* certain answers out there if you can get out of this cave, but that's dangerous thinking. Okay, that's enough.

JK: Okay, well thank you very much for being with us today. We really appreciate it.

[End of Audio]