

American Agricultural Economics Association
Annual Meeting
Providence, RI
July 26, 2005

REFLECTIONS ON LEADERSHIP, DIVERSITY AND HUMAN CAPITAL¹ **Clifton R. Wharton, Jr.**

When I received the invitation from the two committees – COSBSE and CWAE² – I immediately accepted since my wife, Dolores, and I remember fondly our first AAEA annual meeting in 1956 when I was a graduate student at the University of Chicago. Your organization and its meetings have always held a special place in our book of memories. As some of you know, I have been trying valiantly to finish my autobiography. After more than ten years work and not yet finished, Dolores has titled the archival version “Wharton on Wharton: An Encyclopedia.” Nevertheless, a product of that effort has been a great deal of thought as I resurrect events of the past and ponder the lessons learned that might be particularly relevant for minorities and women.

I have had careers in a variety of institutional settings – in philanthropy, foreign economic development, higher education administration and business – often in leadership positions that also were the first for my race. This has added a special dimension of a “diversity” perspective. Thus, I thought it might be appropriate to reflect upon my personal experiences which influenced my leadership.

A cautionary note: Inasmuch as these reflections are based upon personal experiences spanning more than five decades, and considering the unarguable progress of diversity in the workplace in more recent years, some of my observations may be out of date. Still, the fact that my invitations to your meeting came from AAEA committees concerned with the opportunities for Blacks and for women in agricultural economics, it is evident that the goal of diversity is still elusive. (This is also apparent when I noticed that your program yesterday morning had a section titled “The Status and Progress of Under-represented Groups in the Agricultural Economics Profession.”)

1. Recognize and Treasure Human Diversity and Intellectual Diversity

In 1924 my father was the first Black to pass the U.S. foreign service exam. He served for 40 years, ending as the first Black career Ambassador when he was posted to Rumania and then Norway. I lived abroad at his posts with my family until I was sent back to the U.S. at the age of ten. During the ensuing six years at the Boston Latin School I had many great teachers and role models and rarely encountered any serious racial difficulties. Because the students were competitively drawn from all sections of the city, the classes looked like a racial, ethnic, religious, and socio-economic rainbow.

¹Partially based upon my earlier speech for the Abshire-Inamori Leadership Academy, Center for Strategic and International Studies, Washington, D.C., (October 21, 2003).

²Committee on the Opportunities and Status of Blacks in Agricultural Economics and Committee on Women in Agricultural Economics

Many years later, I was asked by a Boston Latin student reporter what I considered the most important subject which I had studied during my six years there. I told him that it was not a subject but a lesson. I learned that “. . . innate ability is randomly distributed in society. In any given class . . . the best student of Greek might be a low-income Jewish youth; the best in French, a middle-income Black; the best in English, a high-income Irish; the best in Latin, a low-income Italian . . . It made little difference where you lived or your station in life.”³ From this I learned the importance of excellence and of equity and the profound complementarity of the two.

I did have one negative racist experience that alerted me to attitudes I would later encounter. During a discussion an English teacher asked me about General Franco’s inaugurating the Spanish Civil War. I responded, "Which time?" He scathingly replied that there was only one Spanish Civil War and one beginning. I protested that General Franco had made two attempts to start the war, but he waved me off contemptuously. After class, I explained that I had lived in the Canary Islands, Spain where Franco had been imprisoned and had made two escape attempts to start his coup. I said that my father was the American Consul there at the time, and I thought I knew something about the subject. The teacher didn't apologize, but merely murmured that he had not realized that I had such information.

He then asked about my career ambitions, indicating in a supercilious tone that he thought that I should "go back down South and help your people as a school teacher." Despite my youth, I resented the teacher’s paternalistic idea that I was only suited to "go back to the South." I will never forget the look of astonishment on his face when I told him my ambition was to be a diplomat and follow in my father’s footsteps.

This experience made me realize that not everyone was prepared to accept intellectual challenges from someone who did not fit their stereotypes.

2. Rely upon and Trust Individual Talent and Initiative

From my earliest jobs I learned the importance of relying upon individual talent and initiative. The best leader, I found, understands the power of unleashing individual talent by offering persons the opportunity to learn, to be enterprising and to make a contribution.

Nelson Rockefeller’s AIA

This lesson came in my very first job. In 1948, with a freshly minted MA in International Affairs from the School of Advanced International Studies at Johns Hopkins, I became an Executive Trainee in one of Nelson Rockefeller’s non-profit technical assistance initiatives in Latin America, called AIA (the American International Association for Economic and Social Development). My immediate boss was Pete Hudgens, who still carried shrapnel in his body from World War I. One of the chief architects of the Farm Security Administration during the Franklin D. Roosevelt years, Pete was a great believer in the efficacy of supervised credit for poor farm people.

One of my duties was to prepare Pete’s memoranda for the board of trustee meetings. Early on, he gave me a difficult assignment to propose a new program for Central America. I labored over the memorandum for over two weeks and finally submitted it with a great deal of trepidation. Pete read it over and then called me into the office. In his gentle Southern drawl he said, "Well, Clif, you've got all the basic points that I wanted in the memo." I heaved a sigh of relief, until he added, "But there's a slight problem," and my heart leaped. "You see this memo sounds like Harvard, not like South Carolina. " He then broke

³Quoted in Dennis J. Curran, “Outstanding Alumnus, Clifton R. Wharton, Jr. ‘43, Boston Latin School Bulletin, Spring 1980.

into a broad grin, and I immediately understood that a memo over his name needed to reflect his personal style and approach. He was right, of course, and I never made the same mistake again.

On another occasion I was asked to solve a major problem in one of our programs in Brazil. I did everything I could to get the answer calling every expert whom I could think of who might have the needed information. After three days without success, I confessed that I had failed in my efforts. Pete picked up the telephone, dialed someone, asked the question, got the answer and hung up. My face must have betrayed my dismay at my incompetence. With a fatherly look he explained, "Clif, you have to realize that I have been doing this for the last 45 years. When you get to be as old as I am and have as many contacts as I do, you'll find that you can do the same thing." Years later, as I gained experience, I realized that he was absolutely right. Even more important, he did not criticize my youthful failure. Instead he gave me a very useful lesson in the advantages of age and experience and a recognition that, when you're young, you shouldn't be faulted for your youthful ignorance and inexperience. Pete had faith in giving me an assignment; even more significant, he let me learn and grow in the process.

Mosher and ADC

After completing my Ph.D. in economics at the University of Chicago in 1957, I returned to the Rockefeller family philanthropic interests in a program of John D. Rockefeller 3rd dealing with agricultural development in Asia, the Agricultural Development Council. When I told my father that I had decided to move to Singapore for 10 years to work on programs in Southeast Asia, he was unhappy. He was still pressing me to follow in his diplomatic footsteps by making a lateral entry into the Foreign Service. I pointed out that one of my goals was to achieve administrative responsibility for development and conduct of programs in Thailand, Vietnam, Cambodia, Malaysia and Singapore. I noted that in his positions as "chief of mission" and as ambassador he had learned to exercise independent judgement and to take responsibility for his decisions. I told him that I wanted to do the same in Southeast Asia and be responsible for the development of a program on my own – just as he had! He agreed and indulgently capitulated.

My work in Asia during the 1950s and 60s represented more than a decade of personal and professional growth as an expert in economic and agricultural development leavened with a critical exposure to the creative programmatic administrative genius of Art Mosher, the president of ADC. A person's success in life is often the product of what one has learned from a "master," and Art was a true "master." I would learn from him the value of choosing the best people and giving them the opportunity to use their intelligence, rather than fitting them into a pre-determined mold. I would learn from him the importance of recognizing and exploiting the complexity of problems rather than trying to fit solutions into a single cookie-cutter approach. I would learn the importance of studying an issue thoroughly, thinking clearly, writing clearly, and speaking clearly one's vision.

Mosher created a unique overseas program staffing structure. He believed that the key to pushing forward the rural social sciences in Asia rested with recruiting a handful of U.S. professionals with outstanding academic credentials who could provide policy leadership for the Council's programs at the field level, instead of direction from a central headquarters. These "Field Associates" were conceived as dual academic and philanthropic professionals who would be stationed abroad on a multi-year assignment, and who would become the eyes and ears of the organization to discover areas where the Council's Programs would be most effective. Associates were expected to identify local individuals and professionals who might benefit from our graduate study fellowships in the United States and also recommend local academic and governmental institutions that might benefit from modest assistance either through research or library grants.

It was Mosher's favorite expression that captured his unshakeable faith in relying upon individual initiative that I found most telling. Whenever you encountered a problem and sought Mosher's advice or direction, he would say, "Use your own judgement!"

Most important of all, Art reinforced what I had already been learning: the importance of human capital in personal and general economic development. I was working in some of the most diverse regions in the world. For example, in Singapore and Kuala Lumpur Malaysia where we lived for six years, the religious mix included Islam, Buddhism, Daoism, Hinduism, Christianity, Sikhism, and Shamanism. This multi-cultural society included Chinese, Malays, Indonesians, Arabs, Indians, Pakistanis, Afghans, Javanese, Minangkabaus, Bajaus and Kadazans. Often, these groups were subdivided linguistically, such as the Chinese into dialects of Cantonese, Hokkien, Hakka, Hainanese and Teochew.

Diversity with a capital “D.” I saw both the problems engendered by such diversity, but more meaningfully I was able to see and interact with the wide range of intelligence, skill, and talent that was to be found regardless of ethnicity, religion, or national origin. And my efforts in teaching, research and grant-making that contributed to building this diverse human capital was most gratifying. Today, many of the leading figures in Southeast Asia are my former grantees, fellows and students – including such figures as a national president, a deputy prime minister, a governor of central bank, university presidents, and ministers of agriculture.

3. Treasure and Protect a Reputation for Honesty and Integrity

In my opinion, a great asset of successful leaders, at any level, is their reputation for honesty and integrity. A leader consequently is perceived as a person whom “followers” can trust — a person in whom people will have faith. Although my lessons on honesty started in childhood, the virtue of integrity was indelibly etched by an incident during my doctoral studies.

My major mentor at the University of Chicago was Theodore W. Schultz, who won the Nobel Laureate in Economics in 1979 and for whom I served as research assistant for three years. Schultz had a commanding presence, but not a physically intimidating one. Rather, it was an intellectual intimidation due to his incredible mind.

Whenever I am asked to describe Theodore Schultz, the word “integrity” immediately leaps to mind. He first came to national prominence due to a controversy when he was Chairman of the Department of Agricultural Economics at Iowa State College (later University). A study by a fellow professor had concluded that the nutritional properties of oleomargarine were no different from, and might be better than, traditional dairy-based butter – thus infuriating the state’s dairy industry. When the college sought to squelch the study, Schultz resigned, citing academic freedom and the danger of censoring research. He then joined the department of economics at the University of Chicago and later became its chairman for the next 15 years.

I personally witnessed another example of Schultz’s integrity. The early 1950s were a time of intense witch-hunts over allegations of communist infiltration of government, featuring the infamous Senator Joseph R. McCarthy and the House Un-American Activities Committee, whose hearings had permeated the country like a viral infection. Security checks and loyalty oaths were widespread. The atmosphere of distrust and fear was at times palpable among those contacted by Congressional staffers or the FBI.

On this unforgettable occasion, I was waiting to see Schultz when a man entered the office and insisted upon speaking to him before me. Schultz asked me to wait, and since he did not close the door, I heard the entire conversation. The visitor told Schultz that he was conducting a security check on one of his former students. After inspecting the visitor’s credentials, Schultz asked, “Do you want my opinion on his character, or professional competence as an economist, or loyalty to the United States?” All three, the visitor said.

Schultz responded: “I will be glad to provide this information to you on the condition that you keep notes of my comments. Next, I will furnish a room and typewriter for you to prepare a written document summarizing my responses which you will end with a statement to the effect that I am prepared to testify to

my statements in a court of law and in the presence of the individual. Then I will sign the document with you as witness!"

The stunned investigator said he wasn't sure that he could do that. Schultz handed him a telephone and said, "Please call your superior and ask him now." The flustered man did, and was told something to the effect, "Oh, Professor Schultz. Skip him and go on to the next person!"]

4. Nurture Future Talent

In my first job with Nelson Rockefeller as an Executive Trainee, I had an unmatched experience of "learning at the top" that would provide me at the age of 21 with the opportunity to gain exposure to the management style of a premier philanthropic family. I could learn about the accounting process of a non-profit organization and of a profit-making one. Or I could spend time visiting the public relations section on the legendary 56th floor of 30 Rockefeller Plaza to see how it operated. The lessons I learned would last me a lifetime. Equally, I was fascinated by those sober-sided individuals who were secretly, but fearfully, mocked as the "Lions at the Gates" – the key advisers to the Rockefeller brothers through whom all major issues and requests were vetted. Thus, I was able to study how their companies and organizations were managed, as well as how persons interacted and a little about what made them succeed or fail. I thereby gained an invaluable and comprehensive perspective at the very beginning of my subsequent careers. It was an opportunity to see leadership at the top that I would subsequently try to offer other young men and women later in life when I had the chance.

Similarly my great mentors, Ted Schultz and Art Mosher – both of whom, by the way, are Fellows of this Association – shared one important characteristic from which I benefitted and which I hope I have continued: the nurture of the next generation of leaders. Schultz and Mosher did it for me and I have tried to do it wherever and whenever I could. Consequently, throughout our respective careers, both Dolores and I have sought to do what we can to encourage and contribute to the success of those who can provide the next wave of leadership.

When I became president of Michigan State University, one of my early acts was to develop a program of Presidential Fellows. Each group of Fellows included one undergraduate student, one graduate student and an assistant professor, among whom usually were women and minorities. Each group spent five months working in my office to learn what it was like to run a mega-university. The program ran for two and a half years, and some 13 fellows had an opportunity to observe, participate and learn the intricacies of managing an academic institution. Today, thirty years later, the former fellows have reached such posts as college or university presidents and vice presidents, foundation executives, university provosts, professors, and government officials.

Later, as chairman and CEO of TIAA-CREF, I adopted a similar approach, creating a program of rotating special assistants -- mid-level, high-potential officers -- who spent five months in my office. They attended virtually all of the internal governance committees and trustee board meetings, conducted special projects, and met with me alone bi-weekly for confidential discussions on why certain decisions were made. They could ask me anything they wanted to know, often about what they had observed while shadowing me. Why did I follow one strategy vs. another in dealing with a particular problem? What was I trying to achieve in my opening remarks to the Officer Group? How seriously did I view a critical comment made by a trustee? As long as they maintained my strictures on confidentiality, I answered all their questions as truthfully and accurately as possible. They were thus given a chance to see first hand my leadership role in forging the future directions of our company.

Giving these younger people an exposure and insight into how a corporate leader operated had broader benefits beyond the personal. Each person came away with a far greater appreciation and understanding of how things were done and why, a perspective which helped them to perform better when they returned to their jobs and facilitated their communicating these insights to their colleagues.

Over the next five years some 20 special assistants were selected, of whom seven were minorities and 10 were women, and I have been pleased to follow the upward progress in the company of several “alumni.” In its first ten years of operation, the special assistants program had reached 42 company officers.

Perhaps the most successful example of "giving back" is not mine, but Dolores's Fund for Corporate Initiatives, Inc., a private operating foundation which she established with her own funds to increase the upward mobility of women and minorities in the corporate world. For some 15 years, FCI conducted programs designed to give special leadership skills.⁴ Before the program was turned over to the Aspen Institute, over 200 mid-level, high potential executives participated from major U.S. corporations such as Exxon, Xerox, Ford Motor, GE, Time, Kellogg, Verizon, AT&T, NBC, Showtime and other Fortune 500 corporations. Today, many of the program's alumni are in senior vice presidential positions at their corporations – two have even become directors of major corporations.

5. Avoid the Shackles of Stereotypes and Protect Your Freedom of Choice

Let me return now to a different aspect of my earlier comment regarding diversity. One of the difficult problems faced by women and minorities is how to avoid the negative aspects of racism or sexism in the choice and pursuit of a career, while protecting and advancing your ability to pursue the full use of your human talents.

When I joined John D. Rockefeller 3rd's Agricultural Development Council one of the Council's major programs was graduate study fellowships in the U.S. for Asians. However, the program was experiencing problems, and Art Mosher asked me to conduct a survey of Asian graduate students studying at major U.S. universities and to prepare a report.

I visited some 14 campuses across the country, contacting deans, chairmen of Departments of Economics or Agricultural Economics, interviewing 71 faculty members and 48 Asian graduate students. Meeting the outstanding professors whose books and journal articles I had studied as a graduate student and whom I had heard giving major addresses at professional meetings was a great experience.

There was, however, an awkward incident when a professor at a Midwest land-grant university wanted to know why I was bothering to work on Asia. “You should be helping your own folks, the Negro farm people in the South or working on the problems of Africa,” he said. “They need you.” I agreed that they could use help, but I couldn't resist asking him, “Why should my professional interest or career be limited to Blacks or Africa? From your name, I assume that you are Norwegian, but do you only work with Norwegian farmers or overseas only in Norway?” There it was again – the mind set that I had experienced with the English teacher at Boston Latin that because I was Black, my horizons were inescapably limited to the Black community – whether at home or in Africa. I wondered whether my success as a development economist would be judged as successful only if I were working in Africa rather than in Latin America or Asia. Any success might be judged as not based upon my abilities, but rather because I was working with “my people.”

I later found a similar stereotyping in business – if you are a Black in sales, your worth is to sell to the Black community, and, if successful, your success is discounted as achieved only because you have this “special” universe, not because you are a top marketer. Somehow, at the time, I intuitively feared that such

⁴For a good description of Dolores' FCI, see Patricia O'Toole, “Another Kind of Wharton School, A Training Ground for Executives – Including Women,” Lears, March 1991. Also, Committee on Economic Development (CED) and Fund for Corporate Initiatives (FCI), Dialogue on Diversity, (New York, NY: CED, 1999).

categorization would lessen the significance or value of whatever I might achieve. Such stereotyping too often limits the arena in which you can show your skills and competence, but worse, it fundamentally seeks to diminish your true accomplishments.

Let me be clear. I strongly believe that there are critical needs and roles to be played by minorities or women in their personal, more parochial fields, but these should not be a choice forced or based upon the acceptance of negative stereotypes. Moreover, for many minorities and women the ideal choice would be the freedom to choose to work in *both* arenas, the parochial and the universal.⁵

From the earliest days of Black presence in North America, most Black scholars and intellectuals who have made their mark have focused their attention upon the needs and problems of the Black community. For example, Black historians have chronicled the parts played by Black men and women in yesterday's civilizations and in the American past.⁶ But for the Black scholar or professional it presents special problems. If the field is history, the Black scholar too often is seen as an historian of Blacks, not a historian who simply happens to be Black. Any investigations he or she undertake outside the approved domain will be viewed with raised eyebrows, if not active hostility. The case is similar for the writer or sociologist who pursues empirical research on exclusively Black issues. The larger academic community may accept or applaud such work. But in private the work will be criticized as "parochial" or even "separatist." Questions may be raised as to methodological rigor or scholarly objectivity. And if the Black researcher is affiliated with a predominantly white college or university, those criticisms may well be influential when the time comes for academic promotions and tenure. The fact that the locus of the problem lies with the majority not the minority can readily be seen in that such questions are rarely asked of other ethnic intellectuals. Women face a similar though slightly different aspect where the long-standing anti-female intellectual competencies and gender bias come into play. One need only mention Larry Summers and Harvard to make my point.

On the predominantly or historically Black campus, the assumptions may be uncomfortably similar, if for different reasons. Here the issues will be the scholar's Black authenticity, commitment, faithfulness to personal roots and racial solidarity. The cultural credentials of the Black scholar or professional become the litmus test, rather than the purely intellectual ones of the discipline.

Thus, Black scholars face a choice: should they be parochial or universal? Closely related is the issue identity: Are you a Black scholar or a scholar who is Black? When engaging in scholarship or research do you choose problems of concern which are unique to Blacks, or in whose study the Black viewpoint is especially useful? In one sense this issue is the obverse of the broader issues of integration vs. separatism that has frequently plagued the careers of many minority professionals. If you choose to study or work on non-minority areas – becoming "intellectually integrated" – have you thereby turned your back on the needs of the minority community? Conversely, if you choose to work only on Black or minority issues, have you capitulated to the stereotypes and limited your professional standing.

I am reminded of this by what I observed in the 1950s and 1960s when I and others chose to work on the economic problems of the Third World rather than those in the U.S. Often, we were advised by colleagues that our work would not receive the same recognition or count as much in a tenure track evaluation as if we had stayed at home and devoted attention to U.S. economic or agricultural problems. We U.S. scholars and researcher working abroad were in that sense viewed as "separatists" compared with the mainstream or "integrated" homebodies. Nevertheless, I believe that many of us did make contributions to the discipline and were appropriately recognized upon returning home. We did help to push forward the frontiers of knowledge on the problems of foreign economic development.

⁵An outstanding example of this duality in agricultural economics is your member Professor Ralph D. Christy of Cornell University, the former President of AAEA.

⁶Two superb living examples that immediately come to mind are John Hope Franklin and David Levering Lewis.

Similarly today, in the case of minorities and women who choose a “separatist” course, there is no question that they can bring their distinctive talents to bear by working on parochial subjects. In fact, I would argue that in far too many instances the subject would not otherwise be addressed – when without such attention these “parochial” topics will be neglected or inadequately dealt with by those whose base of experience limits their understanding, even sympathy, for the subject.

But my strong plea is that these individuals should feel free to choose whether to follow a “separatist” course or the “mainstream” avenues. The choice should be theirs. And, most important, they should not be penalized for having made a choice. Those who decide to pursue the special focus should not be considered lesser or incompetent by those in the mainstream areas and likewise those who choose to mainstream should not be criticized as ignoring or being insensitive to the plight of their identity group. As I said a moment ago, the ideal would be the ability to choose to do both.

Conclusion

As a philosophical ideal, most of us uphold the idea that society should be race-neutral and gender-neutral – that these differences should confer neither penalties nor favors in social, economic, political, and cultural life. Yet reality and experience have shown that a legacy of stereotypes does not evaporate overnight. I would argue that benefitting from greater diversity is a major force in achieving this goal. How this can be achieved is a fundamental challenge to the profession.

Minorities and women do have unique characteristics and perspectives that significantly enhance and broaden professional contributions to the advancement of knowledge in most fields. They also help the profession capture the advantages of this human capital for the furtherance of the discipline itself. This is precisely what makes greater diversity within the profession such a powerful tool. Diversity offers better solutions to problems. Diversity fosters improved programmatic actions. Diversity provides improved discovery and knowledge. Diversity strengthens the discipline. Most important, diversity represents the full utilization of all human capital.

Never forget that in this 21st century those groups we call minorities within our borders are a majority in the globe as a whole. In this new era, mankind faces unprecedented challenges of a globe that is shrinking due to technology and communications while simultaneously confronting its escalating problems — such as growing ethnic conflicts and religious-based violence; multiplying border-less infectious diseases, mounting environmental degradation, and intensifying health issues ranging from AIDS to Avian flu; growing breaches between have and the have not nations; and within nations burgeoning gaps between the rich and the poor.

We need to – no we must — develop and use all our human capital if we are to succeed in meeting these challenges.

#####

Dr. Wharton has been a Black pioneer in four different fields — philanthropy, foreign economic development, higher education and business.

He is the former Chairman and CEO of TIAA-CREF, the world's largest pension fund with assets of \$260 billion. He thereby became the first Black to become CEO of a Fortune 500 company. Among his previous

pioneering positions are President of Michigan State University (1970-78) the first Black to head a predominantly white major university; Chancellor of the State University of New York System (1978-87), this nation's largest university system with 64 campuses; and Chairman of the Rockefeller Foundation (1982-87). The son of a career Foreign Service Officer and Ambassador, Dr. Wharton has served six presidents in foreign policy advisory posts and most recently in 1993 was appointed by President Clinton as Deputy Secretary, the second highest post in the U.S. Department of State.

Dr. Wharton's first 22 year philanthropic career began in Latin America with Nelson Rockefeller. Subsequently, he was resident in Southeast Asia from 1958 to 1964 representing a foundation headed by John D. Rockefeller 3rd. During this period he also supervised the foundation's programs in Thailand, Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia, as well as taught economics at the University of Malaya.

Among his former directorships are Ford Motor Company, Time-Warner, Equitable Life, Tenneco Inc., Federated Department Stores, Public Broadcasting Service (PBS), New York Stock Exchange, Harcourt General, TIAA-CREF, and Vice Chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. He holds a BA honors degree in history from Harvard, an MA from the School of Advanced International Studies of John Hopkins University, a Ph.D. in economics from the University of Chicago, and has been awarded 62 honorary doctorates. In 1994, he received the American Council on Education Distinguished Service Award for Lifetime Achievement and in 1970 was named Boston Latin School Man of the Year.

His wife, Dolores D. Wharton, has had her own distinguished career as a corporate director of Gannett, Phillips Petroleum, the Kellogg Company, COMSAT, New York Telephone, Albany Capital Bank and Trust, and as a trustee of many non-profit organizations such as MIT, the Center for Strategic and International Studies, National Public Radio, the Asia Foundation, the Asia Society and the Museum of Modern Art. She is the founder and CEO of the Fund for Corporate Initiatives, Inc. to increase the upward mobility of women and minorities in the corporate world. She has received nine honorary doctorates.