Items

SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL

Volume 52 / Number 4 / December 1998 ■ *810 Seventh Avenue, New York, NY 10019*

The Social Science Research Council: 75 Years Young

*by Paul B. Baltes**

The last time the Council celebrated an anniversary was 25 years ago, on the occasion of its 50th birthday. Birthdays of institutions are different from birthdays of people, and the difference carries important meaning. Beyond age 30 or so, we as individuals want to be younger, and this desire for youth increases with age. Besides, the lifetime of individuals has definite limits! When these limits are reached, living longer becomes an exception to the rule.

A vignette from history illustrates the point. Close to 250 years ago, Bernard de Fontenelle (1657-1757) was the permanent secretary (*secrétaire perpetuelle*) of the French Academy. One day Fontenelle, who lived to the ripe age of 99, was sitting in the Academy together with a much younger colleague, a mere 89 years old. This friend turned to Fontenelle and asked worriedly, "Why do you think we are getting so old? Could it be that the Almighty has simply forgotten us, that God does not know that we are still around?" Fontenelle, known for his cynical humor and practical wisdom, whispered, "Shhh, shhh, dear colleague, not so loud!"

* Paul B. Baltes, a psychologist at the Max Planck Institute for Human Development in Berlin, chairs the SSRC board of directors. This piece is adapted from a speech delivered at a symposium in honor of the SSRC's 75th anniversary on June 11, 1998.

The situation is very different for institutions. Their lives in a way are limitless, thus they can be loud and clear where their age is concerned. The older, the better, since longer tradition makes for prestige, health and influence. They stand on the shoulders of many and the many reach across generations. Regarding institutions, there is the potential of eternity. In this sense, at age 75 the Council is young.

That institutions can have a much longer life than individuals is one of the reasons why in the end, the social and cultural is so powerful, perhaps more so than the individual. Aside from the genome, institutions are the primary carriers of the fabric of the human condition and the dynamics of continuity and change. For a psychologist such as myself to reach such insight into the significance of the social-cultural-institutional is perhaps a rarity. That I am able to do so is due foremost to my experience in the Council and its spirit of interdisciplinarity. My asso-

■ **CONTENTS OF THIS ISSUE** ■

ciation with the Council has helped me to think beyond the single-person paradigm of mainstream behavioral science.

The ritual of this anniversary requires me say a few words about the raison d'être of the Council. Four activities shape the profile of the Council as I see and have experienced it.

Pure, Applied and Action Research

First, the founders of the Council placed its squarely at the intersection of science, society and social reform. Operationally, this can be interpreted in various ways. One interpretation is that the Council since its inception has been and remains committed to joining the pure with the applied or action-oriented in social science work. Associated with this emphasis is an important function of encouraging communication between the social sciences and the private and public sectors. In this spirit, the Council has more than once been a meeting place of diverse minds and interest groups who from their respective vantage points aspire to make the world a better place.

Consequently, the Council is subject to pulls and pushes in alternative directions by the trends of fashion in the academic world and by the ever-changing political issues of the day, as well as those of other institutions that are in the business of social analysis and social reform. It is not easy to respect these often incompatible demands and at the same time to pursue a coherent program aimed at the advancement of the social sciences and the public good. We ask our institutional peers, supporters and stakeholders to continue to help us in this regard, and to ensure that the conditions of financial support do not separate us from the core of the social sciences as its fields develop. Only by continuing to attract the best of academia to its work can the Council achieve its objective; that is, to explore how social science-based knowledge can be brought to bear on matters of public concern.

Methodological and theoretical innovations

Throughout its history, the Council has made a second topic part of its signature profile: the frontiers of methodological advances and social-science theory. Indeed, the Council's record on that score is impressive, covering such diverse topics as the role of mathematics in the social sciences, methods of survey research, methods of qualitative and hermeneutic analysis, social indicators and the role of ethics in the planning and conduct of research.

At its 75th birthday, I urge the Council to continue its efforts to be in the center of social-science methodology and theory construction. Currently, for instance, the Council is grappling with the challenge presented by modern technologies of genetics and neuroscience. Has the time come to inform the social sciences better about how a close collaboration between social scientists and neuroscientists might open new doors towards understanding such issues as the life course, aging, gender, social class or education? Similarly, on the topic of genetics and gene technology, the social sciences occasionally appear to take a hands-off position. One reason, from an international point of view, is that American discussions surrounding the genome-behavior-society interface are unfortunately completely locked into issues of race.

But the methodological and theoretical challenge is not limited to the intertwining of the life sciences with the social sciences. It also involves seemingly oppositional methodological and theoretical approaches within the social sciences. Think only of the negative dynamics surrounding current discussions of hermeneutics and deconstruction. Rather than exploiting the opportunities for humanists and empiricists to shed their respective lights on institutions and behavior, scholars have allowed deep canyons to open between them. Departments are breaking up because the faculty was not able to talk productively across methodologies.

At such junctures, the Council has a special role. Its longstanding tradition qualifies it to transcend disciplinary biases and isolation. For instance, many social scientists think that the modern age of biology produces another hegemony, that of biological determinism. For the most part, however, biologists themselves do not believe that at all. On the contrary, during the last decades biologists and neuroscientists have opened their minds more than ever to the powerful role of environmental, behavioral and social factors in gene expression. They are interactionists to begin with. Yet many social scientists believe the opposite, largely because they are underinformed and reluctant to engage themselves.

Thus, the more we learn about the human genome, the more we need to have a good social science in

place to promote the kind of transdisciplinary collaboration that spells progress. The discourse between the biological and the social-cultural is a dialectic, where the social sciences are challenged more than ever. Biologists are naive when it comes to the measurement of the social and cultural. They need our expertise in measuring behavior, in identifying methods that permit quantification of the micro- and macroenvironments in which we humans live. These are the kind of opportunities that the Council seeks out to fulfill its responsibility as one of the premier institutions in the making of the theory and methodology of the social sciences.

Interdisciplinarity

The third cornerstone, and historically perhaps the foundational one, in the profile of the SSRC is interdisciplinarity. Keep in mind that the charter of the Council was framed by collaboration among seven scientific organizations. When creating the Council, these organizations recognized that the institutional structure of science and scholarship favors disciplinarity. Yet problems in the world are not organized that way. This dynamic continues to provide a special opportunity for the Council.

Let me use myself as an example. I was trained as a psychologist and in my department, the primary goal was to show that, in questions of human behavior, we psychologists knew best. My experience in the Council opened my eyes to alternative views, views that made me respect colleagues and their approaches to the study of behavior and society in fields such as sociology, anthropology, economics, history or political science. For me, this broadening of my mind and my intellectual ecology was a gift from the Council.

This gift from the Council has much worth, to individuals and disciplines as well as institutions of higher learning. Universities, for instance, benefit from the opportunities that the Council offers regarding interdisciplinary training and discourse. The Council often succeeds in connecting scholars across fields and their boundaries in ways that universities are simply not designed to do. I hope the Council will never depart from this principle, the principle of linking disciplines, of generating networks among those who in their home institutions live the lives of disciplinary specialists. And we need to focus in our efforts in both directions–the link to the humanities and the link to the behavioral sciences.

Note also that this effort applies to all levels of training and expertise, graduate to postgraduate, and to the retraining and nurturing of the elders in the academic community. A recently initiated Council program on the structure and function of higher education is one example. Another is the initiative to strengthen the social-science perspective in doctoral training of economists.

Internationality

The fourth cornerstone of the Council's architecture is internationality. As a community, American scientists are underinformed about work outside the United States, including Europe. Since its beginning, the SSRC has contributed to overcoming this limitation, and has brought to the United States the best social science that other countries have to offer. At the same time, the Council has played a major role in encouraging social science in other parts of the world. Indeed, among the success stories of the Council are its international programs in area studies and in international comparative analysis. Originally, this was called “Foreign Area Training and Research.” Hundreds if not thousands of young scholars have been assisted and encouraged by the Council in learning about other areas of the world. The beneficiaries included not only the world of learning but also the private and public sectors.

Recently, in the wake of the Council’s effort to reexamine its approach to area studies, there has been much discussion about whether the Council is weakening its investment in internationality. I do not believe that the Council’s review and reformulation of its program in area studies was meant to reduce its commitment to internationality; on the contrary. Together with the American Council of Learned Societies, we have put in place a new organizational structure of comparative and area studies work that we believe is innovative and forward-looking. From my experience on the Board, I can unequivocally say that weakening internationality was not and is not part of the Council’s agenda, neither under the former presidency of David Featherman nor that of Kenneth Prewitt.

The issue was a different one. In the tradition of the Council, we also want to stay ahead of the game,

to innovate and demonstrate what evolutionary scientists call adaptive fitness. As a Council, we are interested in exploiting this world-wide emphasis, not only for the public good and the scholars who work as area specialists, but also for the disciplines at large and the more general advancement of the social sciences. Non-area specialists, as someone on the board recently remarked, would like a piece of the action. We need to recognize, therefore, that internationality itself has taken on new perspectives. Not only of interest to those who want to understand specific cultures and localities, it has become a way to live and do science for practically all disciplines.

In this spirit, the Council is making an effort not to abolish one of its prized programs–that is, area studies–but to enrich it, and in addition to entice additional cohorts of scholars to engage themselves more fully in the pursuit of international dimensions of research. Many on the Council's board believe that our portfolio of international activities needs to be expanded, and that as in the past the Council needs to demonstrate its facility to match organizational structures to intellectual agendas. I believe this dynamic is to be expected if one considers the scope of the scientific organizations that are the founders and intellectual powers of the Council. Aside from the American Historical, Economic and Anthropological societies, there are at least four others who have a stake in the international agenda of the Council. This goal was the reason why the board decided to initiate a new system of committee structures, and we are grateful to the foundations that supported us in this exciting venture. The next years will show that the Council means what it says, that its reach regarding internationality will be enriched and extended, not curtailed.

The Council fundamentally is a collective enterprise. It is made by humans for humans. The best divine interventions the Council expects, therefore, are love, support, hard work and cooperation with our proven institutional coalitions and partners, invisible as these might want to be. The community gathered here makes me hopeful and optimistic about the Council's chances for continued success. Unlike Bernard de Fontenelle, we ask God not to forget us so that we might continue to live, but you, the audience and the invisible college of the Council, to be with us as we continue to expand the commitments and values of the SSRC in a changing world. While the general profile of the Council continues to stand, its methods and subject matter need to reflect and prefigure the future. ■

The Social Science Research Council: Plus Ça Change

*by Kenton W. Worcester**

The Social Science Research Council was one of a number of professional organizations established in the interwar period to nurture research and promote new forms of knowledge.[1] In the early months of 1923, a small group of social scientists, representing the American Political Science Association, the American Sociological Society, the American Economic Association and the American Historical Association met informally to consider how they might assist scholars to secure funds for "field work and other special researches"; to "carry on inquiries of a fundamental nature"; to make provision for "the publication of results of scientific research of a type that do not possess immediate commercial value"; and to convey the value of social science "to the appropriate university authorities and to the general public."[2] The group was soon joined by representatives of the American Statistical Association, the American Psychological Association and the American Anthropological Association. Informal arrangements were found inadequate, and the Council was incorporated in late 1924, for reasons of convenience, in Illinois.

What made the Council distinctive was its exclusive focus on "the advancement of research in the social sciences."[3] The founders of the SSRC—most notably University of Chicago political scientist Charles E. Merriam; economist Wesley Clair Mitchell, director of research at the National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER); and psychologist Beardsley Ruml, director of the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial (LSRM)—envisioned an organization that would place the highest priority on improving the quality of, and infrastructure for, social knowledge. The aim was not to propose legislation or other ameliorative measures, nor to represent the interests of any single discipline or faction. Merriam hoped instead that the new body would provide for a "more adequate organization of our technical research, and its coordination with other and closely allied fields of inquiry."[4]

It was understood that the committees making up the Council would focus on "the planning exercise," or what later became known as research planning. While training fellowships would enable individual scholars to undertake their own research projects, committees would guide and stimulate research in a given area, rather than complete an entire research program. Thus, the research planning process enabled committees to evaluate topics, marshal resources, identify obstacles and announce strategies for effective research. They were empowered, in other words, to exercise intellectual and programmatic leadership.

In pursuing a program of research planning, the new organization could complement, rather than compete with, work undertaken within the research universities and academic disciplines. As a medium of scholarly communication, the Council was destined to play a very different role from colleges and universities, disciplines and departments, and public policy think-tanks. Located at a remove from the bustle of campus life, the SSRC could offer its members a respite from entanglements with students, colleagues, deans, trustees and even taxpayers and state legislators. Committee members were encouraged to get on with the task at hand without paying attention to disciplinary boundaries, campus squabbles or vested interests. Over time, scholars identified with the Council were encouraged to think of themselves as part of an invisible college of researchers and research planners. Membership implied an elevated professional status; as the first national social science institution in the world, the Council clarified the position of individual social scientists even as it strove to enhance the authority of the social sciences writ large.

Four aspects of the Council's original conception merit special emphasis. First, the organization was premised on the assumption that social science was a collective enterprise requiring the combination of multiple perspectives. It was, in other words, an intrinsically interdisciplinary operation.[5] Rather than promising to deliver an all-purpose, all-encompassing social science, the Council was constructed as a platform on which scholars from diverse traditions could come together in a spirit of problem-solving intellectual cross-fertilization.

* Kenton W. Worcester directs the International Dissertation Field Research Fellowship Program. Mr. Worcester is at work on a history of the SSRC since 1973; this article is adapted from the introduction.

Second, the Council was also an intermediary organization. That is, it built up a thick layer of relationships with disciplinary associations, research centers, government agencies, private foundations, international bodies and other knowledge-based organizations. Ties with the research-supporting foundations were of particular significance. The foundations provided money, of course, but their support made it possible for the Council to act as an intermediary between researchers and research funding in the first place, given that the federal government was not prepared to put its weight behind a central funding agency for the social sciences. "Interscience" relations were similarly important. Linkages with the humanities, via arrangements with the American Council of Learned Societies, proved especially durable, but the founders of the SSRC anticipated that the Council would interact with the physical, medical and biological sciences as well. By the same token, while the Council was never intended to become a lobby for the social sciences at the federal level, it responded from time to time to potentially important matters such as the establishment of the National Science Foundation in 1950.

Third, to take advantage of changing social conditions and methods of investigation, the Council was designed to be as elastic as possible. Even in its early days, the Council's research planning committees were expected to carry out their work for a limited span of time—say, five to seven years—and for the same reason fellowship programs were kept going only as long as a persuasive argument could be made for their continued effectiveness. The ethos of flexibility also allowed committees to spin off new committees, subcommittees and working groups, sometimes with overlapping memberships. At least a few social scientists shuttled back and forth among committees, governance bodies and working groups as circumstances required.

Finally, the Council was conceived as a place where research could provide the foundation for a more rational approach to the management of social problems. In part this was a question of "doing policy"—Council committees have overlapped with the policymaking process on several occasions—but more generally the Council insisted on the pragmatic value of social science. From the standpoint of Merriam and his fellow "captains of intellect,"[6] the social sciences could only address real-world concerns by moving in a more data-sensitive, empirical direction—and they could only become more scientific by evaluating their theories and hypotheses in relation to genuine social problems. "What the SSRC sought to do," explained David Featherman, "was to use contemporary social problems as a research laboratory. The laboratory would provide the testing ground for theories and hypotheses and in the course of doing so, generate new knowledge about fundamental features of human behavior and social institutions. The generated scientific knowledge would provide the basis in facts and in legitimacy for informed policymaking."[7]

Each of these premises—interdisciplinarity, interscience relations, institutional flexibility and scientific advance in the greater interests of society—reflected the Deweyean, Progressive-era sensibility of a small core of well-placed academics and philanthropists who sought to go beyond the limitations of "prescientific" approaches to knowledge-building in the social sciences. Together these organizing principles provided the basis for a new kind of institution, one that derived its legitimacy from the vitality of its networks and programs as much as from any particular intellectual product. If the apparent indirectness of the enterprise sometimes baffled outsiders, it made perfect sense to a group that saw itself on the cusp of a qualitative transformation in the coherence, relevance and scientificity of social knowledge.

The impact of the 1920s generation went beyond these deceptively simple premises. For one thing, Merriam, Mitchell and several of their peers remained involved long after they ceded executive positions to others. More important, lines of communication that the first generation established with funders, particularly the Rockefeller Foundation (which incorporated the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial in 1929), the Carnegie Corporation, the Julius Rosenwald Estate and the Russell Sage Foundation, provided the organization a solid footing right through the end of World War II.

Merriam remained a member of the Council's Board of Directors until his retirement in 1948. This was the same year that the board appointed a Harvard political scientist, E. Pendleton Herring, as president of SSRC. The inevitable ascension of a new generation of leadership—symbolized by

Herring's remarkable twenty-year presidency (1948-1968)—coincided with the postwar "golden age" of higher education. The growth in resources and human capital provided the Council with new opportunities for advancing the status and reach of the social sciences. At the same time, as historian Thomas Bender has argued, the "social sciences seemed to hold special promise for addressing the challenges of the postwar era."[8]

To take advantage of these new challenges and opportunities, the Council in the early postwar period stitched together a broad portfolio of programs encompassing methodology, area studies, interscience issues, training and domestic problems. While research methods had always been an important area for the Council, new initiatives on historical statistics, sociolinguistics, survey research, econometrics, mathematical training in the social sciences and scaling theory reflected the breadth of innovation that was characteristic of the period. In addition to producing books and reports on approaches to research methodology, Council committees sponsored training workshops and fellowship programs that introduced graduate students to the most up-to-date research methods. Herring and other postwar Council leaders firmly endorsed what has been described as "the new rigorism in the human sciences."[9]

The Council's agenda went beyond questions of method and training. In the early 1950s, the Council launched a handful of committees with an area focus, including the Committee on Slavic and East European Studies (1948-71) and the Committee on Near and Middle East Studies (1951-59), that combined training activities with a strong emphasis on research planning. Starting in the late 1950s the Council began to collaborate with the American Council of Learned Societies in establishing a network of jointly-sponsored area committees, most notably in the fields of Latin America (1959-96), Near and Middle East (1959-96), Contemporary China (1959-81), Japan (1967-96) and African Studies (1960-96). It was not until 1975 that the Councils would organize a joint committee on Western Europe, and the area committees on South and Southeast Asia were both constituted the following year.

A couple of the research planning committees became, by the standards of academic life, famous. One of the most celebrated was the Committee on Comparative Politics (1954-72), chaired by Gabriel Almond. The committee "helped produce over 300 written reports...[it] sponsored 23 conferences, cosponsored 6 others, [and] conducted 5 summer workshops,"[10] and also generated an eight volume series ("Studies in Political Development") that enjoyed an undeniable impact on the comparative study of developing areas. Other prominent committees included the Committee on Economic Growth (1949-68), chaired by 1971 Nobel Prize-winner Simon Kuznets; the Committee on Economic Stability (1959-74); the Committee on Sociolinguistics (1963-79); and the Committee on Genetics and Behavior (1961-66), which was superceded by the Committee on the Biological Bases of Social Behavior (1966-79). Each was associated with the publication of keynote texts in their respective fields.[11] The Committee on Political Behavior (1949-64) was closely associated with the so-called behavioral revolution that transformed political science and sociology research and teaching in the 1960s. Council committees incorporated the perspectives of many disciplines but in this period political science, economics and psychology were especially vital to the life of the institution.

One of the notable aspects of the Council was its ability to draw on the talents and energies of distinguished scholars working in a variety of fields. As David Sills has suggested, the membership of postwar governance committees "reads like a 'who's who' of the social sciences," and he cites such visible postwar intellectuals as Clifford Geertz, V.O. Key, Jr., Frank Knight, Gardner Lindzey, Frederick Mosteller, Neil Smelser, C. Vann Woodward and others.[12] A scan of committee rosters and fellowship recipient lists says a great deal about the SSRC's capacity to enlist the support of, and lend support to, successive groups of leading social scientists. In 1945, for example, in an effort to make up for the training lost during the war years, the Council issued Demobilization Awards to such future luminaries as Gabriel Almond, James McGregor Burns, Morris Janowitz and Paul Sweezy. All but Sweezy were later drafted onto Council committees. A decade later, Merle Curti, Robert Dahl, John Hope Franklin, Melville Herskovits, Henry Kissinger, Paul Lazarsfeld, Robert Merton, Lucian Pye and Thomas Schelling could all be found on SSRC committees. By 1970, some of

the better-known committee members included Norberto Bobbio, John K. Fairbank, Eugene Genovese, Samuel Huntington, Chalmers Johnson, Arthur Okun and Marshall Shulman.

Lurking behind the dynamism and increased international awareness of the social sciences in the postwar period is the inescapable presence of the cold war. The pursuit of superpower antagonisms played a critical, if often indirect and sometimes contested, role in fueling university growth, shaping research priorities, galvanizing research centers, building information systems and defining the boundaries of acceptable scholarship. This period has recently come under closer scrutiny as scholars have investigated the connections among area studies, campus research centers, foreign policy imperatives and grant-making in the social sciences. Stanley Heginbotham's frank admission in the pages of *Items* that "cold war goals...motivated much of the private foundation grant-making in the arena of international scholarship and educational exchange,"[13] struck some observers as "too little, too late," while others insisted that even early postwar programs had been able to function without compromising their academic integrity.[14]

Each of these developments—the expansion of higher education, the ratcheting up of pressure to achieve scientific results and cold war agendas that simultaneously rendered the Council a complicit and potentially subversive organization (in 1954 the Council, Rockefeller Foundation, Ford Foundation and Russell Sage Foundation were investigated by a Congressional committee looking into allegations of, in Herring's words, "a conspiracy to take over the control of public affairs"[15])—shaped the environment in which the Council operated from the 1940s to the 1960s. By the early 1970s, however, the era of uninterrupted growth was coming to a close. Confidence in the capacity of technically-accomplished social science to develop sound policy diminished as the lofty ideals of the 1950s and 1960s dissolved into the deepening pessimism of the 1970s. Above all, social scientists were blamed by some for the perceived failures of the domestic programs (and foreign policy) of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations.

Meanwhile, greater attention was paid to the issue of research funding itself. A small but revealing episode took place in 1973, when the Army Institute for Behavioral and Social Sciences approached the Committee on Work and Personality in the Middle Years about the possibility of supporting research on military careers. While the Committee was inclined to apply for funding, several other committees were critical of the idea. Although Programs and Policy (P&P), the principal policymaking component of the governance apparatus, resolved that Army Institute support would be acceptable, provided that "the acceptance of such funds would involve no special reporting or other special conditions requested by the grantor," the Army Institute quietly rescinded its invitation. A year later, P&P returned to the broader debate over funding sources and resolved that "neither governmental nor any other grants for research that is classified or similarly restricted may be accepted by the Council under any circumstances." [17]

Another discussion at the governance level that reflected the changing tenor of the times concerned the demographic make-up of the Council's network and staff. The board mandated that the president deliver an annual report to P&P on the composition of Council committees. In the first report, in 1972, Acting President Ralph Tyler noted that, out of a total of 202 committee members, 9 (4.5%) were classified as African-American, 5 (2.4%) were female, 6 (2.5%) were Asian-American, 9 (4.5%) were based at non-U.S. institutions and 12 (5.9%) were under 40.[18] The Board further resolved in 1973 that the organization "develop guidelines for the staffing of committees which take into consideration the range of talent, ingenuity, experience and ability in the social science community, especially with reference to race, sex, age, ethnicity, and foreign status."[19] By the end of the 1970s, many more women were active members of committees than had been the case at the start of the decade. In the academic year 1979-80, for example, out of a total of 411 committee and subcommittee members, 81 were women, or just under twenty per cent of the total. And in 1995-96, out of 376 committee and subcommittee members, 126 were women, or approximately one-third of the total.

Changes in the institutional environment may have been as significant as these demographic shifts. In the 1920s, and even in the 1950s, very few institutions were in the same business as the Council. By the 1970s this was no longer the case. A proliferation of think tanks, research centers, scholarly associations, ad hoc committees and so on intersected with

the Council's areas of interest and in some cases began to move onto the turf of research planning. Federal agencies, notably the National Science Foundation, began to play more of a leadership role in certain areas of the social sciences. It was for this reason that Nobel Prize winner Herbert Simon, who served on Council governance committees from 1958 until 1971, raised the question of whether there was still a compelling *raison d'être* for the Council when he stepped down from the organization's board of directors.[20] It is at least arguable that the Council's identity as a forum for scholarly communication and exchange was to some measure eroded as well as complicated by changes in the research environment.

Changes taking place within the Council in the early 1970s also underscored the sense that the organization was entering a moment of transition. First, the organization lost three key staff members: Elbridge Sibley retired in 1970, after joining the staff on a temporary basis in 1944; Bryce Wood retired in 1973, after serving as staff associate for 23 years; and Eleanor Isbell retired in 1975 after 37 years on staff, including 27 as editor of *Items*. At the same time, several of the Council's most influential research planning committees, such as the Committee on Comparative Politics, which had been staffed by Wood, were either winding down or had been dissolved by the early 1970s.

Second, finding a president who could command the respect of committees, funders and staff proved more complicated than expected, and those who did were not always inclined to settle into the job. After Pendleton Herring stepped down, Henry Riecken, a psychologist who had served under Herring as vice president, and who had been the program director for the social and behavioral sciences at the National Science Foundation, assumed the presidency. Riecken resigned in 1971 and was followed by Acting President Ralph Tyler, the founding director of the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences. Eleanor Sheldon, an empirical sociologist at the Russell Sage Foundation with a strong background in the field of social indicators, became president in the fall of 1972, and left seven years later. Her successor was Kenneth Prewitt (1979-85), a University of Chicago political scientist who was former director of the National Opinion Research Center. Francis Sutton, one of the architects of the Ford Foundation's postwar International Program, served as interim president for a little over a year (1985-86), and was followed first by Frederic Wakeman, a historian of modern China at the University of California, Berkeley (1986-89) and then by David Featherman, a sociologist at the University of Wisconsin, Madison specializing in human development (1989-95). After serving at the Rockefeller Foundation as senior vice president for ten years, Kenneth Prewitt returned to the SSRC for a second tenure as president in 1995. He resigned in October 1998 to direct the US Census Bureau, and social psychologist Orville Gilbert Brim, a former president of the Russell Sage Foundation and the Foundation for Child Development, stepped in as interim president. It is a distinguished group, and highly indicative of the organization's broad intellectual agenda, but it may be asked whether the post-Herring leadership dynamic was optimal.

Third, the board was reorganized in 1975, so that the disciplinary associations designated one representative rather than three, a change which reduced expenses and accorded at-large members a greater voice in Council affairs, but which also loosened ties between the Council and the associations. Finally, in the early 1970s the Councils merged the Foreign Area Fellowship Program (FAFP) into the joint international program. The FAFP had been founded in the early 1950s, with funding provided by the Ford Foundation. Starting in 1962, ACLS and SSRC shared responsibility for appointing committee members, but the fellowships themselves were administered by an independent office with several full-time staff. The merger of FAFP provided the joint international program with greater control over a budget of over $2 million for fellowship support on world areas, and allowed the area committees to link their research planning agendas to regionally-tailored programs of fellowship support. As it turned out, a merger on this scale required that the Council move offices, reinvent staff roles and reorganize its international program. As a result of the FAFP-Council merger, the area committees acquired a renewed sense of purpose as well as greater weight inside the organization. This would have important repercussions further down the road.

In the 1970s and beyond the Council faced the familiar challenges of devising innovative research

strategies, preparing training agendas, attracting and retaining funder support and mobilizing and replenishing scholarly networks. But it also confronted a larger project, that of reasserting and redefining itself in the context of a transformed intellectual, cultural and institutional environment. Despite these changes, the ability of the Council to promote research agendas and build research infrastructures would reflect the core principles articulated by the interwar generation and refined in the postwar era. ■

Notes

1 Examples include the American Council of Learned Societies (1919), the American Law Institute (1923), the Brookings Institution (1927), the Council on Foreign Relations (1921), the Institute for Advanced Study (1930) and the National Bureau of Economic Research (1920).

2 "A Decade of Council History," *The Social Science Research Council: Decennial Report, 1923-33* (SSRC, 1933), p. 1.

3 Elbridge Sibley, *Social Science Research Council: The First Fifty Years* (SSRC, 1973), p. 2.

4 Quoted in Barry D. Karl, *Charles E. Merriam and the Study of Politics* (University of Chicago Press, 1974), p. 107. See also Dorothy Ross, *The Origins of American Social Science* (Cambridge University Press, 1991), chap. 10.

5 As David Sills has pointed out, the word "interdisciplinary" did not exist in the early 1920s and it took several years for scholars to coin a term to describe activities that "combined the methods and perspectives of the different disciplines." See David L. Sills, "A Note on the Origin of 'Interdisciplinary,'" *Items* 40, no. 1 (March 1986): 17.

6 The phrase is taken from Thorstein Veblen, *The Higher Learning in America* (1918).

7 David Featherman, "SSRC, Then and Now: A Commentary on Recent Historical Analysis," *Items* 48, no. 1 (March 1994): 15.

8 Thomas Bender, "Politics, Intellect, and the American University," in *American Academic Culture in Transformation: Fifty Years, Four Disciplines* ed. Thomas Bender and Carl E. Schorske (Princeton University Press, 1998), p. 31.

9 Carl E. Schorske, "The New Rigorism in the Human Sciences, 1940-1960," in Bender and Schorske, p. 309.

10 Lucian W. Pye, "Foreword," in *The Formation of National States in Western Europe* ed. Charles Tilly (Princeton University Press, 1974), p. ix.

11 Examples are supplied in the bibliography to Sibley, chap. 4.

12 David L. Sills, "Requiem for P&P," *Items* 50, no. 4 (December 1996): 95.

13 Stanley J. Heginbotham, "Rethinking International Scholarship: The Challenge of Transition from the Cold War Era," *Items* 48, nos. 2-3 (June-September 1994): 34.

14 An historian of the Cold War in Asia, Bruce Cumings, complained that "it is a bit much, of course, for the SSRC only to acknowledge this now...when it spent all too much time in the 1960s and 1970s denying that the state had any influence on its research programs.... The academic integrity of the [area studies] institutes themselves was compromised by a secret and extensive network of ties to the CIA and the FBI." See Bruce Cumings, "Boundary Displacement: Area Studies and International Studies During and After the Cold War," in *Universities and Empire: Money and Politics in the Social Sciences During the Cold War* ed. Christopher Simpson (New Press, 1998), p. 179. Three senior figures in Soviet/post-Soviet studies, on the other hand, insisted that "Slavic and Eurasian area scholars and funders produced results strikingly independent of assumptions driving U.S. political preferences...." Robert T. Huber, Blair A. Ruble and Peter J. Stavrakis, "Post-Cold War 'International' Scholarship: A Brave New World or the Triumph of Form over Substance?" *Items* 49, no. 1 (March 1995): 30-31.

15 The Special Committee to Investigate Foundations, chaired by Representative B. Carroll Reece of Tennessee, convened hearings between May and June 1954 to investigate the activities of tax-exempt foundations. "The thesis supported by the staff testimony and the general witnesses appeared to be that great changes had occurred in America in the direction of socialism and collectivism...through a 'diabolical conspiracy' of foundations and certain educational and research organizations....one rebuttal witness was heard, Pendleton Herring." See F. Emerson Andrews, *Foundation Watcher* (Princeton University Press, 1973), pp. 146-147. Herring later told an interviewer that the "their charges were bizarre. The Council, they asserted, was the apex of a pyramid of power. And this power was maintained through interlocking contacts that brought together the overweening influence of private philanthropy and public policy, and the whole thing was, in effect, a conspiracy to take over the control of public affairs." E. Pendleton Herring, interviewed in *Political Science in America: Oral Histories of a Discipline* ed. Michael A. Baer, Malcolm E. Jewell and Lee Sigelman (University of Kentucky Press, 1991), p. 38.

16 Committee on Programs and Policy Minutes, September 9-11, 1973. Rockefeller Archives Center (RAC), Accession I, Series 9, Box 364, File 2144.

17 Committee on Programs and Policy Minutes, March 15-16, 1974. RAC, Accession I, Series 9, Box 364, File 2145.

18 Committee on Programs and Policy Minutes, March 25, 1972. RAC, Accession I, Series 9, Box 364, File 2140. A number of the African-American members belonged to a single committee, the Afro-American Cultures and Societies Committee (1968-75).

19 Board of Directors Minutes, March 23-24, 1973. RAC, Accession I, Series 9, Box 364, File 2141.

20 Letter from Herbert A. Simon to the SSRC Board of Directors, cited in Committee on Program and Policy Minutes, March 21-22, 1975. RAC, Accession I, Series 9, Box 364, Folder 2145.

Public Intellectuals: A View from Southeast Asia

The following exchange is drawn from discussions that took place at a workshop sponsored by the Social Science Research Council Regional Advisory Panel (RAP) for Southeast Asia. Like other international panels at the Council, the Southeast Asia RAP has been debating a term much in vogue all over the world today—civil society. The theme of the workshop, "History, Civil Society and Social Change: Public Intellectuals in Contemporary Southeast Asia," emerged from an effort to understand the growth of civil society in that region through an exploration of public intellectuals—here defined as individuals articulating and representing novel political presents and futures—even as it challenges the validity and utility of those terms in a setting far from that in which they originated.

The workshop had four themes: histories of public intellectuals, public intellectuals and power, questions of minorities and globalization. Participants, some of them well-known public intellectuals, came from across the region. While some of the debates referenced in these articles are specific to the region, many themes will resonate with concerns in other parts of the world as well.

Participants were (alphabetically) Leonard Andaya, University of Hawaii; Chua Beng Huat, National University of Singapore; Ariel Heryanto, National University of Singapore; Jomo K. S., Universiti Malaya; Khoo Khay Jin, independent scholar, Sarawak; Tin Maung Maung Than, Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, Singapore; Resil B. Mojares, San Carlos Publications, Cebu City, Philippines; Seksan Prasertkul, Thammasat University, Bangkok; Nirmala PuruShotam, National University of Singapore; Norani Othman, IKMAS, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia; Craig J. Reynolds, Australian National University, Canberra; Rustam Sani, independent scholar, Kuala Lumpur; Kasian Tejapira, Thammasat University; Anna Tsing, University of California, Santa Cruz; and Diana Wong, Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, Singapore. Itty Abraham is program director of the Council's Southeast Asia program; Alana Rosenberg is program assistant. They acknowledge the help of Mr. Foo Ah Hiang of University of Malaya. The workshop was held on May 8-9, 1998.

Located Knowledges

Craig J. Reynolds

The economic dislocations that have affected Southeast Asia since the middle of 1997 were very much on everyone's mind when the Regional Advisory Panel for Southeast Asia convened a workshop in Kuala Lumpur in early May 1998 on "public intellectuals." The scholars from Southeast Asia who participated in the workshop had all been involved in public discussion of the effects of the economic crisis on their societies. As if to underscore where public intellectuals put their priorities, invitees from the Philippines could not make the trip because of impending national elections. And most prospective participants from Indonesia declined because of the upheavals that would soon lead to the overthrow of the Suharto regime.

In Southeast Asia, as everywhere else in the world, globalization is both a blessing and a curse. On the one hand, it means new kinds of connections and forms of organization, new networks that can benefit the disenfranchised and the poor. New kinds of nationalism are flowering; diasporic and indigenous peoples have more advocacy than ever before. The transformative powers of the globalizing process can be immensely appealing. On the other hand, capitalism reorganizes itself at a blinding pace. Deregulation, free trade policies and transnational markets in labor, as well as commodities and consumer goods, are putting people out of work while trying to sell them things they do not need. Both the marketing manager and the NGO worker alike have reason to fetishize globalization and confer on it magic powers. It is almost as if globalization is expected to solve the problems of its own creation.

One of the objects of the workshop was to hear public intellectuals reflect on the present moment in light of their own experiences. What, for example, did public intellectuals consider to be their relationship to power and how might they compare that relationship in the present globalizing epoch with earlier historical moments both colonial and postcolonial? In the past, lines may have been clearly drawn: for or

against the colonial power; for or against the bureaucratic or militaristic state; for or against socialist or communist ideals. But what about today, when intellectuals have a more ambiguous, more necessarily complicit, relationship to power? The privileged access of some public intellectuals in the region to holders of state power can give them a significant influence on public policies. Is it then possible to articulate an alternative view of society and remain a "public" intellectual? Because of this complicity with power, one participant in Kuala Lumpur argued the era of public intellectuals had come to an end. Another said that the position of power and influence of a Southeast Asian public intellectual today sometimes blunted one's critical edge.

Another aim of the workshop was to problematize what "civil society" means in different political cultures in terms of the ethnicized and gendered spaces that are contested by writers, artists, activists and academics. The character of this space varies enormously across the region. Singapore has only two NGOs, press freedoms are greater in Thailand and the Philippines than in Vietnam and Cambodia, military regimes still dominate in Myanmar and Indonesia (as of September) and so forth. Despite these variations across the region, participants from very different settings found plenty to discuss. One of the common features was security laws, framed in an earlier period to deal with insurgency, but used today to "manage" political dissent.

It would be folly to try to reduce the complexities and inspired digressions of two days into a set of generalizations. Three of the participants offer their own comments below. My own contribution to this report—from the field, as it were—is to note the discrepancy between the kinds of knowledge that public intellectuals bring to bear on the problems they confront and what normally passes for "researched" knowledge in a Western or Westernized educational culture. While almost all the Southeast Asian participants had studied in the West and had thus established their reputations initially with foreign academic credentials, these two days of discussion were not about research plans, methodologies and results. Rather, they were about the constraints and restraints on public discussion, the problems of negotiating media that could protect as well as silence speech and the challenges of confronting nationalist and other powerful discourses.

What is the character of this knowledge and how is it deployed? I used to hear this knowledge referred to as "engaged knowledge" which the knower would deploy polemically against adversaries, particularly bureaucrats, officials and state functionaries. One participant in Kuala Lumpur talked about "located knowledges," which resonates with the new vocabulary of globalization. An example of located knowledge would be familiarity with a particular ecosystem in a socio-cultural setting threatened by the forces of official development. What is sometimes called for in these circumstances is not a "properly" drawn up research plan but technical know-how and data that challenge the pronouncements of governments or multinational corporations. An official bureaucracy that under-reports the rate of HIV infection so as to maintain a steady flow of tourists needs to be confronted with accurate numbers in the interests of public health. Empiricism can still be a formidable weapon against certain opponents.

The other point that strikes me about the character of these located knowledges is how they are disseminated. In the seminars and conferences I have attended in Southeast Asia I have been struck by how often the most important audiences are outside the walls of the seminar room. What to me seems "merely academic" may have immense public significance. A session on early epigraphy, which at first seems arcane or antiquarian, is reported the following day in the national press because it suggests that new evidence radically alters the narrative of the nation's past. Moreover, what accounts for the public prominence of an issue may be the personal qualities, personal connections, oratorical skills and flair for attracting headlines that a public intellectual can bring to an issue. Mass media is significant here. A TV interview is of more interest to most people than a footnoted article in a prestigious, peer-reviewed international journal. For this reason one of the participants in Kuala Lumpur was adamant that the media was absolutely critical in the role and effectiveness of public intellectuals.

I conclude with a question posed by Arjun Appadurai in "The Research Ethic and the Spirit of Internationalism" (*Items* 51:4, Dec. 1997): "We might ask ourselves what it means to internationalize a research ethic which itself has a rather unusual set of cultural diacritics." Similarly, we might ask about the character of the located knowledges in various parts of

the world that are to be the objects of the internationalizing process. I hazard the observation that the international scholarly community may take "located knowledges," which are not always produced by a Western academic research ethic, for granted and thus devalue them. But the question is whether this research community will figure out how to "internationalize" its research ethic without riding roughshod over local knowledges, many of which are in languages other than English. While the workshop in Kuala Lumpur was conducted in English, perhaps we should have addressed the question of translation and dissemination across the linguistic divides so characteristic of the region. It is in and across these other linguistic worlds that located knowledges have their place.

Questions of Minorities

by Kasian Tejapira

"Questions of Minorities" is itself an intriguing title. To begin with one can ask, "minorities" in relation to what? The obvious answer is the "majority." But what kind of majority is involved here?

Speaking from the Thai experience, I would argue that it is not a majority of numbers. Ethnically speaking, the Thais have never been the majority in Thailand, in absolute or relative terms. According to a recent scholarly estimate, the single largest ethnic group in Thailand, totaling 31% of the population, is in fact the Laotians in the country's northeastern region. Altogether the non-Thais actually outnumber the Thais in "Thai"-land. (See Charles F. Keyes, *Thailand: Buddhist Kingdom as Modern Nation-State*, 1989, Table 1.2, p.16.) Therefore, as a matter of fact, we are talking about an imagined, invented or constructed "majority" with some kind of ethno-ideological or political cultural content built into it. The "minorities" in question are so only in relation to a particular project of nation-state building.

As such, the emergence of national minorities presupposes two things. The first is boundaries, both internal and external, by which a physical, natural space is carved out and mapped as a definite national frame, a past is selected and interpreted as a national history and a subject is constructed and narrated as the nation-people. The crucial moment here, with regard to the "minorities," is when the divide both internal and external to the nation-state was drawn, the process being the political minoritization or political identification as minority in relation to a nation-state. And this process evolves over time, with the political divide being redrawn again and again as some minorities become co-opted and re-categorized as members of the "majority," while others remain excluded or perhaps are reinvented as new "minorities," depending on political circumstances.

The second thing that national minoritization presupposes is the abstract equality of atomized individual citizens. This deep, politically unconscious notion has a lot to do with the idea of popular sovereignty and democracy. One may think about this along the following lines: when people are held to be equal, then power comes from numbers, i.e. greater number leads to greater power (for the majority) while lesser number leads to lesser power (for the minorities). This kind of notion seems to inform the inferiority complex of being in a minority, or "minority complex" so to speak, as if there were something wrong with it and no way to escape it. Contrast the calm and ease, confidence and pride, with which traditional monarchs wore the badge of being the minority of one! In this context, one remembers Benedict Anderson's quip that the European colonizers were "perhaps the first minorities in Southeast Asian history…by their own racist doing" and "quite naturally the first to think in these majority-minority terms." (See his *Introduction to Southeast Asian Tribal Groups and Ethnic Minorities: Prospects for the Eighties and Beyond*, proceedings of a conference co-sponsored by Cultural Survival Inc., and the Department of Anthropology, Harvard University.) The rest, alas, is history.

There is also a further problem resulting from an ambiguous sense of equality according to which equality is taken to mean sameness (Noberto Bobbio, *Left and Right: The Significance of a Political Distinction*, 1996, p.xiii). To insist on that equality results either in the brutal and unnatural negation and eradication of difference in the name of equal citizenship and democracy, or in the conservative rejection of egalitarianism per se as plain utopia. On the contrary, people should be able to be both equal as well as different and a utopian society ought to be conceived as one in which people could be different without fear (Theodor Adorno, *Minima Moralia*, 1991, p.103).

Simply put, the questions of minorities arise when the minorities become dissatisfied with the story that the majority tell about them because it doesn't accord with their own lived experiences. They want to tell their own stories. And in so doing, they end up undoing the old national story of the majority and retelling a whole different story. So, in a way, the so-called questions of minorities are actually the questions of the majority and the nation itself.

The peculiar position of public intellectuals in the questions of minorities has to do with their problematic, troublesome, love-hate relationship with their presumed audience or constituency under the name of "the people." For, in most cases, public intellectuals are the isolated and not-always-understandable intellectual minority within a minority. They can't live without the people who are the public consumers of their ideas but neither can they live in peace with them. Public intellectuals usually have to argue with, cajole and criticize the public who don't always heed their suggestions, and more often than not disappoint and desert them. So many public intellectuals often feel hopeless about and disdainful toward the people, and then feel unconscionably guilty about it.

The opposite, no less troublesome, attitude is to hold to the cult of the people which regards it as the font of wisdom and final arbiter of all issues, to whom the intellectuals are unquestioningly bound to adhere. Thus characterized, one can say that the public intellectuals' relationship to the people is one in which they try to sell their reasoned arguments to it, or try to buy it with their accumulated and borrowed cultural capital (read resources for argumentation, signification, communication and persuasion available in society's cultural repertoire). Their capacity to win over the people seems to vary with (for want of a better term) the current, given structure of plausibility or cultural opportunity structure.

Hence the present financial and currency crisis in the region allows a critique of neo-liberal economic policy and capitalist globalization to sound much more convincing than during the period of the bubble economy. However, prior to the coming of that rare moment of cultural opportunity, what are public intellectuals supposed to do, especially those who feel they owe their loyalty to a higher authority than the powers or the people-that-be, namely the truth? Based on the experiences of Thai public intellectuals, I would say that they practice some form and degree of self-censorship, i.e. entering into a continual dialogue with the public in which they negotiate between the truth and their own truth-telling, until the day of truth dawns on them.

Civil Society and Public Spaces

by Khoo Khay Jin

I recognize the fashionable status of the term "civil society," its role in the discourse of the international financial and development institutions and, it should be added, that of a significant number of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) that have benefited from the "discovery" of civil society and governance. Nevertheless, the term has a certain vagueness of content, and not just because of its varied meanings or of its status as a slogan-phrase into which meanings can be poured. Rather, "civil society" has, I think, come to acquire a status as emblem of the uniqueness of the "West" and of the "Western" route to modernity—most evident in Ernest Gellner's *Conditions of Liberty: Civil Society and Its Rivals* (1994)—even as a concerted attempt is being made to universalize it. "Civil society" has been deployed to great effect buttressing what is otherwise old-fashioned modernization theory. It would appear that what was seemingly applauded in the World Bank's East Asian Economic Miracle document was simultaneously discounted by promotion of the twin notions of "civil society" and "governance"—something made evident by how they have been called upon to do double duty in what might be said to be the most widespread explanation of the Asian economic crisis, i.e., that it is a consequence of "statism."

Given this, it is perhaps inevitable that despite the attempt to problematize "civil society" and "public intellectuals," there appears to be irresistible slippage toward the broad standard view of "civil society" (an arena independent of and usually standing in opposition to the state). From this, it is but a slight elision to a consideration of "public intellectuals" as independent persons articulating alternative visions and options, where "alternative" dissolves into alternative to the visions and options of those holding state power. (That said, it nevertheless appears that we cannot do without some notion of "civil society" as a space in which non-state and non-corporate— in the narrow sense—institutions, organizations or individu-

als can operate and function with considerable latitude. Of course it must be recognized that the state and corporate institutions, local and global, are ever co-present in that same "civil society.")

There is continual danger that the territory the state encompasses comes to define the territory of society, abetted by the tendency of intellectuals who conceive of themselves as at the spatial/social/religious/ethnic/political "center" to view "civil society," in whatever form they variously understand it, as socio-spatially co-extensive with the "national society." (The exception might be intellectuals who conceive of themselves in strictly regional, ethnic or religious terms pursuing a project of autonomy or separation.) In addition, the ever-present global dimension risks being lost to view. In the case of "local" (sub-national) intellectuals, the situation is further compounded by the disjunctures and linkages between the local and the national, especially if that local is self-viewed as backward and undeveloped.

All this has always been problematic, and not only in Southeast Asia. But it might be especially problematic in instances of relatively new states (comprising not only diverse ethnicities but also diverse populations of effectively distinct social formations) whose unitary founding myths have not quite gained a sufficiently amnesic hold on all parts of the "nation," even as the coherence of the "nation" is continually destabilized by current global economic forces. Malaysia might be seen as one such instance.

However, to the extent that the space for "civil society" is delimited by the state or by what the state is made to accept, then the conceptions actualized at the "center" do affect the resources available to those in the margins. This is particularly so with respect to space for independent mobilization and action. Even then, the limits for those at the margins, irrespective of the conceptions holding sway at the "center," are generally much more restricted—except through subterfuge and indirection—than for those in the "mainstream."

Three concrete issues draw together some of the themes set out for the workshop. The first is that of domestic violence, an instance in which what was apparently private has been made public and placed within the purview of the state. It represents one of the most successful campaigns by women's NGOs in Malaysia, a success significantly deriving from the alliance forged between these NGOs and at least a few of the holders of state power. It was also an instance in which some religious views were effectively marginalized.

It is a signal fact of campaigns pertaining to some women's issues that at least some dimensions of the public-private divide are called into question, thus redefining what is public. Seen in this light, it may not provide much insight to inquire whether women have control of specific public spheres; rather it may be a question of whether they are able to redefine what properly falls within the public sphere. The latter may more properly reflect the power that women actually have. In contrast one may take the instance of electoral campaigning, which is very much a public sphere in which UMNO women have a very prominent role, or of voluntary charitable organizations in which prominent women have prominent roles.

At the same time, insofar as the issues amount to a redefinition of the public and the private they inevitably must draw in the state, the major institution that gives recognition to what is properly public. It is not so much a question of an ambivalent relationship to power as one of getting power to respond and to act in ways consonant with the objectives and views of non-state, non-corporate organizations. But it was never just a question of the public-private. As noted, the issue of domestic violence had a religious dimension. This religious dimension was equally public, specifically an interpretation of a specific injunction apparently permitting legitimate force to be used against "recalcitrant" wives. Thus, there were two views of what was properly public.

In contrast, a recent issue, while generating much debate largely in Muslim circles, has resulted in making public (as in state public) what was previously a religious public concern. I refer to the proposed anti-apostasy bill. While some segments of Muslim opinion would apparently prefer that the question of apostasy be privatized, it is instead going to be taken fully into the public spheres at least insofar as Muslims are concerned. While the proposed bill obviously has no application to non-Muslims, it has implications for all to the extent that it reshapes the tenor of national society.

The second is that of international campaigns, whether over United Nations Conference on

Environment and Development, the World Trade Organization or more recently the Multilateral Agreement on Investments (MAI) and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) deals. Here there is indeed an ambivalent and ambiguous relationship to power insofar as the state has a shared nationalist agenda with the NGOs and their intellectuals. It is multiply ambivalent because the NGOs are (a) cognizant of the role of economic power in getting a voice in international forums, (b) simultaneously concerned with the nature and direction of national development and (c) cognizant of the power of governmental voices in the North, while (d) concerned over domination by the North, whether government or corporate.

Thus, in the Asian economic crisis and the consequent IMF deals, more careful NGOs and their intellectual representatives have found themselves walking a tightrope, joining with the government in criticism of international financial flows and seeking their regulation, critical of the government for policies which they see as having led to the crisis—culminating in some of them providing testimony to the US Congress and allying with some of the most outspoken voices of the "Washington Consensus" in an attempt to deny the IMF the $18 billion being requested from the US. Associated with this has been the NGO campaign against the MAI which, reportedly, represents the first successful use of the internet. A Malaysia-based NGO, the Third World Network, has been credited with a primary role in the successful conduct of this campaign.

Insofar as locally-based NGOs have spoken with a broadly similar voice as the government of the day with respect to global economic and environmental issues, they have not only been tolerated but indeed given some measure of prominence in consultations and even in the media. Simultaneously, those views which are somewhat at odds with officialdom are sidelined.

Finally, where there has been no such ambivalent relationship to power, the ability of movements to make their voices heard within the national, as contrasted to the international, arena has been greatly circumscribed. We can see this in relation to environmental campaigns, especially where such campaigns have involved local marginal populations. In such instances, it is more often than not the case that by virtue of linguistic and other divides, the "public intellectuals" who may emerge have largely been those at the "center." Without wishing to devalue the efforts that have been put into such campaigns, it is doubtful to what extent this represents an imaginative re-mapping of the nation and to what extent an "exoticization" of those at the margins, whereby those who stand in an ambiguous relationship to the blandishments of "modernity" as opposed to their own histories and identities are often dropped from consideration.

I would be the first to acknowledge that such a bald characterization is an exaggeration and, most important, pays insufficient attention to the restrictions of the state. Still, it serves to bring out the fact that society (whether civil or uncivil) is not unitary, even less so history, compounded by the fact that some live in marginal social formations. In such a context, the linkage of a common cause of opposition often belies the differences in objectives.

The Possibilities of "Asian" Intellectuals

by Nirmala PuruShotam

The question before us is, how do we who would call ourselves "intellectuals" do our work such that spaces are opened up through which the silent and the silenced are represented. In this respect, there are two main problems.

First, the spaces that are opened up pertain to the work that I do in the production of knowledge, and hence discourses by which particular social realities become both understandable and productive. In this respect, intellectuals occupy certain sites which give them a greater possibility to speak (or be heard) than the average citizen. Here the intellectual has the responsibility, or claims to have the responsibility, to speak for the silenced and the silent. Second and more crucially, the intellectual has the responsibility to participate in the creation of spaces by which others, "normally" deemed not to have the authority to speak, are given confidence in their own voices. Here the intellectual must be willing to allow for the loss of his or her expertise: ideally, the silent and the silenced find their voices sufficiently so that they speak for themselves, rather than be spoken for by the intellectual.

Underlying these two concerns is the problem of the appropriateness of the language in which the

intellectual must speak today. In the main, we are always to be mindful that we present ourselves as decolonized minds. This distinction of decolonization is most easily claimed when we make statements with a conscious attention to our "Asian" identity and status. The seductiveness of the "Asian" identity is understandable. To be postcolonial, after all, is to talk back to the empire and reassert what was denied us in that historical time. This reassertion involves the elevation of that which set us apart from the West; that by which our voices were silenced because we were not of the West. Correspondingly, the very process by which we come to bear the qualifications of an "intellectual" involves some important connection to an evaluation through which we are always open to be caught out as "not Asian enough" or worse, "not Asian at all."

Yet to accept the identity is to accept the paradigm of race, one of the most basic principles of the colonial mode of classifying the world. I should add that many who attach this identification with "Asian" would boldly state that they de-race the label. That is, their particular use of the identification is devoid of essentialism. Hence it is not a racial identification but a political one, a means by which we can recognize and make statements against the colonial and the neocolonial.

This context by which we have become "Asian" intellectuals has been managed and constructed both in terms of a larger history involving us as subjects of a received knowledge informing us who we are, as well as the more immediate history of us as members of particular nations. In both instances we are caught within the discursive realities of particular class interests. But class interests are hidden, and, additionally, difficult to extricate because they have been wedded to what constitutes our Asian-ness. The primary area of my concern, in this respect, is with the claim that democracy, and by implication and explication, civil society, must be subject to Asianizing. Nowhere is this more powerfully argued than in Chua Beng Huat's *Communitarian Ideology and Democracy in Singapore* (1995). In contrast to his optimistic rendering, I see in "Asian democracy" the device by which ongoing managed versions of democracy and civil society are legitimately constrained. Limits can "rightfully" be placed upon civil society, and hence too on the intellectual. Indeed, the intellectual has before him/her a tailor-made excuse for the silences that s/he participates in reproducing. Thus my question: given Asian democracy, how are intellectuals to make representations of the silent and the silenced?

"Asian" democracies that limit political freedom for individual citizens in the name of the greater good do so by claiming there is an essential difference between West and East. This difference supposedly rests upon a divide between the individual and the family and community. Thus, the "West" is perceived as an "individualistic" society; while the "East" is read as essentially communitarian in its social arrangements and concerns. This is of course a rather simplistic reading of the world, which I shall not go into here. However what is significant is that such a reading legitimizes limitations on the rights of citizens. Thus the individual citizen becomes cognizant that his or her claim to rights must not compromise the interests of the larger community of which he or she is a part.

The individual citizen's rights, including the work of intellectuals, are framed by his or her membership in an "Asian" community. This "Asian" itself involves a complex, always ongoing number of configurations. Yet it claims to be based on an essential characterization that is supposedly reflective of our "true" tradition. One of the most crucial institutional forms that the claim to being "Asian" carries is the reference to our membership in a particular, patriarchal form of the family. This "normal family" is based upon a hierarchy of members, at the apex of which is a male head of household. This pyramidal image of the normal family, together with the familial roles it presents, particularly with respect to the "father," has more often than not been used as a primary means of depicting even elected rulers of the modern state. In the last instance, "father knows best" and father will make decisions based on his superior understanding. He will have all the facts.

The authority of the government's position in Southeast Asia is based on this claim. It is notable that while the concept of "founding fathers" is not original to this part of the world, the "founding fathers" in this part of the world are not those of a distant past, but of fairly recent colonial history. At times, they are figures that are still with us. This includes the identity of real political figures, whose authority to contest for state power is located in the identities of their fathers.

The claim of fatherly or paternalistic authority is augmented further by the process by which certain kinds of information are not available for the average citizen; they are "classified." In a democracy that claims "the normal Asian family" as its metaphor, the claim that some information must necessarily be classified becomes a means to a limitless end. Who decides what information is classified? How long must such information be classified? Why is it necessary for that particular information to be classified? There is no space to table this process of classification; to open it up for discussion.With time, more and more information becomes classified without public discussion or scrutiny. I should stress that classified information is not, once again, specific to the Southeast Asian situation. The point is that the process of classification is itself highly classified. The classification issue is not open to question either before, during or after information is rendered unavailable to all but a privileged few. These privileged few may include the intellectuals who can show themselves to be expert on pertinent issues. This in turn is tied to that intellectual's public presence; the social recognition and distinction accorded to him/her as the expert.

Intellectual activity requires access to information and knowledge. But information and knowledge in the "Asian democracy" are not open to just anyone. Additionally, the closure of sources of information becomes a continually available means to reject a dissenting position as not being based on enough "facts" and hence limited and weak: "they" don't know what "we" know. Another aspect of this problem is that the official version of knowledge often involves summarizing the complexity of social reality into neatly ordered statistical information. The numbers that a researcher has access to thus reduces his or her significant voice. More crucially, if the researcher speaks via the voice of those s/he represents, that representation can be dismissed as "anecdotal." Summarily, "they" will always know more—including that "more" that is particularly significant. "Classified information" is always in excess of what is available to a perceivably dissenting intellectual, who would not be trusted with the information.

To become socially relevant, an intellectual must be able to disseminate the alternative ways of thinking that her/his work can create/enable. Indeed, the more public her or his dissemination becomes, the more recognized her or his "expertise" on the subject; and hence her or his ability to be an effective intellectual. There are at least two crucial kinds of public spaces that an Asian intellectual needs to access: first, conventionally recognized public spaces, particularly those involving mass media exposure; and second, privatized public spaces, the closed door spaces where one enters into discussions with politically powerful experts, i.e., state and government officials. In these secret spaces you can be given "facts" that others are not privy to. Hence the intellectual can be in the know and yet not have the right to dispense this received knowledge. In this respect, such a space gives an intellectual a particular distinction which, effectively, can be used to win him/her over and give him/her the legitimacy to make statements without having to fully clarify them.

How can and/or what does it take for an intellectual to enter these spaces? Girded by the fear of falling, which includes both a siege mentality and a concern for the nation, fear of reprisals, fear of losing what has already been gained or given (or will be given if we behave ourselves), is the sense that there are limits to what an intellectual can possibly accomplish in an Asian democracy. Laws back these limits, for example, the definition of what constitutes a "subversive" document: "any document or publication" that is "calculated or likely to … promote feelings of hostility between different races or classes of the population." Clearly this allows for the widest possible interpretation. In any case, political interests are often conjoined with issues of race and class: they emanate precisely because there is a perceived difference that is read as generally unequal, if not oppressively or exploitively so.

In sum, the intellectual's public relevance is "public" because s/he locates herself/himself in given spaces and sites of authority. But as the prestige and influence that follow from being a public intellectual increase, they can and have taken some intellectuals further and further away from the ground from whence they first spoke. Additionally, it legitimizes that growing distance because they now know more and more about that which is secret or private—including the personal relationships and hence true character of individuals in power.

The Asianizing of public discourse by intellectuals thus places them in a serious bind. If discourse is to

be truly about un-silencing the silent and the silenced, then the trappings of what constitutes the normal limits—derived from a specifically Asian reading of the body, the body social and the body politic—must be open to examination and reinterpretation. This should bring the intellectual face to face with his or her own raced and gendered identities, his or her own use of "Asia" to claim a postcoloniality that is used as a mantle of correctness. It brings to mind the statement that "all men are created equal" at a time when "men" was not by any means a generic reference. Likewise "Asian" as the hyphen before the intellectual is a dangerous myth; a notion of ourselves that, paradoxically, is the disguise of a colonial mode of orientation. An alternative strategy must involve us going to the ground, where the ordinary people are, and getting them to speak with reference to their own sense of what is relevant and from actual life experiences: so that there is grounded data from which to begin our work. ■

Tracking the Human Genome Project

*by Rayna Rapp, Deborah Heath, Karen Sue Taussig**

In 1988, when the controversy about Congressional funding for mapping the entire human genome was heating up, James Watson—the renowned co-discoverer of the structure of DNA and the Project's most visible and influential scientist—encountered a tough question at a press conference. A reporter opined that eugenics cast a shadow over the genome project and asked what Watson intended to do about it. Seemingly spontaneously, Watson immediately replied that 3-5% of the (hefty) annual budget would be devoted to social impact studies. From such origin tales are Requests for Proposals born!

What Watson proposes, Congress disposes, and every year since 1990 the Human Genome Project's budget has contained an allocation for social impact studies. The range of issues that fall under the umbrella of "social impact" travel under the acronym ELSI— Ethical, Social and Legal Implications. Not everyone is overjoyed by this disposition of government monies; critics variously denounce the ELSI funding structure as window dressing or too little, too late. Moreover, some legislators hostile to ELSI have asked, "Why do you need all this money? Who cares what jurisprudence scholars and philosophers have to say, let's get on with the work." In response to one such critic, Watson replied that for better or for worse, the cat was out of the bag, and the public was quite concerned. The needling Senator continued, "OK, so the cat's out of the bag, but do you have to put the cat on TV?"

And the cat certainly is on TV. When I started tracking media coverage of genetic issues more than a decade ago while conducting research on amniocentesis, stories were few and far between. Now, hardly a day or week goes by without genetics stories appearing in *The New York Times*, *Newsweek* or TV's evening news. Public interest and knowledge about this project has certainly become much more widespread. National opinion surveys now query attitudes toward prenatal genetic diagnoses and insurance-related discrimination against those whose inherited predispositions may make them susceptible to certain workplace conditions.

The ELSI Program is administered by the National Human Genome Research Institute, a branch of the National Institutes of Health. It has funded almost $40 million worth of research since 1990. The ELSI portfolio has four funding priority areas. They are: (1) privacy and fair use (how can genetic information best be used while protecting individuals and families from its abuse?), (2) clinical integration (how will new genetic knowledge be applied in patient-centered medicine?), (3) research issues (once the genome has been mapped, what pressing research questions will follow?) and 4) education (how are America's many publics to be informed of the benefits and burdens of new genetic knowledge?). Those publics include not only key educators at every level, but the country's physicians, most of whom report a stunning lack of understanding of the genetic tests they are increasingly ordering for their patients.

From the beginning, the lion's share of ELSI's budget has consistently gone into clinical integration research aimed at operationalizing advances in genetics while taking enduring ethical dilemmas into account. Clinical integration has averaged a 48% share of the budget over the first seven years. Funding has also covered the projects of bioethicists and philosophers; primary, secondary and higher education planners and analysts; legal scholars and their fellow travelers working on intellectual property rights, patent rights and the protection of privacy. ELSI grants have been awarded for studying the public impact of the new science journalism and for investigating the use of the internet for sharing genetics-based information. Into this volatile mix, social science and humanities scholars have stepped rather gingerly, realizing how little most of us understand about the theoretical foundations and practical activities on which contemporary molecular biology (or any of the other up-and-coming-ologies) rests.

*Rayna Rapp teaches anthropology at the New School for Social Research. This essay is drawn from a talk she delivered at the SSRC on May 5, 1998. It has been edited and refashioned with her colleagues Deborah Heath, who teaches anthropology at Lewis and Clark College, and Karen Sue Taussig, who holds a postdoctoral appointment in social medicine at Harvard University.

Yet methods developed within and across the social sciences may provide useful, even innovative frameworks for understanding the social consequences of rapidly evolving scientific world views and practices. Here, we report on an ELSI-funded anthropological project aimed at mapping new genetic knowledge among three constituencies: research scientists, clinician physicians and patients living with the diseases and disorders that have become the objects of genomic investigation. We believe that participant observation (or "deep hanging out") enforces and enables those of us who practice it seriously to engage the natives—in this case, the science natives— right at the center of their belief systems and practical activities. We shadow scientists in laboratories, collaborative projects, professional meetings, on the web and in corridor talk, trying to describe and interpret how their facts-in-the-making are produced and how they travel. We watch and listen as clinicians diagnose and treat rare conditions that run in families. We attend meetings of support groups and voluntary health organizations, learning how the knowledge gleaned from living with a genetic condition is put into social action.

In our three-year study, we have developed research strategies that are both national and local, working across the three constituencies of molecular geneticists doing the basic mapping and biomedical research; clinician-physicians, who are in a position to traffic in that knowledge; and patient support groups, of which there are over 200 in this country, loosely connected in the Alliance for Genetic Support Groups. We are particularly interested in the recent proliferation of such support groups for families and individuals coping with chronic physical differences and disorders that have a hereditary basis. How does communication (and miscommunication) occur among these three constituencies? Whose knowledge travels in which networks? How do clinicians and researchers (who are, of course, often the same people) understand what their patient populations understand, desire and need from new genetic knowledge? How does patient knowledge enter into research agendas? Genetic knowledge is generated in many venues; how do these locations intersect and influence one another?

The genome is, of course, a vast research space; we focus on one small portion of it. Our project tracks three connective tissue disorders that have been the sites of recent and dramatic research activities. Connective tissue includes cartilage, skin and bone; all are susceptible to genetic changes with resultant consequences for individual health and social well-being. Moreover, a small range of genetic variation generates a large range of human variability and associated pathogenesis and a vast range of differential expressivity, which means that people may have relatively mild or severe expressions of the same condition. From a small set of genetic alterations that can be grouped into a neat set of scientific problems, an enormous range of individual and social difference develops.

The particular conditions which we follow are the chondrodysplasias (or dwarfing conditions), Marfan syndrome (alleged to have affected Abraham Lincoln and responsible for serious cardiovascular and skeletal disorders) and EB (epidermolysis bullosa, a family of blistering skin diseases). They are linked through various national organizations, although members of each group may have little or no knowledge of their connections to one another.

The new knowledge we are tracking also has implications for our working relations as anthropologists. In undertaking this research, we have constituted ourselves as a science team; that is, we're learning to act like the people we're shadowing. What better way to do participant observation than to form a social grid like the ones through which scientists organize themselves? Our project includes three co-investigators (PIs), three graduate student research assistants and three tape transcribers, whom we might think of as our lab technicians. We are especially pleased to have insisted on this science-team model for it involves three-year funding for a group of students, something which is unusually hard to provide in the social sciences but is *de rigeur* in the life sciences where we conduct our research. We argued strenuously for the need to train a new generation of anthropologists to study the sciences by having them participate in the work that produces scientific knowledge. We and our research assistants therefore spend time in laboratories and on the internet, as well as in more conventional field locations like clinics and homes. We are as likely to find ourselves at fundraisers to benefit voluntary genetic

health organizations as in laboratories observing how geneticists interact with a dizzying array of veterinarians and mice, orthopedists, biochemists, medical engineers, obstetricians, ophthamalogists and pediatricians. We operate on two coasts, in four cities, with five institutional affiliations; much of our communication takes place on the net, where we are endlessly constructing a website into which to pour and share our data. Like the scientists we are tracking, we're engaged in a collective endeavor in which the data belongs to the project, not individual investigators. Classically, US anthropologists "go to the field" as individuals; even when we collaborate, we often bring our individual data to the collective project. Here, we tackle problems none of us can investigate on our own. We author collaborative publications, help research assistants to organize sessions at professional meetings and learn to use slide presentations with bullets that index conclusions (rather than the exquisitely rambling narratives much beloved by anthropologists and historians) when we present our work to scientific audiences. Genre switching is part of experiential learning.

Our field work sites are diverse; some are repetitive but ephemeral. We have attended national and local meetings of Little People of America, National Marfan Foundation and DEBRA (Dystrophic Epidermolysis Bullosa Research Association) in Georgia, California and North Carolina; observed scientists at work in laboratories in Oregon, California, Massachusetts and New York; interviewed people living with the conditions that we are tracking in the states in which we respectively live. The impact of this work on us as participants is highly visual and kinesic, as well. At the LPA, for example, the PIs had to register as "average statured" although our tallest member is 5' 4.5" tall. In convention hotels temporarily given over to more than a thousand short-statured members, we learned to use hotel registration counters on elevated platforms and hairdryers dropped much closer to floor level. At the National Marfan Foundation, we craned our necks upward and learned about tall humor.

At each of these national conventions, which are usually held in the summer, lay people, scientists and clinicians whom we are studying come together. Recent experimental and clinical findings are presented in workshops; clinicians committed to serving the organization's members often offer pro bono consultations, especially valuable for those living far from major research centers; researchers also recruit participants for their studies; activists solicit new members and renewed commitment from old ones; expositions display products of special interest to particular bodily-defined constituency. A dense and complex matrix of exchange is thus continuous. So is interest in and controversy about what we have come to think of as "soft eugenics," notably in the field of prenatal diagnosis where, once a gene for a condition is found, the possibilities for amniocentesis or pre-implantation diagnosis open up.

Eugenic fears are most clearly expressed among LPA members and their biomedical supporters. In 1994, for example, when the gene that causes achondroplasia was cloned, T-shirts appeared at national meetings proclaiming dwarfs to be an "endangered species," indexing the profound discrimination Little People face. Geneticists close to the organization run informational workshops on the Human Genome Project; they participate not only as scientists but as individuals concerned about the costs and benefits of prenatal testing. Geneticist/obstetricians conduct workshops concerned with reproductive health among short-statured people; their goal is to make pregnancies safer, not to prevent them for this group. Moreover, prenatal testing as it is currently practiced almost always involves a reproductive couple who are both short-statured. For those with achondroplasia, there is a one-in-four chance of conceiving a fetus that inherits this dominant condition from both parents. Double dominance is inevitably fatal; thus dwarfs may seek prenatal diagnosis, despite the widespread fear in this community that the general public will use testing to eliminate dwarf fetuses. A controversial technology holds different meanings when used inside and outside the community.

The very notion of "community" is, of course, also differential. People with dwarfing conditions have a lengthy social history as represented in folk tales, Baroque art, circuses, movies and theater. They can and do contest the significance to acquiring genetic information. But Marfan syndrome, characterized by French pediatrician Antoine Marfan in 1896, can be life-threatening; aggressive medical interventions since the 1970s have added two decades to the average life span of those with the syndrome. They are therefore likely to be extremely receptive to genetic diagnosis and the circulation of

genetic information. Being medicalized has had dramatic benefits for people with Marfan. Likewise, families in which members have EB live under continuous medical surveillance. Because the condition is so overwhelming, the controversial world of gene therapy seems to offer the most hope, despite the failure of all gene therapies to date. Thus, what constitutes a "genetics success story" varies dramatically with the condition and the social circulation of information, aspirations and practical knowledge.

And genetics stories aren't the only stories to which we are attentive. The people and groups from whom we are learning are diverse not only in light of their location vis-à-vis genetic disease. They also live out the complex social relations of gender, generation, social class, racial-ethnic identities, political opinion and cultural resources that currently structure all our lives. We are learning to situate their stories in a much larger framework that includes attention to kinship, work and community relations.

Learning our way around this new territory takes time, and a commitment to new languages and techniques. We are often less skilled at these tasks than many bright undergraduate biology majors. But as anthropologists we have a willingness to go back to square one, in the hopes of learning "from the natives' point of view," or, in this case, multiple points of view. Our methods leave us surfing the internet for the online mouse genome, observing fundraising art auctions for genetic disease organizations and in chat rooms of people with Marfan discussing drug prescriptions. It also makes us acutely aware that many national genetics organizations are disproportionately white in their membership and leadership; that lab personnel are highly international in their origins and training; and that the national voluntary health organizations, where we're watching a significant transformation in the way people think about themselves and their political aspirations for inclusion, largely run on female labor. Who is participating in the genomic exercise, who is positioned to truly conduct research or to truly give informed consent, who benefits and who is burdened (of course, those outcomes are often simultaneous) by new genetic knowledge is in large measure also a construct of much older forms of social differentiation and stratification of which we need always be aware.

In 1993, during the hearings on proposed national health care reforms, members of the ELSI Working Group (who were not allowed to lobby as members of a government-funded entity) joined as individuals with a wide range of health advocates in a coalition called People With Genes. Their efforts were directed toward sponsoring legislation that would cover genetic disease and outlaw genetic discrimination while raising national awareness of the importance of genetic issues. We are, of course, all people with genes. Here, we argue that we are also all people inside of science. Science has an enormous and rapidly expanding presence in our social and political life, cultural representations and daily personal experiences. And we are located differentially in relation to its benefits and burdens. As this brief research report suggests, it is worthwhile to turn our considerable collective minds and methods toward enhanced understandings of the many ways in which science can and should be understood. The tools of the social sciences can surely help us to grasp the many powerful ways in which science as culture plays out in social life. ■

Suggestions for further reading:

My opening and closing stories are borrowed from (Juengst 1996). Introductions to the Human Genome Project particularly useful to social scientists include (Annas and Elias 1992) and (Kevles and Hood 1992a).

Introductions to the anthropology of science literature can be found in (Downey and Dumit 1998) and (Franklin 1995).

Annas, George and Sherman Elias, eds. 1992. *Gene Mapping: Using Law and Ethics as Guides*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Downey, Gary Lee and Joseph Dumit, eds. 1998. *Cyborgs and Citadels: Anthropological Interventions in Emerging Sciences and Technologies*. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Studies Press.

Franklin, Sarah. 1995. "Science as Culture, Cultures of Science." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 24: 163-184.

Juengst, Eric T. 1996. "Self-Critical Federal Science? The Ethics Experiments within the U.S. Human Genome Project." *Social Philosophy and Policy* 13 (2): 63-95.

Kevles, Daniel and Leroy Hood, eds. 1992a. *The Code of Codes: Scientific and Social Issues in the Human Genome Project*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Current Activities at the Council

New Staff Appointment

John Ambler joined the Council professional staff in mid-October. For the next year, Mr. Ambler will be developing the Council's East Asian programs: strengthening ties and networks in China, Korea and Taiwan; developing East Asia RAP activities; and managing the Vietnam Project.

Mr. Ambler was most recently the Ford Foundation's representative for Vietnam and Thailand, based in Hanoi. He has also been the foundation's deputy representative in New Delhi and served as a program officer in Jakarta. Mr. Ambler received the Ph.D. in Rural Sociology from Cornell University.

Program in Applied Economics Summer Workshop

The Program in Applied Economics (PAE) held its first Summer Workshop at the Airlie Center in Warrenton, Virginia from August 3 to 8, 1998. Through a national competition, the program selected 34 first- and second-year economics Ph.D. students from US universities (see the list of student participants on pp. 106-07) to attend the workshop. Led by a distinguished "faculty" of scholars and policymakers, seminars addressed three of the most complex and pressing issues on the economics research and policy agenda: the spread of currency and financial crises in Asia, the causes of and cures for increasing economic inequality, and the limits to regulation and deregulation in network industries. Members of the PAE Steering Committee and the SSRC staff, along with a representative from the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, also discussed the goals and opportunities of the program and the foundation's other investments in economics.

The seminars and informal discussions encouraged students to apply their core training in economic theory and econometric methods to these vital questions, but also exposed them to approaches not covered in the standard curriculum. For each topic students were introduced to theoretical innovations ("third-generation" models of currency crises, the theory of social interactions and models of network externalities), comparative and historical perspectives (on international financial flows, income inequality and vertical integration and deregulation) and policy debates (on regulating international financial flows, improving the plight of unskilled workers and the role of antitrust law). In small discussion groups they analyzed the background readings and seminar presentations and prepared questions for the roundtable discussions that concluded each session.

Students were invited to apply for small grants to support individual or collaborative research motivated by the issues discussed in the workshop. They were also strongly encouraged to apply for the 1999-2000 Fellowship in Applied Economics, which will support third-year Ph.D. students to acquire the necessary training or experience for their dissertation research.

The 1999 Summer Workshop will be held at the Airlie Center from August 2 to August 7, 1999.

Speakers (in order of presentation): Paul Krugman, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Albert Fishlow, Council on Foreign Relations; Barry Eichengreen, University of California, Berkeley; Robert Wade, Brown University; Gary S. Fields, Cornell University; H. Peyton Young, Johns Hopkins University and Brookings Institution; Rebecca M. Blank, Council of Economic Advisers and Northwestern University; George Akerlof, Brookings Institution and the University of California, Berkeley; Peter Gottschalk, Boston College; Nicholas Economides, New York University; Richard N. Langlois, University of Connecticut; Catherine D. Wolfram, Harvard University; and Daniel L. Rubinfeld, Deputy Assistant Attorney General, US Department of Justice and University of California, Berkeley. Staff: David Weiman, George Samuels

International Predissertation Fellowship Program Fellows' Conference and Regional Workshops

The purpose of the International Predissertation Fellowship Program and therefore of the fellows' conference and regional workshops is to prepare students for careers in research on the developing world that will begin with the dissertation research project, but not end there. Thus our goal at these events is to help students think not only about their dissertation research but also about their long-term careers and the research that they will go on to do. The conference and workshops provide an opportunity for stu-

dents to reflect on the strengths as well as the limitations of their own disciplines, to consider the ways in which research methods and perspectives of social scientists in other disciplines might be of value to them and to broaden the scope of their thinking—with regard both to their methodological options as social scientists and to what they consider good research. The gatherings provide an environment of collegiality and mutual support in which they can sharpen their research design skills and become more self-conscious about the choices they make in their research.

Fellows' Conference

On October 8-11, 1998, the International Predissertation Fellowship Program (IPFP) held its annual fellows' conference in Scottsdale, Arizona. A group of 23 current and former IPFP fellows and nine faculty met to discuss theoretical and methodological concerns at issue in the conduct of research in the developing world.

Roughly one-third of the conference was devoted to plenary sessions on research design and methods of data collection. David Collier of the University of California, Berkeley discussed methods of strengthening research design, and he and other faculty offered "true confessions" about their own research experiences. Mitchell Seligson of the University of Pittsburgh gave a presentation on the use of small-N survey data; Robert Vitalis of Clark University spoke about approaches to archival research; and Albert Park, a former IPFP fellow who is now an assistant professor at the University of Michigan, gave a presentation on the uses of census data in research. In addition to these methods-focused sessions, Thongchai Winichakul of the University of Wisconsin, Madison gave a talk entitled "Native Privilege, Native Blindness: Local In/sensitivity and Local Gossip Behind Foreign Researchers."

Most of the conference consisted of small group discussions of each fellow's preliminary thoughts about a research project in the developing world. Fellows each prepared 8-10 page Statements of Research Goals which were distributed to all participants several weeks prior to the conference so that they could prepare thoughtful feedback. Each fellow's statement was discussed by the small group for one full hour. Discussions emphasized adequacy of methodologies in addressing a given theoretical issue, adequacy of attention to issues of context-sensitivity and problems of data collection, analysis and interpretation. Conference faculty moderated the small workshop groups and participated in informal discussions.

Fellows were invited to organize impromptu discussions during meals and free times on topics of their choice—from the practical to the methodological to the theoretical. This year such discussion topics included: "doing research on/with children," "academic publishing," "ethics in field research" and "problems of returning from the field." Students and faculty also met for informal discussions by discipline and region.

Regional Workshops

In the spring and summer of 1998, the International Predissertation Fellowship Program (IPFP) held workshops in Peru, Malaysia and South Africa as part of its continuing series entitled "Conducting Social Science Research in the Developing World." The workshops in this series are designed to bring a small, multidisciplinary group of IPFP fellows together with graduate students in the developing world to engage in critical discussions about the design of social science research and to establish contacts with local scholars.

Students typically spend most of the three- or four-day workshops in discussions of the perceived strengths and weaknesses of each other's preliminary plans for research. Topics vary, but the discussions converge on the adequacy of methodologies in addressing a given theoretical issue; adequacy of attention to issues of context-sensitivity; problems of data collection, analysis and interpretation. Workshop agendas typically include one-on-one meetings between each of the students and a local scholar with similar research interests.

Lima, Peru (April 20-23, 1998)

This workshop was held in cooperation with Red Para el Desarrollo de las Ciencias Sociales en el Peru and was co-

chaired by Gonzalo Portocarrero and Carlos Ivan Degregori, both of la Red. The five IPFP fellows who participated in the workshop were residing in Brazil, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador and Guatemala; the five local participants were all affiliated with la Red. Together they considered topics such as the relationship between socioeconomic inequality and democracy, identity among gay youth in Lima and the problem and control of corruption in Brazil, Colombia and Venezuela. Participants also met with faculty at the University San Marcos and visited the San Juan squatter settlements and pre-Hispanic ruins at Pachacamac.

Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia (May 31-June 5, 1998)

University of Malaya professors Jomo Sundaram and Hazim Shah, of the Department of Economics and the Faculty of Sciences respectively, were the co-chairs of this workshop, held in cooperation with the University of Malaya. IPFP fellows pursuing their training programs in Indonesia, Malaysia and Thailand met with students from the University of Malaya, the Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Cambridge University and the MARA Institute of Technology to discuss topics such as the relationship between environmental and demographic change; translocal identity, community and citizenship in Indonesia; and strategies used by politically marginalized groups to attain access to the policymaking process. The workshop agenda also included a visit to the Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia and individual meetings with local scholars at the University of Malaya.

Johannesburg, South Africa (June 21-26, 1998)

This workshop was held in cooperation with the Social Sciences Research and Development Forum and was co-chaired by Renosi Mokate, director of the Institute for Reconstruction and Development at the University of Pretoria, and Bernard Magubane, professor emeritus of the University of Connecticut. South African students from the University of the North, the University of the North West, the University of Fort Hare, the University of Cape Town and the University of Pretoria joined SSRC fellows residing in Kenya, Madagascar, Namibia, South Africa, Tanzania and Zimbabwe for discussions of topics such as the ANC leadership in exile, discourse and power in multilingual courtrooms and identity among Rwandan and Burundian women and child refugees in Tanzanian camps. Other highlights of the workshop agenda included a presentation by Ibbo Mandaza of the South African Regional Institute for Policy Studies, visits to both the Human Sciences Research Council and the Council for Scientific and Industrial Research and an excursion to Soweto.

Bio-Behavioral Social Perspectives on Health

On October 5, 1998 a small group of scholars from several disciplines convened at the SSRC to lay the foundations for a recently-funded initiative at the intersection of the social, behavioral and biological sciences. The Working Group on Bio-Behavioral-Social Perspectives on Health represents a new partnership among the Council, the Office of Behavioral and Social Sciences Research (OBSSR) at the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and the National Opinion Research Center (NORC) at the University of Chicago (with assistance provided by the National Institute of Aging). The goal of the two-year project is to help foster creative interdisciplinary research on health. Through systematic and comparative study of several paradigmatic cases of collaborative, integrative research, the working group will document both the processes of discovery and noteworthy findings in such cases.

The discussions at this meeting focused on four planning tasks: First, sharpening and deepening the working group's analytic framework and thus the issues and questions that will guide the project inquiry; second, making final decisions on the case-study domains (aging/-longevity and biodemography; cognitive-affective neuroscience; behavioral cardiology; and AIDS/HIV/infectious disease, among others, were given close consideration); third, locating the best representatives and analysts for each domain; and finally, spelling out how the material will be produced, integrated and distributed. Based on these discussions SSRC and OBSSR staff are producing a detailed plan of

activities for the working group, to begin early in 1999.

Participants: Norman Anderson (OBSSR), Orville Gilbert Brim (SSRC), John Cacioppo (Ohio State University), Virginia Cain (OBSSR), Richard Davidson (University of Wisconsin), Frank Kessel (SSRC), Shirley Lindenbaum (Graduate Center, City University of New York), Jay Olshansky (University of Chicago), Patricia Rosenfield (Carnegie Corporation), Neil Schneiderman (University of Miami), Richard Suzman (NIA), Linda Waite (NORC). (The latter two participated by speaker-phone.)

International Peace and Security Research Workshops

The Committee on International Peace and Security sponsored several research workshops during 1998. Descriptions follow in reverse chronological order.

"Does Ethnic Conflict Exist? Globalization and Processes of Identity and Violence" was held at Cornell University on May 30-June 1, 1998. Participants gathered to develop a more synthetic and critical approach to the issues of conflict and peace building and their local-global dimensions.

Organizers: Darini Rajasingham, International Centre for Ethnic Studies, Sri Lanka; and Chip Gagnon, Ithaca College and Cornell University. Participants: Martijn van Beek, Aarhus University, Denmark; Ronnie Lipschutz, University of California, Santa Cruz; Stefan Senders, Cornell University; Greta Uehling, University of Michigan; Maria Hadjipavlou-Trigeorgis, Columbia University and University of Cyprus.

"Secret No More: The Security Implications of Global Transparency" was held at the National Air and Space Museum in Washington, DC on May 21-22, 1998. An edited volume on the security implications of commercial observation satellites is in preparation.

Organizer: Gregg Herken, Smithsonian Institution, National Air and Space Museum. Participants: John Baker, George Washington University Space Policy Institute; Li Bin, Union of Concerned Scientists; Mark Brender, Space Imaging Corporation; Avner Cohen, US Institute of Peace; Mark Goodman, US Arms Control and Disarmament Agency; Brian Gordon, Direct Information Access Corporation; Lisbeth Gronlund, Union of Concerned Scientists; Vipin Gupta, Sandia Laboratory; Richard Leghorn, Itek Corporation; Karen Litfin, George Washington University Space Policy Institute; Steven Livingston, George Washington University Space Policy Institute; Richard McCormick, US Air Force, Space Plans and Policy; Janne Nolan, Twentieth Century Fund; Kevin O'Connell, RAND Corporation; Gordon Oehler, Potomac Institute for Policy Studies; William Stoney, Mitretek Systems; Ray Williamson, George Washington University Space Policy Institute; and Peter Zimmerman, Zimmerman Associates.

"Ideas, Culture, and Political Analysis" was held at the Center for International Studies, Princeton University on May 15-16, 1998. This workshop brought together scholars of comparative politics and international relations as well as sociologists working on ideas and culture from a variety of viewpoints. A planned edited volume will set out the basic premises of an ideational/cultural approach to politics and provide concrete guidelines for carrying out research in a wide variety of empirical settings.

Organizers: Kathleen MacNamara, Princeton University; Sheri Berman, Princeton University; and Michael Doyle, Princeton University. Participants: Mark Blyth, Johns Hopkins University; Consuelo Cruz, Columbia University; Frank Dobbin, Princeton University; Martha Finnemore, George Washington University; Neil Fligstein, University of California, Berkeley; Peter Hall, Harvard University; Judith Goldstein, Stanford University; John Kurt Jacobson, University of Chicago; Robert Jervis, Columbia University; Peter Katzenstein; Cornell University; Jeffrey Legro, University of Virginia; Sarah Mendelson; State University of New York, Albany; Daniel Philpott, University of California, Santa Barbara; Thomas Risse, University of Konstanz; Anna Seleny, Princeton University; Kathryn Sikkink, University of Minnesota; Jack Snyder; Columbia University; and Sven Steinmo, University of Colorado, Boulder.

"Democracy, the Use of Force and Global Social Change" was held at University of Minnesota on May 1-2, 1998. Participants gathered to discuss and rethink the foundations of the democratic peace debate in order to expand the range of theoretical work and empirical data considered relevant to questions of democracy and war. Plans for an edited volume are moving forward and several of the workshop papers will be published in a special issue of *Global Security*, a British interdisciplinary journal of international relations, in January 2000.

Organizers: Tarak Barkawi, King's College London; and Mark Laffey, Kent State University. Participants: David Blaney, Macalester College; Bruce Cumings, Northwestern University; Keith Krause, Graduate Institute of International Studies, Geneva; Mark Rupert, Syracuse University; Martin Shaw, University of Sussex; and Jutta Weldes, Kent State University.

"Civil Society, Democratization and the Remaking of War-torn Societies" was held at Emory University School of Law on March 29-30, 1998. Democracy/civil society strategies for building peace in war-torn countries present various conceptual and operational problems. Participants examined the transformative nature of such strategies, their successes and contradictions on the ground, and debated their long-term implications for meaningful social and political peace.

Organizer: Julie Mertus, Emory University. Participants: Abdullahi An-Na'im, Emory University; Alexander Costy, University of Toronto; Dorinda Dallmayer, University of

Georgia; Ryan Farley, Emory University; Louis Fein, Emory University; Julius Ihonvbere, Ford Foundation; Richard Joseph, Emory University; Mohammed-Mahmoud Mohamedou, Ralph Bunche Institute on the UN; Roula Majdalani, ESCWA, Lebanon; Joyce New, Carter Center; Robert Pastor, Carter Center; Margaret Popkin, Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Center for Human Rights; Catherine Scott, Agnes Scott College; Steven Sheinberg, Emory University; George Shepherd, Emory University; Beth Stephens; Johan Van der Vyver, Emory University; Tibor Varady, Emory University; and Suzanne Werner, Emory University.

"Regionalism and Globalization: The Impact of External Actors on Vietnam's Development" was held from March 21-30, 1998 in Hanoi, Vietnam. Participants discussed the impact of the US and China on changes within Vietnamese society; East Asia and the external globalized financial impact on Vietnam; ASEAN's influence on Vietnam; and the impact of US -Vietnamese relations on Vietnam's development process.

Organizer: Dan Wessner, University of Denver. Participants: George Demartino, University of Denver; Ilene Grabel, University of Denver; Harry Harding, George Washington University; Lynellyn Long, Population Council, Vietnam; Julie Mertus, Emory University; Nguyen Manh Hung, Institute for International Relations, Vietnam; Pham Doan Nam, Institute of International Relations, Vietnam; Tran Trong Toan, Institute of International Relations, Vietnam; and Peter Van Ness, University of Denver and Australian National University.

Industrial Upgrading

There is widespread awareness of the importance of industrial upgrading for efforts to sustain economic growth and improve living standards. Communities and firms that fail to improve their productive capacities are unlikely to prosper. Yet for social scientists, constructing a theory of industrial upgrading presents intriguing challenges, for upgrading is not merely a technical puzzle but a fundamentally social and political process.

A November 2-4, 1998 workshop at the International Labour Organization (ILO) in Geneva brought together more than a dozen specialists from Asia, the Americas and Europe with shared interests both in the mechanics of upgrading and with the development of empirically testable theories. Co-sponsored by the SSRC and the International Institute for Labour Studies (IILS) at the ILO, in collaboration with the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), the workshop was convened as part of continuing efforts by SSRC's Collaborative Research Network on Globalization, Local Institutions and Development to advance research on industrial upgrading.

The workshop's first sessions were devoted to a review of competing approaches to conceptualizing upgrading and analyzing the social and economic linkages that make it possible in different settings. Subsequent sessions focused on key actors and institutions, and on the diverse issues that arise in distinctive regional and sectoral contexts. Panels were also devoted to the employment implications of different strategies for promoting industrial upgrading and the challenges of linking analytical advances to policy initiatives in which several participants are involved.

Follow-up meetings involving researchers and institutions are planned for several world regions. The organizers also hope to convene a conference at which revised versions of several papers presented at Geneva, along with a number of additional contributions, will be debated.

Participants: Rick Doner, Emory University; Dieter Ernst, University of California, Berkeley; Gary Gereffi, Duke University; Amy Glasmeier, Pennsylvania State University; Leonid Gokhberg, Centre for Science Research and Statistics, Russia; Charles Gore, UNCTAD; Raphael Kaplinksy, Institute of Development Studies, UK; Zeljka Kozul-Wright, UNCTAD, Switzerland; Thandika Mkandawire, UN Research Institute for Social Development, Switzerland; Jorge Monge, Compañia para el Desarollo Tecnologico Industrial de Centroamerica, Costa Rica; Lynn Mytelka, UNCTAD, Switzerland; Khalid Nadvi, Institute of Development Studies, UK; Florence Palpacuer, Université Montpellier II, France; Tony Tam; Academia Sinica,Taiwan. ILO participants: Christine Evans-Klock, Employment and Labour Market Policies Branch; Rosemary Greve, IILS; A.V. Jose, IILS; Aurelio Parisotto, IILS; Nikolai Rogovsky, IILS; Arturo Tolentino, Entrepreneurship and Management Development Branch. Staff: Eric Hershberg, Judith Sedaitis.

International Scholarly Collaboration

If one of the last true global commons is represented by the invisible college of knowledge production and scholarly training, strong and closely linked higher education systems across the world are a must. That said, we still do not have a rigorous understanding of the mechanics of the most basic of those linkages, namely, international scholarly collaboration.

However, it is easier to preach the need for more and better forms of international collaboration than it is to design them. Good design will start with an understanding of what collaboration is, how it has been done and why it has so often failed. With these concerns in mind, the SSRC established an interregional working group on the

question of international scholarly collaboration.

The first meeting was held in New York City on August 2-3, 1998. The group agreed that its focus would be international research collaboration, defined as scholarly exchange that leads to new knowledge production. The group concluded that a necessary condition was the creation of common vocabularies or conceptual bridges that allow for new ways of thinking or new combinations of existing thought. Participants outlined the principal features of most collaborative exercises, and identified agenda-setting and a systematic understanding of the process of research collaboration as features that needed further examination. The group identified a number of relational zones, i.e., area studies and disciplines with distinct forms of collaboration, but also noted the need to identify zones of absence—where collaboration has not or typically does not take place, and to understand why.

The group's objectives are to increase our understanding of how collaborations have taken place, to compare different international collaborative exercises and to create an archive of cases—possibly leading to some general conclusions about the features, structures, characteristics, origins and/or successes of IRC. At least three more meetings will be held over the next two years; the group hopes to prepare reports and articles based on its work. For more information, contact Itty Abraham, program director, South Asia and Southeast Asia programs, staff to the working group.

The working group is comprised of Paul Drake, David Ludden, Penina Mlama, Sujata Patel, Lilia Shevstova and Diana Wong.

International Dissertation Field Research Fellowship Program Fellows' Workshop

The first fellows' workshop organized by the SSRC-ACLS International Dissertation Field Research Fellowship program (IDRF) was held at the International Institute for Research and Education in Amsterdam on October 2-6, 1998. Seventeen fellows took part. The facilitator was Paul Gootenberg, professor of history at the State University of New York, Stony Brook. The workshop featured two guest speakers: Judith Williamson (cultural history, Middlesex University) and Ivan Szelenyi (sociology, University of California, Los Angeles).

The workshop was structured around six panels at which fellows presented their projects and field research experiences. The panels were constituted on the basis of research methodology (interviews, data sets, archives and so on), and panel members were also given time to discuss their work among themselves.

Most of the fellows were finishing or had recently completed their field research. Interestingly, that experience itself, along with a shared commitment to scholarly dialogue, provided a sufficient basis on which to bring together researchers with disparate projects and affiliations.

The discussions were informed by a set of readings on international research that circulated prior to the workshop. The readings included articles and book chapters by Gabriel Almond, Lisa Anderson, Arjun Appadurai, Albert Hirschman, Ira Katznelson, Sherry Ortner, James Scott, William Sewell, Jr. and Immanuel Wallerstein.

The next IDRF fellows' workshop will be held at the University of San Francisco on January 8-12, 1999.

Staff: Kenton W. Worcester, Michael Brogan, Abby Swingen.

Local Governance and International Intervention in Africa

On March 28-29, 1998, a workshop on "Local Governance and International Intervention in Africa" was held at the European University Institute (EUI) in Florence, Italy. The workshop was jointly organized by the Council's Africa and International Peace and Security Programs under the leadership of Thomas Callaghy of the University of Pennsylvania and Council staff. Support for the meeting was provided by the Research Council of Norway and EUI.

The workshop brought together an interdisciplinary group of scholars to explore the complex interactions between local, state and global sources of power and authority in Africa. While exploratory in nature, workshop discussions highlighted several key themes. In Africa (and perhaps elsewhere), the post-cold war era is characterized by a reshaping of the state as it simultaneously competes with and intertwines with global and local orders. Workshop participants called attention to social networks as a missing piece in

the analysis of local politics in Africa, but argued that networks must be located within structural contexts and prevailing discursive practices. Finally, the ways in which Africa interacts with the "global" are complex and contradictory: the propagation of economic reform programs, the spread of norms such as human rights, the presence of peacekeepers and development workers, the trafficking in weapons and many other phenomena are all examples of the "intrusion" of the global, but may have radically different consequences for local and state power relations.

Forced Migration and Human Rights

The International Migration Program held a planning meeting on "Forced Migration and Human Rights" from September 11 to 13, 1998 to explore ways in which academics and practitioners might collaborate by employing a human rights perspective to investigate the issues of refugees and the internally displaced. The participants, including legal scholars, social scientists and practitioners from human rights and refugee organizations, considered topics suitable for collaborative research and discussed possible approaches to research and writing that would inform policies and practices aimed at the protection and assistance of forced migrants. The meeting was made possible with funding from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation.

Over the past two decades growth in the size and diversity of forced migrations have challenged the protective capacity of international laws and organizations that were originally created in response to post-World War II refugees. Despite their shared concerns, scholars and practitioners have often found collaboration difficult, in part because of their different emphases on intellectual and practical goals. This meeting explored how an international human rights framework can help to bridge this divide by integrating conceptual, institutional, geographical and prescriptive approaches. To identify particular issues for collaboration, the participants considered how human rights law supplements existing protections for forced migrants and provides a basis for enhancing cooperation between non-governmental organizations, international agencies and states.

Based upon these discussions, the International Migration Program is developing a project to support training for social scientists and practitioners to undertake collaborative research and a series of international meetings to include diverse perspectives and disseminate research findings. These activities are designed to bring together the theoretical perspectives of academics and the policy perspectives of practitioners in order to explore connections between human rights and forced migration.

Participants: Abdullahi An-Na'im, Alexander Aleinikoff, Peter Benda, Nathalie Borremans, Beverlee Bruce, B.S. Chimni, Francis M. Deng, Robert DeVecchi, Mary Diaz, Stefanie Grant, David Haines, Kimberly Hamilton, Irene Khan, Gil Loescher, Richard Ryscavage, Marge Tsitouris, David Turton, Aristide Zolberg. Staff: Josh DeWind, Walter Miller.

European Modernity and Cultural Difference

From September 25-27, 1998, a conference on "European Modernity and Cultural Difference From the Mediterranean Sea to the Indian Ocean, 1890s-1920s," was held at the Maison Méditéranéene des Sciences de l'Homme (MMSH) at the University of Aix-en-Provence, France. This conference was the third and final meeting of a project organized by Leila Fawaz. Funding for the meeting provided by Tufts University and MMSH in addition to the SSRC. The project's intent was to explore the role of port cities as critical arenas of interaction during a formative period in the encounter between modern and pre-modern ideas, identities, norms and cultural practices. In focusing on both the Mediterranean and Indian Oceans, the project not only sought to situate Middle East cases in a larger comparative context, but to highlight links between the Middle East and broader networks of circulation and trade from Southern Europe to the Indian subcontinent. A project volume edited by Leila Fawaz is under contract at Columbia University Press.

Participants: Engin D. Akarli, Brown University; Christopher A. Bayly, University of Cambridge, UK; Susan Bayly, University of Cambridge, UK; Sugata Bose,Tufts University; Juan R.I. Cole, University of Michigan; Colette Dubois, IHCC-Institut d'Etudes africaines, France; Paul Dumont, CNRS Strasbourg, France; Hala Fattah, Royal Institute for Interfaith Studies, Jordan; Leila Fawaz, Tufts University; Robert Ilbert, MMSH, France; Resat Kasaba, University of Washington; Kenneth McPherson, Curtin University of Technology, Australia; Robin Ostle, Oxford University, UK; Abdul-Karim Rafeq, College of William and Mary; André

Raymond, Université de Provence/ Institut de Recherche sur le Monde Arabe Musulman, France; May Seikaly, Wayne State University; Peter Sluglett, University of Utah; Michel Tuchscherer, Institut de Recherche sur le Monde Arabe Musulman, France. Discussants: Steve Heydeman, Columbia University; Jean-Paul Pascual, MMSH/Institut de Recherche sur le Monde Arabe Musulman, France. Staff: Juliana Deeks.

RECENT COUNCIL PUBLICATION

Imperial Russia: New Histories for the Empire, edited by Jane Burbank and David L. Ransel. Sponsored by the Joint Committee on the Soviet Union and Its Successor States (1983-96). Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1998. xxiii + 359 pp.

This collection brings together innovative scholarship on the history of the Russian Empire from the time of Peter the Great to the 1880s. It introduces a variety of methodologies to the field, including demography, family history and gender studies, legal history, microhistory and semiotics. Broad chronological, methodological and and topical coverage combined with analysis of the possibilities for a more expansive understanding of imperial Russia make this volume an important resource.

The Digital Council

Council computer and editorial staff are preparing a complete overhaul of the SSRC website (www.ssrc.org) in the summer of 1999; our goal is to make the site as informative about SSRC programs, events and publications as it already is about fellowships. In the meantime, individual programs have improved their own web pages.

The International Predissertation Fellowship Program (Ellen Perecman, director; Lisa Angus and Alexa Dietrich, program assistants) recently posted field reports from a number of its fellows on various overseas training sites. If you (or one of your graduate students) wonder whether the library at the University of South Africa in Pretoria is worth a visit or how much cash to bring to Tashkent, this is the place to turn. You can find the reports by following links to SSRC Programs, then to the International Predissertation Fellowship Program, and finally to IPFP Fellows' Field Reports. Eventually they'll be more directly accessible. The IPFP staff wants feedback on this feature, so if you have any suggestions for making it more useful, please contact them at angus@ssrc.org.

The SSRC Mellon Minority Fellowship Program (Beverlee Bruce, director; Sara Robledo, program assistant) has enlivened its report on its annual fellows' conference. Visitors to its page (follow links to Programs and then to SSRC Mellon Minority Fellowship Program) can now read presentations by faculty members and student fellows and see pictures of last June's conference at Bryn Mawr College.

More program page updates will be announced in our next issue.

Awards Offered in 1998

Following are the names, affiliations and topics of the individuals who were offered fellowships or grants by SSRC programs in the most recent annual competitions for research in the social sciences and humanities.

The awards for research abroad were made by the programs jointly sponsored by the SSRC and the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS). In addition to funds provided by the two Councils, these awards received core support from the Ford Foundation, the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation and the National Endowment for the Humanities. Additional funding for grants administered by specific programs is provided by the Ford Foundation, the German Marshall Fund of the United States, the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science, the Japan–United States Friendship Commission and the Rockefeller Foundation. Support also comes from the US Department of State through the Research and Training for Eastern Europe and the Independent States of the Former Soviet Union Act of 1983 (Title VIII) and the US Information Agency through the Near and Middle East Research and Training Act (NMERTA).

Fellowships in international peace and security are supported by a grant from the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation. The Ford Foundation supports the joint ACLS/SSRC International Predissertation Fellowship Program. The Abe Fellowship program is funded by the Japan Foundation Center for Global Partnership.

Unless it is specifically noted that a program is administered by the ACLS, the programs listed are administered by the SSRC. The Council does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, gender, sexual orientation, national origin, age, religion, disability, marital or family status or any other characteristic protected by applicable laws.

The programs change every year, and interested scholars should contact the Council for a copy of the current general brochure. Individual programs usually publish more complete descriptions of their aims and procedures. Fellowship information is also available on the SSRC's website: http://www.ssrc.org.

Predissertation and Dissertation Fellowships for Area and Comparative Training and Research

International Predissertation Fellowship Program**

Jennifer Bair, sociology, Duke University
Maria Castellanos, anthropology, University of Michigan
Deanna Cooke, psychology, University of Michigan
Kenneth Croes, anthropology, Princeton University
Michelle Dion, political science, University of North Carolina
Sara Dorow, sociology, University of Minnesota
Beth Dunford, sociology, Michigan State University
Amy Freeman, geography, University of Washington
Payal Gupta, demography, University of Pennsylvania
Bruce Hall, history, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign
Sean Hanretta, history, University of Wisconsin, Madison
Rachelle Jacobs, religion, Northwestern University
Arang Keshavarzian, politics, Princeton University
James Kessler, history, University of Chicago
Asim Khwaja, economics, Harvard University
Helen Kinsella, political science, University of Minnesota
Gina Lambright, political science, Michigan State University
Enid Logan, sociology, University of Michigan
Karuna Mantena, government, Harvard University
Jacquelyn Miller, forestry, Michigan State University
Elena Obukhova, anthropology, Northwestern University
Shanti Rabindran,* economics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Jeffrey Rothstein, Industrial Relations Research Institute, University of Wisconsin, Madison
Carmen Ruiz, anthropology, University of Texas, Austin
Susanna Trnka, anthropology, Princeton University
Jocelyn Viterna, sociology, Indiana University
Andrea Vogt, anthropology, Michigan State University

* Declined award
**This program is designed to prepare students to conduct research in the developing world.

Sonny Vu, linguistics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cory Welt, political science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Eastern Europe (Administered by the ACLS)

Postdoctoral Fellowships

Gabriela Ilnitchi, music, New York University. Post-Byzantine musical iconography: representations of musical instruments and dances in the late medieval frescoes of Moldavia and Wallachia
Nicholas J. Miller, history, Boise State University. The nonconformists: nationalism in a Serbian intellectual circle
Katya V. Nizharadze, history, Georgetown University. The world of provincial bureaucracy, Russian Poland, 1870s -1904
Bozena E. Shallcross, Polish literature, Indiana University. Journey of the poet's eye: Herbert, Brodsky and the art of travel
Timothy D. Snyder, modern history, Harvard University. Poland's silent Ostpolitik: how Warsaw avoided national conflict and thereby rejoined Europe, 1989-1998
Jane C. Sugarman, music, State University of New York, Stony Brook. Imagining modernity: mediated musics and contemporary Albanian identities
Anna G. Szemere, sociology and communication, University of California, San Diego. Civil society and the formation of autonomous self in postsocialist Central/East Europe
Curt F. Woolhiser, Slavic languages, University of Texas, Austin. From borders to isoglosses: sociolinguistic aspects of dialect divergence in the Polish-Belarusian borderlands

Dissertation Fellowships

David S. Altshuler, social anthropology, University of Chicago. Moral ideology and socioeconomic change in the Czech Republic
Justyna A. Beinek, Slavic literatures, Harvard University. The album and the album verse in the culture of Polish and Russian romanticism
Elzbieta W. Benson, sociology, University of California, Berkeley. From information monopoly to market for information: institutional and organizational transition in Poland, 1970-1997
James E. Bjork, history, University of Chicago. Neither German nor Pole: Catholicism and national ambivalence in Upper Silesia, 1890-1914
Barbara A. Cellarius, cultural anthropology, University of Kentucky. Global priority, local reality: rural communities and biodiversity conservation in Bulgaria
Krisztina E. Fehervary, socio-cultural anthropology, University of Chicago. Building Hungarian dreams: the built environment and socio-cultural change in post-socialist Hungary
Danielle M. Fosler-Lussier, musicology, University of California, Berkeley. The transition to communism and the legacy of Béla Bartók in Hungary
Eagle Glassheim, history, Columbia University. Nationalization of the nobility in Czechoslovakia, 1918-1948
Thalia S. Gray, archaeology, New York University. The social organization of trade and exchange in early medieval Wolin
Sean A. Martin, history, Ohio State University. The ethnic identity of the Jews of Krakow, 1918-1939
Judith Pintar, sociology, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign. Reconstruction and recovery in southern Dalmatia
Sherrill L. Stroschein, political science, Columbia University. The components of coexistence

Eurasia

Dissertation Write-up Fellowships

Katherine Burns, political science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Subnational power and international cooperation: the Russian Far East and its Northeast Asian neighbors
Keith Darden, political science, University of California, Berkeley. From economic myth to institutional reality: the creation of new forms of regional order in the former Soviet Union
Michael David, Russian history and medicine, University of Chicago and Yale University School of Medicine. The white plague in Soviet Moscow: tuberculosis in politics and society, 1917-1941
Jennifer Dickinson, linguistic anthropology, University of Michigan. Language and identity in a Ukrainian border community
Adrienne Edgar, history, University of California, Berkeley. The making of a Soviet nation: Turkmenistan, 1924-39

Katherine Graney, political science, University of Wisconsin, Madison. Projecting sovereignty: post-Soviet statehood in a multicultural Russia

Leonid Livak, Slavic languages and literature, University of Wisconsin, Madison. Russian emigré literature in the context of French modernism: a study in the cultural mechanisms of exile

Adriana Petryna, anthropology, University of California, Berkeley. The technical and political administration of life after Chernobyl: science, sovereignty and citizenship in a post-cold war era

Guita Ranjarbaran, anthropology, Graduate Center, City University of New York. Strategizing for power: marriage among the Soviet elite in Tajikistan

Robert Romanchuk, Slavic languages and literature, University of California, Los Angeles. The textual community of the Kirillo-Belozerskii monastery

Barbara Skinner, history, Georgetown University. Catherine the Great's policy toward the Uniate church, 1765-1796: the absorption of Belarusians and Ukrainians into the Orthodox empire

Ernest Zitser, history, Columbia University. The kingdom transfigured: parody and power at the court of Peter the Great, 1682-1725

Near and Middle East

Predissertation Fellows

Hina Azam, religion, Duke University. Classical Islamic jurisprudence, "fiqh"

Ali Hussain, Near Eastern languages and civilizations, University of Chicago. Perceptions of the deaf in Islamic society: a social and linguistic history of deaf communities in the Middle East

Agnieszka Paczynska, government, University of Virginia. Institutional legacies and policy choice: the political incorporation of labor under Nasser in Egypt and the contemporary economic reform process

Leslie Weaver, Middle Eastern studies, New York University. Whither Morocco? The emergence of Morocco's early nationalist movement

Dissertation Fellows in the Social Sciences and Humanities

David Crawford, anthropology, University of California, Santa Barbara. Berber identity formation in the Moroccan High Atlas

Rochelle Davis, anthropology, University of Michigan. Patterns of diaspora among 1948 Palestinian refugees from the Jerusalem sub-district

Kathryn Ebel, geography, University of Texas. Images of empire: the city and the Ottoman imperial vision, 1450-1700

Marwa Elshakry, history, Princeton University. Science and evolutionary theory in late 19th- and early 20th-century Egypt

Ilana Feldman, anthropology and history, University of Michigan. Colonialism, nationalism and bureaucracy: civil service in the Gaza Strip

Jason Greenberg, anthropology, Temple University. Comparing failure: social reproduction and change within the Israeli educational system

Bassam Haddad, government, Georgetown University. Reform strategies of populist-authoritarian regimes: state-business relations in Syria

Margaret Lynch, geography, University of Texas. Geographical visions of Ankara

Anastasios Papademetriou, Near Eastern studies, Princeton University. Non-Muslims in Ottoman society: the Greek community of Istanbul in the 16th century

David Peters, history, University of Chicago. Development and its discontents: the origins of a national moral economy in Egypt, 1928-1952

Michelle Rein, art history, University of Pennsylvania. Visual expressions of Baraka: saints' shrines and material culture in Morocco

Karen Rignall, anthropology and history, University of Michigan. Urbanism, the state and the transformation of property in colonial Morocco

Christopher Toensing, history, Georgetown University. A social history of workers in Suez Canal ports, 1924-1952

Jessica Weaver, anthropology, New York University, Cultural and intellectual identity in the contemporary Egyptian art world

Bangladesh

Predissertation Fellowships

Ian Petrie, history, University of Pennsylvania. Domesticating development: A century of village uplift in Bengal, 1880-1980

Robert Yelle, history of religions, University of Chicago. A poetic and rhetorical analysis of the mantras on Bengali tantra

Dissertation Fellowships

Maimuna Huq, anthropology, Columbia University. Women and Islamic activism in Bangladesh

Vietnam

Dissertation Fellowships

Su Hong Chae, anthropology, Graduate Center, City University of New York. Working in factory, living in village: the formation of class identity in contemporary Vietnam

Barbara Halpenny, sociology, Indiana University. Local culture, market forces, global science: practicing the biosciences in Vietnam

Pamela McElwee, forestry and environmental studies, Yale University. Changing landscapes and geographies of place in highland Vietnam

Vinh Quoc Nguyen, East Asian languages and civilizations, Harvard University. Demythologizing a nationalist icon: Emperor Quang Trung Nguyen Hue of the Tay Son dynasty in Vietnamese history, historiography and literary imagination

Advanced Grants for Area and Comparative Training and Research

Eurasia

Postdoctoral Fellowships

Timothy Frye, political science, Ohio State University. The politics of post-Communist legal reform

Michael Gorham, Slavic languages and literatures, University of Florida. Speaking in tongues: the language and culture of early Soviet Russia

Laura Olson, Russian culture, University of Colorado, Boulder. Making memory: Russian folk music revival and the fashioning of cultural identity

Abby Schrader, history, Franklin and Marshall College. The languages of the lash: corporal punishment and the construction of identities in imperial Russia, 1785-1904

Willard Sunderland, Russian history, University of Cincinnati. Steppe-building: colonization and empire on the Russian steppe, 1764-1850

Judyth Twigg, political science, Virginia Commonwealth University. Following the doctors' orders? Path dependence and impediments to reform of Russia's health care system

Institutional Support Programs

Russian Language Institutes in the United States

Beloit College
Bryn Mawr College
Indiana University
Middlebury College
Monterey Institute for International Studies
University of Iowa
University of Pittsburgh

Non-Russian Language Institutes in the United States

Arizona State University, Tartar program
Harvard University, Ukrainian program
Indiana University, Baltic cultures, Estonian, Latvian, Lithuanian, Georgian, Kazakh, Turkmen and Uzbek programs
University of Washington, Uzbek program

Japan

Postdoctoral Fellowships (Japan Society for the Promotion of Science)

E. Taylor Atkins,* history, Northern Illinois University. This is our music: authenticating Japanese jazz, 1920-1980

Hiroko Yamashita Butler, East Asian languages and cultures, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign. Role of case-marked nouns in the processing of Japanese and implications for universality in human language processing

David Campbell, economics, University of Essex. The wealth and income distributions of saving: a comparative study of Japan and the US in 1990

Sherry Fowler, art, Lewis & Clark University. Muroji: A contextual analysis of the temple and its images

Elaine Gerbert, East Asian languages and cultures, University of Kansas, Lawrence. The urban spectator in early 20th-century Japanese literature

Theodore Gilman, political science, Union College. Local government and international relations in Japan: an

* Declined award.

emerging trend?

Robin Leblanc, political science, Ogelthorpe University. Citizens and assemblies: the possibilities for local politics in Japan

Christine Marran, Asian languages and literature, University of Washington. Moral and scientific discourses on woman's nature: the literary and cultural context surrounding the emergence of "poison-woman" fiction

Joseph Parker, East Asian thought, Pitzer College. Zen Buddhism and power relations in Muromachi Japan (1336-1567)

Emanuel Pastreich,* East Asian languages and literature, University of California, Berkeley. Advanced research on the reception of Chinese vernacular fiction in Korea and Japan

Janine Anderson Sawada, religion, University of Iowa. The transformation of Fuji devotionalism in 19th-century Japan

Richard Torrance,* East Asian languages and literatures, Ohio State University. Literacy and modern literature in Osaka, 1880-1940

Lisa Yoneyama, Japanese and cultural studies, University of California, San Diego. Art of laughter and management of life in 20th-century Japan

Postdoctoral Fellowships (Japan Society for the Promotion of Science)

Robert Bullock, government, Cornell University. Recasting the conservative coalition: agriculture, small business and the LDP in contemporary Japan

Susan Burns, history, University of Texas. The body in question: the politics and culture of medicine in Meiji Japan (1868-1912)

Linyu Gu, philosophy, University of Hawaii. Research on Nishida Kitaro and Japanese philosophy: A comparison with American process philosophy

Mizuko Ito, education/anthropology, Institute for Research on Learning. Transnational networks: global/local relations in the Japanese computer game industry

Yoshiko Kainuma, art history, University of California, Los Angeles. A new approach to the Buddhist sculpture of the Kamakura period, centering on the significance of cult practices

Sophia Lee, history, California State University. The Japanese presence and the transformation of wartime Beijing, 1937-1945

Gregory Pflugfelder, history, Columbia University. Dreaming of suffrage: gender and the politics of the imagination in modern Japan

Sumi Shin, law, Inter-University Center. Global migration of labor: low-wage work and human rights

Advanced Research Grants (Japan-US Friendship Commission)

Lee Branstetter, economics, University of California, Davis. The role of Japanese technology transfer in East Asian economic development

Kevin Doak, history, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign. Civil society and the formation of the nation-state in Meiji Japan

Michael Dooley, economics, University of California, Santa Cruz. Market structures and real exchange rates: A comparative study on the Japanese yen and the other OECD currencies

William Wayne Farris, history, University of Tennessee, Knoxville. Land, labor and population in Japan, 1100-1550

Bai Gao, sociology, Duke University. Fascism versus liberalism: the transformation of economic governance in Germany, Japan and the United States in 1930-1945

Senko K. Maynard, East Asian languages and cultures, Rutgers University. Toward a rhetoric of pathos: exploring self-expressivity in Japanese discourse and beyond

Susan Napier, Asian studies, University of Texas. Apocalypse, elegies and aliens: a cultural investigation into Japanese animation

Uma Segal, social work, University of Missouri, St. Louis. Cross-national perceptions of child maltreatment

George Tanabe, religion, University of Hawaii, Manoa. Last rites: the demise of funeral Buddhism in contemporary Japan

John Treat, Asian languages and literature, University of Washington. The Seoul bundan and Japanese literary modernism

Japan Studies Dissertation Workshop

Jennifer Amyx, political science, Stanford University. From comparative advantage to comparative disadvantage: the ministry of finance as a variable in the breakdown of Japanese fiscal policy

Heather Bowen-Struyk, comparative literature, University of Michigan. Japanese proletarian literature: the con-

* Declined award.

struction, seduction and destruction of an audience
Philip Flavin, music, University of California, Berkeley. Sakumono: Musical and textual humor in Japanese chamber music of the Tokugawa period
Hank Glassman, religious studies, Stanford University. The religious construction of motherhood in medieval Japan
Bethany Grenald, anthropology, University of Michigan. Gender and ecological change in a Japanese diving community
Jonathan Hall, history of consciousness, University of California, Santa Cruz. Psychoanalysis in Japanese cinematic and literary modernity
Youngmi Lim, sociology, Graduate Center, City University of New York. Contested meanings of becoming Japanese: race, class and politics in contemporary Japan
Jeff Long, history, University of Hawaii. A Japanese romantic: Hayashi Fusao and the turn to ultra-nationalism
Leila Madge, anthropology, University of California, San Diego. Consuming concerns: anxiety, modernity and the market in postwar Japan
Mari Miura, political science, University of California, Berkeley. Resistance to market forces: labor market flexibility and political power of labor in Japan, 1980s and 1990s
Keiko Suzuki, anthropology, University of Wisconsin, Madison. Printing identity, nation and history: Japanese popular art from Yokohama-e to manga
Sarah Thal, history, Columbia. Rearranging the landscape of the gods: a history of the Kompira pilgrimage in Meiji Japan

Near and Middle East

Postdoctoral Fellows, Junior Faculty Tenure Support

Eva Bellin, government, Harvard University. Courting liberty
Daniel Brumberg, government, Georgetown University. Ideological innovation and power sharing in Arab states: a comparative inquiry
Sumaiya Hamdani, history, George Mason University. Between revolution and state: The imam, al-Nu'am and the construction of Fatimid legitimacy
Deborah Kapchan, anthropology, University of Texas. The affecting Sufi presence: aesthetics as devotion among Sufi practitioners in Casablanca, Morocco

Postdoctoral Fellows, Mid-Career Skills Enrichment

Eleanor Gwynn, health, physical education and dance, North Carolina A&T University. Clearing the space: a quest for the dance of the Nubians in contemporary Egypt
Dale Lightfoot, geography, University of Oklahoma. Falaj irrigation in Yemen: history, ecology and changing technology

Postdoctoral Fellows in the Social Sciences and Humanities

Shahrough Akhavi, political science, University of South Carolina. Historicizing explanations of social change: perspectives by contemporary Egyptian modernists
Kenneth Cuno, history, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign. A world lost? Family and property in 19th-century rural Egypt
Peter Gran, history, Temple University. Social history of Egyptian education, 1900-1930
Christopher Melchert, history, Barnwell Christian School. The coming together of the Sunni community, 9th-10th centuries C.E.
Donald Quataert, history, State University of New York, Binghamton, The coal miners of Zonguldak, 1870-1914
Daniel Schroeter, history, University of California, Irvine. Jews in rural Morocco and their dispersion in Israel
Samah Selim, Middle East languages and cultures, Columbia University. The divided subject: narrative enactments of the nation in the Egyptian village novel
Ahmad Sikainga, history, Ohio State University. Slavery and Muslim jurisprudence in Morocco in the 19th and early 20th centuries

Other Programs

Abe Fellowship Program

Arthur J. Alexander, Japan Economic Institute. Analyzing the links between the economic and political relations of the United States and Japan using objective and comprehensive events data
Marie C. Anchordoguy, East Asian studies, University of Washington. A comparative analysis of US and Japanese regulation and deregulation of the telecommunications and software industries

Laura B. Campbell, Environmental Law International. Global climate change: the roles of Japan, the United States and China

Paul M. Evans, political science, York University. Asia's security order

Eric A. Feldman, Institute for Law and Society, New York University. Justice, compensation and the courts: conflicts over HIV-tainted blood in Japan, the US and France

Jun Furuya, Faculty of Law, Hokkaido University. The rise of conservatism and the redefinition of national identity in contemporary American politics, 1964-1997

Yoshihisa Hayakawa, Faculty of Law, Rikkyo University. Legal problems in international cyber transactions

Hideshi Itoh, Institute of Social and Economic Research, Osaka University. A comparative institutional analysis of delegation of authority and boundaries of the firm in Japan and the US

David T. Johnson, sociology, University of Hawaii, Manoa. The prosecution of political corruption in Japan, the US, Italy and South Korea

Satoshi Kinoshita, Faculty of Law, Kobe Gakuin University. Political representation of racial minorities and the electoral system in the United States

Ellis S. Krauss, Graduate School of International Relations and Pacific Studies, University of California, San Diego. Japan and APEC: regional multilateralism and US-Japan relations

Yuko Nishimura, foreign languages, Komazawa University. Women and labor exchange in aging societies

T.J. Pempel, University of Washington. Financial deregulation, politics and social cohesion: a comparative study

Roddey Reid, literature, University of California, San Diego. Contemporary cultures of health and risk: globalizing tobacco control in the US, France and Japan

Karl L. Schoenberger, Graduate School of Journalism, University of California, Berkeley. Corporate ethics: human rights policy in the global marketplace

Scott A. Snyder, US Institute of Peace. US-Japan-ROK policy coordination: North Korea's challenge and implications for security in Northeast Asia

Kay B. Warren, anthropology, Princeton University. Foreign aid in Latin America: a comparison of Japanese, European and American initiatives and practices

Shinji Yamashita, cultural anthropology, University of Tokyo. Asians in motion in the transnational age: the case of San Francisco

ACLS/SSRC International Postdoctoral Fellowships
(Administered by the ACLS)

Adrian A. Bantjes, Latin American history, University of Wyoming. Idolatry and iconoclasm in revolutionary Mexico: local religion and state formation, 1920-1940

Leela M. Fernandes, political science, Rutgers University. Consolidating economic reform in India: the middle classes, cultural politics and the Indian nation

Sheila Miyoshi Jager, independent scholar in anthropology. Manliness and civilization: linear history and the nation-state in Korea

Joan E. Judge, Chinese history, University of California, Santa Barbara. Reading women: the changing function and meaning of female literacy in early 20th-century China

David Chioni Moore, international studies and English, Macalester College. On the margins of the Black Atlantic: reading a global color line

David W. Robinson, African history, Michigan State University. Paths to accommodation: Muslim societies and French colonial rule in Senegal and Mauritania

Joanna Waley-Cohen, Chinese history, New York University. Qing culture and Chinese modernity

Applied Economics

Summer Workshop

Ariel Burstein, Northwestern University

Steven Callander, California Institute of Technology

Shachi Chopra-Nangia, Graduate Center, City University of New York

Francisco Ciocchini, Columbia University

Gauti Eggertsson, Princeton University

Martin Farnham, University of Michigan

Avi Goldfarb, Northwestern University

Jeffrey Groen, University of Michigan

Derek Gurney, Stanford University

C. Scott Hemphill, Stanford University

Toshihiro Ichida, Columbia University

Dean Karlan, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Laura Malaguzzi, University of Michigan

Paras Mehta, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Atif Mian, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

David Newhouse, Cornell University

Marta Noguer, Columbia University

Nienke Oomes, University of Wisconsin, Madison

Karen Pence, University of Wisconsin, Madison

Susanne Schennach, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Ganesh Seshan, University of Virginia
John Simon, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Andrzej Skrzypacz, University of Rochester
Alessandro Tarozzi, Princeton University
Michele Tertilt, University of Minnesota
Robert Vigfusson, Northwestern University
Diane Whitmore, Princeton University
Justin Wolfers, Harvard University
Chong Xiang, University of Michigan
Pai-Ling Yin, Stanford University
Zhixiong Zeng, Northwestern University
Jonathan Zinman, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Eric Zitzewitz, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Berlin Program for Advanced German and European Studies

Dissertation Fellowships

Andrew Bickford, history, Rutgers University. Male identity, the military and the family in the former GDR
Sace Elder, history, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign. Murder scenes: intimacy, distance and class in Weimar Berlin
Sara Hall, German studies, University of California, Berkeley. Public detection and social order: crime narrative in Weimar Germany
Elizabeth Koch, history, Georgetown University. The musical reconstruction and division of Berlin, 1945-51
Kelly Kollman, political science, George Washington University. Converging or diverging environmental capacities? Implementation of EU law in member states
Sabine Kriebel, art history, University of California, Berkeley. Rearming vision: John Heartfield and the crisis of the left, 1929-38
Jennifer Ratner, history, Brandeis University. The center will not hold: American confrontations with Nietzsche and antifoundationalism
Galya Ruffer, political science, University of Pennsylvania. The constitution of denizens in the democratic polity
Lisa Vanderlinden, anthropology, Rutgers University. Conceiving fertility: an analysis of the experience and treatment of infertility in Berlin
Gregory Witkowski, State University of New York, Buffalo. Industry workers in the countryside: a case study of Communist policy and East German reactions

Postdoctoral Fellowship

Lauren Appelbaum, psychology, Yale University. The influence of deservingness on social policy decisions

German-American Research Networking Program (GARN)*

GARN Grants, Young Scholars' Summer Institutes

Immigration, Incorporation and Citizenship in Advanced Industrial Economies (1996-97)

Felicitas Hillmann, Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung; Abel Valenzuela, University of California, Los Angeles; and Dae Young Kim, Graduate Center, City University of New York. Immigrant workers on the fringe: gendered urban labor markets
Dita Vogel, Universität Bremen and John Torpey, University of California, Irvine. "Legitimate yourself": national identification systems in comparative-historical perspective
Bernhard Santel, Universität Münster; Gianni D'Amato, Universität Potsdam; Virginie Guiraudon, European University Institute, Florence; Nedim Ogelman, University of Texas; and Sarah Wayland, University of Toronto. Comparative perspectives on the adaptive strategies of immigrant social movements
Antje Wiener, Universität Hannover and Rey Koslowski, Rutgers University. Practicing democracy transnationally
Annette Kohlmann, Technische Universität Chemnitz-Zwickau and Sabine Henning, University of Colorado, Boulder. Fertility differences among the foreign-born in two countries of immigration: findings for Germany and the United States

The Organization of Behavior in Higher and Lower Animals (1996-97)

Caroly A. Shumway, Boston University and Hans Hofmann, Universität Leipzig. How do social and environmental pressures affect the brain?
Jeff Dickinson, Princeton University and Martin

* The GARN Program supports continuing collaborations of participants in German-American Academic Council networking activities, including the Young Scholars' Summer Institute Program.

Heisenberg, Universität Würzburg. Testing learning in fruit flies

Frank W. Grasso, Boston University; Sabine Grüsser, Humboldt-Universität Berlin; and Robyn Hudson, Universidad Nacional Autonoma de Mexico. Do early eating experiences have a long-term effect on the perception of food odors? A study of Japanese immigrants in three countries

Martin Giurfa, Freie Universität Berlin and Elizabeth Capaldi, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign. Navigational strategies performed by simple nervous systems: the "map-like" behavior of insects

Wolfgang Stein, Universität Kaiserslautern and Alejandro Bäcker, California Institute of Technology. Olfactory behavior of the locust, *schistocerca gregaria*

International Migration Program

Predoctoral fellowships

Gaston Alonso, political science, University of California, Berkeley. Becoming Latinos in the United States: the formation and political mobilization of panethnic identity

Alejandra Castaneda, anthropology, University of California, Santa Cruz. Transnational politics: political culture and Mexican migration to the United States

Linda Heidenreich, history, University of California, San Diego. History and forgetfulness in Napa County

Richard Kim, history, University of Michigan. Korean immigrant nationalism, ethnicity and transnational politics, 1903-1945

Nelson Lim, sociology, University of California, Los Angeles. Racial and ethnic division of labor, human resource practices and economic incorporation of low-skilled immigrants

Vivian Louie, sociology, Yale University. Academic decisions, group dynamics: the effects of family life on the educational experiences of Chinese-American women

Kristen Maher, politics and society, University of California, Irvine. A stranger in the house: community, identity and transnational women workers

Ian Mast, anthropology, Southern Methodist University. Organizing transnationally: migrant participation at home and abroad

Ronald Mize, sociology, University of Wisconsin, Madison. The invisible workers: state and society in the life histories of braceros

Una Okonkwo, economics, Northwestern University. Transnational economic linkages from international migration: theory and evidence from Nigerian immigration

Reuel Rogers, politics, Princeton University. Somewhere between race and ethnicity: Afro-Caribbean immigrants, African-Americans and the politics of incorporation

Minority Summer Dissertation Workshop

Maitrayee Bhattacharyya, sociology, Princeton University. Indian immigration to the United States: economic and sociocultural causes and consequences

Leigh Blackburn, public policy, Southern University. International migration: a threat to the United States security environment

Marilyn Espitia, sociology, University of Texas. The meaning of citizenship: bridging the gap between theory, naturalization trends and the immigrant experience

Su Yeong Kim, human development, University of California, Davis. Dynamics of the Asian-American immigrant family for adolescents

Sandra Lara, developmental psychology, Teachers College, Columbia University. A developmental approach to understanding mental health outcomes among adult Latino immigrants

Michelle Moran-Taylor, anthropology, Arizona State University. Guatemalan migration to the United States

Antonio Polo, psychology, University of California, Los Angeles. Child behavior problems within an ethnic group: socio-cultural influences on childhood psychopathology among Mexican-American children.

Shalini Shankar, anthropology, New York University. South Asian youth culture: identity, gender and community

Nitasha Sharma, anthropology, University of California, Santa Barbara. The role of hip-hop in the formation of second generation Indian-American identities

Staci Squires, social relations, University of California, Irvine. The changing faces of West Indian New Yorkers

Jerome Straughan, sociology, University of Southern California. Belizean immigrants in Los Angeles

Vivian Tseng, psychology, New York University. Postsecondary education, family background and familial obligations among children from immigrant families

Zulema Valdez, sociology, University of California, Los Angeles.What is "ethnic" about ethnic entrepreneurship? The intersection of ethnicity and class in self-employment participation

Maria Verdaguer, sociology, American University.

Latino immigrant female entrepreneurship: women's contribution to the emergence and development of ethnic enterprises in Washington, DC

Janelle Wong, political science, Yale University. Political socialization and participation among contemporary immigrants in the US

Postdoctoral Fellowships

Margaret Chin, Teachers College, Columbia University. Working, immigrants and public assistance: Asian and Latino immigrants in the New York City garment industry

M. Elizabeth Fussell, Population Studies Center, University of Pennsylvania. Household economic strategies and demographic outcomes: labor migration to the US and female labor force participation in Tijuana, Mexico

Virginia Guiraudon, Center of International Studies, Princeton University. De-nationalizing migration control policy

Kenneth Bruce Newbold, geography, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign. Evolutionary immigrant settlement systems in the US and Canada: a comparative analysis

Mae Ngai, history, University of Chicago. Illegal aliens and alien citizens: US immigration policy and racial formation, 1945-1965

International Peace & Security

Dissertation Fellows

Fiona Adamson, political science, Columbia University. Globalization and the territorial state: international migration, transnationalism and national security

Elisa Forgey, history, University of Pennsylvania. Confronting Germandom: colonial law, African experience and identity in Germany, 1884-1945

Alexandra Gheciu, government, Cornell University. Security, community, morality in post-cold war Europe

Tandeka Nkiwane, international relations, SAIS, Johns Hopkins University. Clash and convergence: political elites and regional security in Southern Africa

Erica Razafimbahiny, medical anthropology, Harvard University. Responses to the political violence of the coup period in Haiti, 1991-1994

Shannon Speed, anthropology and Native American studies, University of California, Davis. Global discourses on the local terrain: grounding human rights in Chiapas, Mexico

Postdoctoral Fellowships

Jacqueline Berman, political science, University of Washington.Women on the market: the trafficking in Polish women and the production of a post-bi-polar European geography

Erik Doxtader, rhetoric and argumentation, University of North Carolina. Between revolution and civil society: the theology and politics of reconciliation in post-apartheid South Africa

Allison Macfarlane, geology, Stanford University. Fissile material control: alternatives for the disposition of surplus plutonium

Obiora Okafor, law, University of British Columbia. Can international human rights institutions contribute to world peace? The influence of the ACHPR in Nigeria, 1987-1997

Robert Vitalis, political science, Clark University. The color line: race, development and the foundations of American international relations

Vadim Volkov, sociology, The European University, St. Petersburg, Russia. The monopoly of legitimate violence: the diffusion and reconstruction of the Russian state, 1987-2000

Research Workshops

Abiodun Alao, Center for Defense Studies, King's College London and Clement Adibe, political science, DePaul University. Consolidating multilateral conflict management efforts in Africa

Adam Ashforth, political science, Baruch College, City University of New York and Michael Watts, Institute of International Studies, University of California, Berkeley. Public violence, public space, the public sphere: global systems, local conflicts

Thomas Christensen, government, Cornell University and Alastair Iain Johnston, Fairbank Center for International Affairs, Harvard University. International relations theory and the study of Chinese foreign policy

James Der Derian, Watson Institute, Brown University. Virtual investigations: the role of new information technology in war and peace

Alexander George, political science, Stanford University and Andrew Bennett, government, Georgetown University. Case study methods in international peace

and security research

Gregg Herken, National Air and Space Museum, Smithsonian Institution. Secret no more: the security implications of global transparency

Kathleen MacNamara, Center of International Studies, Princeton University and Sheri Berman, politics, Princeton University. Ideas, culture and political analysis

Julie Mertus, Emory University School of Law. Civil society, democratization and the remaking of war-torn societies

Dan Wessner, SSRC-MacArthur Dissertation Fellow, Hanoi, Vietnam. Regionalization and globalization: the impact of external actors on Vietnam's development

Sexuality Research Fellowship Program

Dissertation Fellowships

Susan Dreisbach, behavioral science, University of Colorado, Denver. Adolescent sexual behavior: the gap between knowledge and action. *Advisor:* Stephen Koester

Rosemarie Holz, history, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign. The birth control clinic: women, planned parenthood and the birth control manufacturing industry, 1923-1973. *Advisor:* Leslie Reagan

Andrew Hostetler, psychology/human development, University of Chicago. Sources of meaning and well-being in the lives of single gay men: cultural change, adult development and personal narrative. *Advisor:* Bertram J. Cohler

David Johnson, US history, Northwestern University. From deviant bureaucrats to homosexual citizens: gays and lesbians in the federal civil service, 1945-1975. *Advisor:* Michael Sherry

Tamara Jones, political science, Yale University. Marginalized identities and political power: race, class and sexual politics. *Advisor:* Cathy Cohen

Thomas Linneman, sociology, University of Washington. Political climates, perceptions of risk and contemporary activisms. *Advisor:* Judith Howard

Pablo Mitchell, history, University of Michigan. Coyote nation: sexuality, race and conquest in modernizing New Mexico, 1880-1920. *Advisor:* Carroll Smith-Rosenberg

Kevin Murphy, history, New York University. The manly world of urban reform: homosocial desire and the politics of class in New York City, 1886-1916. *Advisor:* Lisa Duggan

Susana Peña, sociology, University of California, Santa Barbara. Cuban American gay male culture. *Advisor:* Avery Gordon

Russell Shuttleworth, medical anthropology, University of California, San Francisco. The lived experience of the pursuit of sexual relationships for men with cerebral palsy. *Advisor:* Lawrence Cohen

Karen Zivi, political science. Rutgers University. Resisting regulation: venereal disease, AIDS and the construction of female sexuality. Advisor: Linda Zerilli

Postdoctoral Fellowships

Katie Gilmartin, American studies/history, University of California, Santa Cruz. A regional approach to the history of homosexuality in the Rocky Mountain west, 1940-1965. *Associate:* Estelle Freedman

Dagmar Herzog, history, Michigan State University. The post-Holocaust politics of the West German sexual revolution. *Associate:* Anson Rabinbach

Karen Kelsky, anthropology, University of Oregon. Butterfly abroad: transmigrant Japanese women and Asian-white sexuality in the United States. *Associate:* Anne Allison

Johanna Schoen, history, Illinois State University. "A great thing for poor folks": birth control, sterilization and abortion in public health and welfare in the 20th century. *Associate:* Rosalind Petchesky

Leah Spalding, social psychology, University of California, Los Angeles. Predictors of women's and men's sexual satisfaction in married, cohabiting heterosexual, gay male and lesbian relationships. *Associate:* Letitia Anne Peplau

Susan Stryker, US history, Stanford University. Transgender community formations in the San Francisco bay area, 1910-1990. *Associate:* Estelle Freedman

Theo van der Meer, history, San Francisco State University. Cross-cultural and historical analysis of anti-gay and lesbian violence. *Associate:* Gilbert Herdt

Grants Received by the Council in 1997–98

A summary of grants received during the year ending June 30, 1998*

Anonymous
- Philanthropy and the nonprofit sector in the social sciences — $1,975,000

Ford Foundation
- Preservation of SSRC archives at the Rockefeller Archive Center — $50,000
- Vietnam project (Indochina program) — $160,000
- Pledges of aid — $175,000
- Study of Vietnam — $313,000
- Research and training on collective memory of repression in Southern Cone — $801,000
- Core support for international programs — $2,786,000
- International Predissertation Fellowship Program — $3,500,000

General Service Foundation
- ACLS/SSRC Working Group on Cuba research workshops for young historians — $10,000

German-American Academic Council
- Committee meeting of the German-American Frontiers of Social Science Program — $18,000
- Workshop on the political integration of immigrants — $15,000
- International Development Research Centre Workshops on cross-regional research networks in Africa — $50,000
- International Institute for Asian Studies, Leiden Conference on criminality in Southeast Asia — $10,000

Japan Foundation
- Dissertation conference (Japan Program) — $32,264

Japan Foundation Center for Global Partnership
- Abe Fellowship Program — $1,968,114

Japan-United States Friendship Commission
- Grants for advanced research in Japan (Japan Program) — $130,000

John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation
- Professional development seminars for Russian faculty and researchers — $92,509
- Cuba project — $100,000

Malaysian Institute of Research
- Project LINK — $75,000

Andrew W. Mellon Foundation
- Human rights and forced migration — $15,000
- International Migration — $390,000
- Fellowships/research planning on political integration of immigrants — $1,300,000

Research Council of Norway
- Local governance and international intervention in Africa — $13,243

Christopher Reynolds Foundation
- Cuba project — $100,000

Rockefeller Foundation
- Workshop on cross-regional research networks in Africa — $50,000
- Rate of return to Africa of Africans earning Ph.D.'s in the United States — $72,000
- Nuclear diplomacy — $75,000

Russell Sage Foundation
- Ethnic customs, assimilation and American law — $199,465

Tufts University
- European modernity and cultural difference — $20,000

US Department of State
- Former Soviet Union — $760,000
- Eastern Europe and Baltic states — $770,000

US Information Agency
- NMERTA predoctoral program — $159,589
- NMERTA postdoctoral program — $200,000

UNESCO
- Regional Advisory Panels — $32,000

United Nations
- Project LINK — $45,000
- Project LINK — $110,000

United Nations Development Program
- Project LINK — $150,000

University of Pennsylvania
- Project LINK — $5,000

Various
- Project LINK — $5,000

Total: $16,732,184

* Does not include "in kind" grants; that is, support of travel, hotel, conference, and similar expenses received by Council committees in the form of direct payments by other organizations.

SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL

810 SEVENTH AVENUE, NEW YORK, NY 10019

(212) 377-2700 FAX (212) 377-2727 WEB http://www.ssrc.org

The Council was incorporated in the State of Illinois, December 27, 1924, for the purpose of advancing research in the social sciences. Nongovernmental and interdisciplinary in nature, the Council advances the quality and usefulness of research in the social sciences. The activities of the Council are supported primarily by grants from private foundations and government agencies.

The Social Science Research Council supports the program of the Commission on Preservation and Access and is represented on the National Advisory Council on Preservation. The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of American National Standard for Information Sciences—Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials. ANSI Z39.48–1984. The infinity symbol placed in a circle indicates compliance with this standard.

All issues of Items are available in Microform.
University Microfilms International
300 North Zeeb Road, Dept. PR, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Social Science Research Council
810 Seventh Avenue
New York, NY 10019

A Resource for
International Scholarship

NONPROFIT ORG. U.S. POSTAGE PAID ALBANY, N.Y. Permit No. 31

ADDRESS SERVICE REQUESTED