Special Issue on Human Capital

Items

SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL

Volume 52 / Numbers 2-3 / June-September 1998 ■ *810 Seventh Avenue, New York, NY 10019*

Council Announces Leadership Change

Kenneth Prewitt, president of the Council since 1995 (as well as from 1979-1985), will resign the presidency effective October 1. He has been nominated by President Clinton to direct the U.S. Census Bureau, and Senate confirmation hearings are expected in September. Census 2000 has become controversial because of disagreements over the Bureau's proposal to use statistical sampling to remedy its usual undercount of urban minorities; Mr. Prewitt hopes to work with Congress and the professional community both within and outside the bureau to ensure a Census free of politics.

Interim president appointed

Albert Fishlow of the Council on Foreign Relations, chair of the executive committee of the Council's board of directors, has announced the appointment of Orville Gilbert Brim as interim president. Mr. Brim received a Ph.D. in sociology from Yale University and taught at the University of Wisconsin before joining the Russell Sage Foundation as a staff officer in 1955. He was Russell Sage president from 1964 to 1972 and then served for ten years as president of the Foundation for Child Development. Since 1989, he has directed one of the most intellectually ambitious of the MacArthur Foundation research networks, on Successful Midlife Development. Mr. Brim knows the SSRC well, having served on research planning committees and as a funder of Council programs. The Council's executive committee called him "a first-rate social scientist and a proven, mature science administrator."

Search process

Paul B. Baltes of the Max Planck Institute for Human Development (Berlin), chair of the board of directors, has announced the formation of a Presidential Search Committee. Cora Marrett, provost of the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, will be chair. Members include: Lisa Anderson, dean of the School of International Affairs, Columbia University; Jean Comaroff, professor of anthropology, University of Chicago; Anne Petersen, senior vice-president for programs, W.K. Kellogg Foundation; Burton Singer, professor of demography and public affairs, Office of Population Research, Princeton University; Marta Tienda, director, Office of Population Research, Princeton University; Kenneth Wachter, professor of demography, University of California, Berkeley and David Weiman, SSRC program director; as well as Mr. Baltes and Mr. Fishlow (ex officio). Mary Byrne McDonnell, executive program director of the Council, will serve as staff to the committee.

A description of the position of Council president will be widely circulated. Persons wishing to apply or to propose candidates are urged to contact Chair, Presidential Search Committee, SSRC, 810 Seventh Avenue, New York, NY 10019.

Introducing the Human Capital Initiative

by Mary Byrne McDonnell

The Social Science Research Council, in cooperation with the American Council of Learned Societies, has embarked on an initiative concerned with the development of intellectual capital on a global scale. A series of planning meetings began in January 1997 and engaged some 60 individuals from around the world in three separate sessions held in New York; Bellagio, Italy; and Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. The meetings assisted in identifying individuals who might sit on an international steering committee and working groups convened around the human capital agenda. In fall 1997 a nine-member, fully international steering committee was appointed, and it held its first meeting in January 1998.

This initiative begins from the premise that there is a global need for new kinds of research professionals who are capable and comfortable understanding local situations in relationship to global, transnational and international trends and impacts. We need a shorthand to refer to this long and complicated thought and many of the useful terms—human resources, capacity building, human capital—already have specific meanings. We are talking specifically about human analytic research capacity at the tertiary level and beyond. This refers to training—but not only to training—to using and sustaining intellectual research capacity internationally, particularly around the set of big issues facing humanity over the coming decades. We are using the term "human research capital" to refer to a process that engages the question of forming an intellectual community. We work from an assumption that this research capacity may be developed in many types of institutions, may be employed in various ways through our societies. Its subject matter and its participants will be fully international.

For an SSRC presentation on this subject in April 1997, committee chair Lisa Anderson prepared a set of remarks on "Human Capital in the Social Sciences" from the perspective of her discipline, area specialty and institutional background. A revised version follows. We have asked members of the newly appointed Human Capital Committee, or their nominees, to respond to this article from their own national, disciplinary and institutional perspectives, and several of these pieces also appear. This issue of *Items* also includes excerpts from talks presented at "Social Sciences Around the World," a symposium in honor of the SSRC's 75th anniversary which took place in New York City on June 11, 1998. These presentations contribute to the attempt to create a global map of the social sciences described later in this issue.

Human Capital Committee

Lisa Anderson, dean of the School of International and Public Affairs at Columbia University, agreed to chair the committee. She is joined on the committee by: Paul Evans, director, Center for Asia Pacific Studies, University of York; C.T. Kurien, professor emeritus, Madras Institute of Development Studies; Wilfredo Lozano, director, Facultad Latinoamericana de ciencias; Kurt Juergen Maass, secretary general, Institut fuer Auslandsbeziehungen, Elzbieta Matynia, East and Central Europe Program, New School for Social Research; Joyce Moock, associate senior vice president, Rockefeller Foundation; Thandika Mkandawire, director, United Nations Research Institute for Social Development; Salim Nasr, program officer, Ford Foundation (Cairo) and Wang Gung Wu, director, East Asian Institute, University of Singapore. Together the expertise of this group spans the globe.

Staff: Mary Byrne McDonnell, executive program director, SSRC; Steven Wheatley, executive director, ACLS.

■ CONTENTS OF THIS ISSUE ■

Human Capital in the Social Sciences

*by Lisa Anderson**

Although there is much debate about the significance of "globalization," there is little doubt that time-honored provincialisms—intellectual as well as geographical—are being challenged by new perspectives, identities and commitments. Our growing awareness of our world citizenship also reminds us of the depth of our immediate attachments. How will our experiences of simultaneous global participation and local affiliation shape and reshape each other? How will scholars in the social sciences and humanities reflect and mold those same shifting relationships? Indeed, what will be the contours, the role, the purpose of social science research in the future? What kinds of social science and what kinds of social scientists will we need? With whom, how, and where will they work? What will they need to know? In what skills shall they be trained?

In addressing these questions, we adopt two premises about the nature of scholarly research in the future. First, we stipulate that pressing public policy questions in the world—famine, plague, war, poverty, tyranny—demand remediation and are amenable to human intervention. Second, we assume that good social science research should contribute productively to understanding, and ultimately solving, those problems.

Plausible as these premises may seem, they are not indisputable. Famines and plagues were considered acts of God long before they became issues of public policy. Moreover, insofar as they are public policy questions, their pursuit may seem to distract from the pursuit of truly scientific—theoretical as opposed to applied—social research. For readers who believe that famine is divine retribution or that social scientific research should bear no relation to social need, little of what follows will be very useful.

For those who agree that research in the humanities and social sciences is appropriately engaged in addressing important public policy issues broadly construed—the SSRC among them—the production and maintenance of humanists and social scientists and the institutions in which they learn skills and conduct research must be central. Those scholars are our "human capital"; identifying their needs, purposes and audiences, and constructing the necessary support—the training, research collaborations, vehicles for dissemination of findings—should be a principal aim of those of us involved in postgraduate social science and public policy education.

Three perspectives from which to approach this project present themselves. We need to ask about the producers and consumers of social science research—who they are and where they work. We need to know to what kinds of issues social scientists will be devoting their attention. Finally, we need to consider what kind of training and institutional support the answers to the first two questions suggest.

The practitioners, parameters and purchasers of social science research

One of the most dramatic changes in social science in the last fifty years has been the internationalization of its practitioners. Social science research, as exemplified and supported by the SSRC, initially developed as a quintessentially American project. American social scientists became more involved in international issues through area studies, including in the enormously influential area committees jointly sponsored by the SSRC and the American Council of Learned Societies. But the emphasis remained the training of Americans and the strengthening of American institutions, notably research universities, in international and area studies.

Incremental reform reflected the expansion of the arena, the worksite, of social science research as international scholars were added to the joint SSRC-ACLS area committees and international social science meetings were held throughout the world. Ultimately, however, area studies as originally configured in the United States fell victim both to global changes and, let us give credit where it is due, to their own success. The original purposes of area studies—the edification of Americans and the illumination of exotic corners of the world—were largely accomplished: there are no dissertations left to be written merely because the author was the first American social scientist to visit the place.

* Lisa Anderson is dean of the School of International and Public Affairs, Columbia University and chairs SSRC's Human Capital Committee.

Today most social science graduate programs in the United States have substantial numbers of international students, and most American graduate students have traveled outside the United States. While their origin does not necessarily give international students special interest or insight into the demography or public health of their home countries, nor does casual tourism confer expertise on labor markets or ethnic conflict to Americans, both have served to dilute the parochialism often found in the United States graduate student population only decades ago.

Just as the provenance of the practitioners of area-based social research has expanded, so too have the parameters of the public policy to which social science research is devoted. Public policy questions no longer respect national or ideological boundaries. Environmental degradation, urban poverty, health crises demand new mixes of internationally recognized technical skills and intimate local knowledge. No society is immune from questions of nuclear waste and public health, energy conservation and consumer preferences, disease transmission and family structure, poverty, public assistance and informal economies. These issues reflect common dilemmas whether they are confronted in New York or Cairo, Moscow or Mexico City, even if their successful resolution obviously requires familiarity with specific places and peoples.

The "internationalization" of social science has caused no small anxiety among area specialists, particularly in the United States and particularly in the context of post-cold war triumphalism. Regional specialists are haunted by visions of social scientists scouring the globe, seeing only regularities, common patterns, universal laws and missing the quite tangible, important, even glorious, variations among the world's societies. It is certainly possible, indeed perhaps inevitable, that enthusiasm for common projects, shared visions and collaborative insights will distort our initial estimation of the specific character of some issues in some places. Yet acknowledging the universal character of some of our problems (and, one hopes, some of our solutions) should ultimately have exactly the opposite effect. Rather than rely on anecdote and conviction, we will be able systematically and analytically to locate variations among world regions, in the estimation of climate change, the significance of AIDS, the impact of electronic media or the definition of human rights. Indeed, we will find variation even in the plausibility, the strengths and the vulnerabilities of our social scientific paradigms themselves.

Our commitment to sustaining rigorous, systematic and analytical social science will be all the more crucial with changes in the nature of its purchasers—and I use the term intentionally. With the world-wide retrenchment of the welfare state, governments are no longer as influential as they were, in either defining public policy or setting intellectual agendas. This presents both an opportunity and a challenge. For decades, research scholars have been concerned that funding by governments—particularly, but not solely, the American government—compromised the integrity of social science research. We will now have an opportunity to test that proposition, for we will be conducting more and more of our research without that funding.

As governments around the world reconsider their involvement in funding advanced research and higher education, much research activity is moving out of universities, to privately funded, for-profit think tanks and consulting firms, and universities themselves are turning to the private sector to sponsor their research operations. Whether this constitutes an improvement over government funding is an open question; in any event, it is a feature of the research environment throughout the world. As American scholars worry over the fate of federal funding of area studies centers at universities, half the world away India's education secretary, P.R. Dasgupta, warns that "higher education has to be market-friendly. It can't just look to government."[1]

Market-friendliness does not necessarily mean the commercialization of social science, although some of us may undertake contract research for pharmaceutical companies expanding market share in the developing world, just as some social scientists have been worked for governments, doing everything from assessing the popular base of enemy regimes to improving social service delivery to the urban poor. Market friendliness will most often mean acknowledging that research conventionally understood as social science—meeting the same standards of rigor and review—is being done not only in universities

[1] quoted in Jonathan Karp, "Change of course: India's ivory towers try to get practical," *Far Eastern Economic Review*, November 14, 1996.

but at international accounting firms like Price Waterhouse and nongovernmental organizations like Human Rights Watch. Academic social scientists cannot afford to simply bemoan or ignore this shift in the locus of research. Rather we must actively engage with these new entrants into the social science sector and participate in the training and development of social scientists who work outside the conventional university setting to ensure that long-recognized scientific standards and controls are maintained.

The internationalization of social science practitioners, the globalization of public policy, the privatization of support for scientific research dictate changes in the job description, the training and the institutional support of all social scientists. So too will the nature of the questions that will be posed to them.

The topics of social science research

The strategies we adopt to foster production and maintenance of social scientists, as well as the communities and institutions in which they will thrive, will depend not only on our assessments of shifting sources or supplies of research scholars but also upon our predictions about demand: the needs for social science research in the future. Several clusters of issues appear likely to seize our attention in the coming decades.

Much of the social science of the 21st century will be devoted to public policy questions growing out of human interactions with the natural environment or, increasingly, the humanly-altered natural environment. From efforts to stem ecological degradation and promote health, to contain population growth and harness genetic engineering, social scientists will be engaged in developing, assessing and promoting new techniques for profitable and sustainable interaction with the natural world. This will require closer collaboration with scholars from the natural sciences than has been our practice in the past; our disciplinary parochialisms are no more appropriate to the new world than is our area studies provincialism.

In addition, social scientists will continue to explore human society itself, examining the myriad forms of human exchange and communication in families, markets and bureaucracies. How global and local societies shape each other in international migration and diaspora communities, and how changes in the scale and medium of exchange alter identities will loom as large and pressing questions. If face-to-face interaction produced solidarity through the idiom of kinship and imagined communities constituted the basis of nationalism, for example, the virtual communities of the electronic media may well produce novel ways of defining and legitimating themselves.

Political theory and political practice constitute a third arena of research for social science. Enlightenment conceptions of the individual and individual rights, which underpin Western definitions of democracy and human rights, are highly charged notions, contested in much feminist scholarship as well as by those who see their export as the latest expression of Western imperialism. Disputes about the very universality of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights are not merely academic feuds: they shape religious conflict and international trade disputes in the Middle East, East Asia and elsewhere. In another example, the vexed debates about clitorectomy in recent years illustrate how conceptions of women, of rights, of adulthood, and of the relative status and power of local and global communities have changed as a procedure once viewed as a right, perhaps a privilege, is now considered an abuse. So too, challenges to the state posed by the growing importance of supernational identities and subnational loyalties as well as by the privatization of much of the welfare state's traditional domain will command sustained attention from social scientists, as will growing attention to human rights, more widespread adoption of liberal democratic practices among previously authoritarian regimes, and continued pursuit of economic reform.

Finally, social researchers will need to be self-conscious and reflective about their own programs and projects. As we develop more sophisticated methods and more elaborate models, we must keep in mind that our social science rests on a conception of knowledge that values quantification, measures reality in numerically precise, probabilistic terms and favors, if not requires, a conception of the human self as a data point, a statistic—as "human capital."[2]

[2] For an historical treatment of this question, see Alfred W. Crosby, *The Measure of Reality: Quantification and Western Society, 1250–1600.* Cambridge University Press, 1997.

This perspective is widely shared in advanced industrial countries—political polling, mass marketing, medical research have popularized the vocabulary of quantitative economics and statistics—but it is by no means universal even in the United States. Indeed, resistance to being a "nameless, faceless number" is the stuff of late-20th-century American folklore, and, as popular reactions to reports of leaking nuclear waste or news of miracle cancer cures suggest, skepticism about "lies, damn lies, and statistics" does not abate in the face of threats to personal health and well-being.

The cleavage between scientific communities and their societies is even deeper in much of the rest of the world. Where literacy is not a foregone conclusions, "numeracy" is often even less common. Indeed, in some places skepticism about or hostility to scientific methods reflects government policy, as regimes are reluctant to collect or disseminate information in this form. The official population figure for the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia is a state secret; half the total volume of economic transactions in Egypt goes unrecorded. In these kinds of contexts, the work of providing appropriate training, congenial work settings and other institutional support for social science is even more pressing and important than it is in the United States.

We should also resist contenting ourselves simply with decrying the "bad data sets" of developing countries. Confronted with the all too frequent absence of even crude census figures, we need to develop scientific methods less unselfconsciously reliant on numbers and social scientists less smitten with the technology of statistics or econometrics for its own sake.

Moreover, we need to be alert to the distortions—of human self-definition, identity, interests—that may inhere in our collective commitment to quantification. In conducting our "thought experiments" and designing our research protocols, we must resist the all-too-human temptation to extrapolate from our own logic to divine the preferences of people to whom miracles may be as real as probabilities are to us.

Creating and sustaining "human capital" in the social sciences

All of this suggests the desirability, if not the necessity, of new models of how we create social scientists who know something about the world. Most importantly, it suggests that the catchment area for the next generation of social scientists should be understood as the whole world. This may mean a variety of initiatives: expanding fellowship opportunities for international students in American universities, enhancing university-based social science training and research in other parts of the world, inserting social science training into the NGO/non-profit sector agenda more seriously, cosponsoring training and research programs with private consulting firms or research institutes. Because the practice of social science articulates with the public and private sectors and with other elements of civil society in such varied ways across the world, we must be expansive and eclectic in our definition of the sites of research and training.

So too we must enlarge our conceptions of the methods and methodologies of social science. Where "bad data" confound our conventional approaches, we should look more seriously at the fact-finding models of research developed in legal research and used to very good effect by human rights researchers. Equally importantly, we should prepare the social scientists of the future to collaborate far more closely with their counterparts in the natural sciences. Even as we recognize and explore the boundaries of the scientific paradigm, we must ensure that social scientists are more knowledgeable and confident about the scientific enterprise in neurobiology, epidemiology, physics, environmental sciences. We need social scientists who can comfortably and sympathetically navigate between the realm of the natural sciences and the much larger arena of skepticism about the scientific enterprise altogether. If area studies once served to introduce and familiarize Americans with the many cultures in distant reaches of the worlds, a comparable initiative should utilize the unique skills and perspectives of social scientists to address the "two cultures" that now reside side by side so awkwardly both at home and throughout the globe.

We should also consider social science training a life-long project. We who work in universities should not expect our students to replicate our own careers: few social scientists in the 21st century, in the United States or elsewhere, will find permanent employment teaching what they learned in graduate school for forty years—and those who do so will probably not be the best or the brightest. Scholarly

careers will look different. Depending on their skills and preferences, social scientists will move in and out of universities, research institutes, think tanks, governments, not-for-profit advocacy organizations, private business firms—and they will still be scholars. They will want and need a variety of mechanisms to continue and extend their training: postdoctoral training (and retraining) fellowships should become routine. Mid-career programs should provide not only the venerable sabbatical rest and renewal to seasoned professionals in and out of universities but also, and perhaps more importantly, exposure to and training in new research techniques, innovative methods and disciplinary advances. If, in our production of the next generation of social scientists, we are open to new sources of supply for the "raw material" and look to new sites and methods for their "processing," we will reap enormous benefits in the inventiveness and intellectual vitality of our scholarship. As it stands now the conventions that govern how social science is done are too often narrow and unduly stylized. Though we rarely concede a difference between pure and applied science, we often distinguish between "literature-driven" and "problem-driven" research, failing to teach our students that these approaches are two sides of a coin. Literature-driven work is too frequently driven by data sets than important questions—the researchers' curiosity is technical rather than intellectual—and the results are trivial: the infamous mathematical demonstrations of corruption's detrimental impact on development in Africa. Yet solely problem-driven work is too often born of the day's headlines, almost entirely descriptive and quickly dated, as the now dusty shelves of Kremlinology attest.

The reinvigorating of the social sciences will be enhanced by the internationalization of scholarship and the concomitant integrative impetus to cross-disciplinary and truly comparative research. When there are good jobs in African universities for mathematical modelers, when research institutes in Southeast Asia hire first-rate young game theorists, when econometricians compete for work in the Middle East, we will find transitory problems less distracting and technical virtuosity less consuming. Social science as a whole will be infinitely better informed and more useful—not only to other academic social scientists and humanists but to the presumed beneficiaries, the ultimate "end-users," of social science research: the people whose economies work better, whose health improves, whose life chances multiply.

Technologically this vision of internationalization is closer than it may appear. At Shanghai Academy for the Social Sciences five years ago there was one computer for each of the fifteen research institutes; today about one-third of the researchers have their own personal computers and all the institutes are linked to the Internet. Indeed, according to Academy vice-president Yu Xintian, by the end of this year "if a scholar does not pass the national computer test, he/she cannot get a higher academic title."[3] Many parts of the developing world are quickly catching up with our technical facility (indeed, if we are complacent, we will quickly fall behind ourselves); the international scientific elite will soon dispose of world-class research equipment even in countries where many of the ordinary people still live in poverty.

Where they do not—in much of Africa and the Middle East—we must recognize that the impediments to the development of internationally recognized social science are not technical.

Social scientific research presumes not just technical infrastructure, equipment, transport, skills, training but, far more important, freedom of association, information, expression. To that extent, genuine social science may represent a direct challenge to the established order.

The internationalization of social scientific scholarship and the creation and maintenance of intellectually responsible and socially aware scholars is a profoundly political project. If we are to pursue it, we must to be prepared to acknowledge and accept the consequences: this will be a difficult, often contentious, but ultimately rewarding effort. ■

[3] Yu Xintian, "The Advantages, Shortcomings and Developing Trends of Chinese Researchers in Social Sciences and Humanities," prepared for "Human Capital Needs and Challenges Facing the Global Research Community: Conditions in Asia," Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, June 2, 1997.

Social Science and Social Reality

*by C. T. Kurien**

In responding to Lisa Anderson's piece, let me indicate two basic premises. The first is that in the final analysis all social science must be about social reality. The second is what may be described as the "situational factor," that is, the vast majority of scholars will remain bounded—to their particular disciplines, to their countries and localities and to institutions.

I take it that it is not necessary to justify the first premise, which is also Anderson's—that pressing public policy questions will occupy the attention of the scholarly community. I hope so, because one of the professional vices of that community is the tendency to escape from real-life problems into the sanctuary of abstract reason. To be sure, there can be no serious research without abstraction even in the social sciences; perhaps especially in the social sciences, which cannot conduct controlled laboratory experiments. But if abstraction is not to become mere production of cobwebs, however elegant, it must be treated as an intermediate step—between starting from some concrete reality and returning to it with greater understanding. Abstraction can only be a view from the top to gain perspective on what is on the ground. But far too often it turns into the cult of climbing, moving farther and farther from the ground realities. In the so-called advanced social sciences like economics this is already a widespread disease.

If research has to be about some aspect of social reality, should it aim to predict, or to explain and interpret? A great deal of social science research in the past was misguided because of the perception that the essence of science was the search for regularities that formed the basis of prediction. This was possibly the case in astronomy or even physics, but certainly not in sciences like biology. In any case, social sciences do not have to imitate physical sciences. If they are to contribute to the understanding of social phenomena, they will search for similarities as well as for differences, because the concrete is always a mixture of the two.

* C.T. Kurien is professor emeritus at the Madras Institute of Development Studies.

Let me now turn to my second premise. It is true that the 21st century will see the breaking down of many once-rigid boundaries, but it is naive to expect that a world without boundaries is going to emerge even in the long run. True, communication technologies and travel facilities will make the sense of the globe an experiential reality for many people, and in the process some parochialisms may disappear. The spirit of jealous nationalism may also wane to some extent. But as Anderson recognizes, supra national considerations and subnational commitments will emerge and gather strength. This is because the social space intrinsically involves the breaking and making of boundaries.

The same is also true of academic boundaries. Some disciplinary boundaries will be broken; others will just disintegrate. New specializations will arise, possibly cutting across existing boundaries. However, nothing like a grand synthesized science of society is going to evolve.

The question, therefore, is how in the decades ahead to move toward research into social problems that will transcend geographical and cultural parochialisms and disciplinary boundaries. It seems to me that a multi-pronged strategy is necessary. Its main feature must be to emphasize the relationship between social problems and analysis from the most elementary to the most advanced levels. Tracing this relationship should form the basis of teaching social sciences at the undergraduate level. At that level the thrust must be to present real-life social problems in a structured manner so that students come to understand the principles of structuring, rather than to unfold the logical structure in the abstract. To take an example from economics, instead of introducing students to the theory of competitive markets, they should be enabled to appreciate the variety of factors that influence the functioning of different real-life markets. To those for whom the undergraduate course is terminal (the vast majority of students in any country of the world), such training will be more useful than a fragmentary and diluted introduction to the "theoretical" corpus of the discipline.

To those who go on for graduate studies, that foundation will underpin a rigorous theoretical approach. A proper internalizing of categories and systems, with the awareness that these are ultimately related to real-life issues, will enable students at the doctoral level to take up concrete problems for rigorous analy-

sis. The dissertation topics of most Ph.D. scholars will and should be of this kind. (A few will, and should, concentrate on systematization and theoretical advances.) If this procedure is followed it does not matter whether the search for the dissertation topic is literature-driven or problem-driven. With such an approach, scholars will not hesitate to transgress the boundaries of their disciplines as the treatment of problems calls for it.

With rare exceptions, during the doctoral research, scholars will stay at a single institution. Institutional mobility will, of course, increase, and a few will also manage to spend time in countries other than their own. But in principle all doctoral students will learn how to open up to new problems, new methods and new disciplines. That kind of opening up, solidly based on real-life issues rigorously analyzed, is academic universalization or globalization. No one will feel too threatened to move to new territories, meet new peers and deal with them as equals. The problem will be for those who approach such situations with imperialistic designs, but they will be shown their place and their parochialisms will be exposed.

Centers of postdoctoral research, whether in the universities or in separate research institutions, will in turn become places where scholars with different backgrounds and orientations meet and enrich one another. Having scholars from different parts of the world will be natural in such global centers, and they will emerge in many parts of the world.

The procedure I have described may appear slow moving, but that is quite deliberate. For there is the danger that in the interest of globalization (a good thing in itself), we may rush to different forms of pseudo-globalization. It will become possible through the internet to access quantities of information from data banks from all corners of the globe and combine them to produce "global" research papers. It will be possible to move around the world and contract collaborative research programs of an interdisciplinary nature, and so on. These have a place, but hovering around the globe is not substitute for becoming global; only those who have been adequately grounded can become genuinely global.

Finally, a word about funding. Research, like education in general, is a public good which will not follow the market principle of being able to pay for itself. Hence subsidy is unavoidable. In most societies, the state has been the agency to provide that subsidy, which has advantages and disadvantages.

But surprising as it may appear to some, market-friendly private concerns constantly practice the principle of subsidy. (The cost of advertizing, for example, is covered by the price of the goods.) Hence it will not be strange at all if private corporations turn to subsidizing research, even social science research. There are advantages and disadvantages in private subsidies too, and in both public and private instances researchers have to learn to figure them out and to lay down their conditions for accepting subsidies. As the thrust of marketized globalization gathers momentum, researchers in the social sciences should explain to the public that the principle of subsidy is just as universal as the principle of pricing, and the two often go together. ■

Social Science and a Rapidly Globalizing World

*by Helga Nowotny**

Are we conceptually equipped to deal with a rapidly globalizing world? Do we have the necessary means and tools in terms of scientific competence, professional organization and methodology to take on the challenges that the Human Capital Initiative has put on the agenda?

Three major pitfalls await us, if we are to engage in road mapping—i.e., looking ahead, charting the terrain and mapping it with the best cognitive and technical means at our disposal—to obtain a globally extended look at our field of inquiry. This comprises the collective knowledge and imagination of the drivers of change as well as those who are most deeply affected by it. The identification of linkages within the sciences and other forms of social knowledge and practice remain crucial. The first pitfall concerns the possibility that the search for global competence is likely to take us into territory where maps simply do not yet exist. Worse, the existing maps—crude and standardized as they are—may have been drawn up for very different purposes. They may readily be misinterpreted, leading unsuspecting users astray. This is the danger inherent in what Pierre Bourdieu calls "les ruses de la raison impérialiste," the unintended cunning inherent in taking for granted the pretensions of one's own culture to being universal. According to Arjun Appadurai, two options are available in internationalization. One consists in taking the hidden armature of our research ethos as given, and proceeding to look for allies. This is weak internationalization. The other is to invite a conversation in which the very elements of what constitutes research are subject to debate and scholars from other societies are invited to bring their own ideas about what is central in pursuit of new knowledge. The latter is strong internationalization, in which participation does not require prior adherence to specific ideas about which road maps to use. (Appadurai 1997)

* Helga Nowotny of the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology in Zurich, Switzerland, is vice-president of the European Science and Technology Assembly.

The second pitfall in road mapping arises when there are no recognizable roads. Lisa Anderson stipulates that good social science research should contribute to understanding and ultimately solving social problems. But the actual process of reaching consensus on public policy priorities—as Anderson is the first to admit—defining them and arriving at a course of action, is fraught with difficulties, especially at a global level. What may look like solid and easily recognizable roads on one map may on another map—corresponding to another kind of social reality—simply disappear, lost in a terrain where mudslides, earthquakes or desert sand render unrecognizable what should be or had been there. Even under such conditions, human beings manage to eke out a living, and social communities attribute meaning to what binds them together. Roads in the Western sense may simply not be there—and yet people move around, exchange and communicate.

The third pitfall concerns the very process of mapping, the act of establishing some kind of correspondence between different social realities and our research-guided representations of them. Mapping is the closest equivalent to experimentation that the social sciences know. But how do our mapping procedures fare when we admit to a plurality of methods, each one answering to specific kinds of questions, but all responding to criteria of practical reproduction? What role is played by the changing materialities of research processes, e.g. by access to new empirical data collection methods like computer-assisted self-interviewing? (Turner et al. 1998) How do our prevalent mapping procedures compare to experimental systems in terms of encompassing heterogeneous elements and their potential recombination? In other words, how are social scientific objects produced and reproduced, stabilized and destabilized, deformed and reformed, in ways similar to what happens in the natural sciences?

None of these pitfalls is insurmountable, but they serve as reminders of the many unstated cultural assumptions that underpin the heterogeneous notions of what constitutes social science research and its global capacity. Better preparation for the processes of globalization presupposes a better understanding of how globalization, like technology, alters the nature of social interaction—not only among our research subjects but also in our relationship to scien-

tific subjects. European social science research, far from being equipped to immerse itself in this challenge, nevertheless is on its way to tackle the diversity of research cultures and traditions, national research systems or the comparability of data. The 5th Framework Program of the European Union contains some innovative features that aim toward a better integration of social science research in areas of great practical concern to the EU. Improving the quality of life and management of living resources, creating a user-friendly information society, or promoting competitive and sustainable growth also demand far greater cooperation with the natural sciences and engineering. One important dimension of the 5FP calls for the focused development of a social science knowledge to underpin policy decisions across a wide range of public concerns. Bringing users and producers of knowledge, including social science knowledge, into closer interaction is another central feature built into the 5FP structure.

While these steps do not necessarily imply internationalization, they represent important milestones in the Europeanization of social science research. Overcoming differences in language and the cultural understandings that go with them, facing the demands of comparability of data and a fine-tuned understanding of the functioning of different political institutions while studying the emergence of a common European identity, calls for unprecedented efforts in improving social science research capacities. With them go an expansion of graduate training and a variety of exchange schemes for students. None of these efforts ensure that a globally competent social science research capacity is yet in place, but they broaden and deepen the experience of European voices to be heard in the common quest. ■

Notes

Appadurai, Arjun, 1997. "The Research Ethic and the Spirit of Internationalism." *Items*, vol. 51, no. 4, pp. 55-60.

Bourdieu, Pierre, 1998. "Sur les ruses de la raison impérialiste." *Actes de la recherche en Sciences Sociales*, mars 1998, pp. 109-118, 121-22.

Turner, C.F. et al., 1998. "Adolescent Sexual Behavior, Drug Use, and Violence: Increased Reporting with Computer Survey Technology." *Science*, vol. 280, May 8, pp. 867-873.

The Human Capital Program: The Next Steps

*by Mary Byrne McDonnell**

During the planning process for the Human Capital Initiative [see p. 30 for an introduction], we identified three critical clusters of issues to analyze in the initial few years. The first is communications and connectivity. This includes new technologies but also asks questions about languages—training and usage—as well as about network formation and function as a tool for research and dissemination. A second cluster concerns the changing nature and role of intellectuals, including how intellectuals engage the many communities they serve. Related to this changing role is the expansion of the term "intellectuals" to include the many walks of life that employ intellectuals and researchers. Another dimension is the extent to which diverse communities—intellectuals, NGOs, local communities, donors and policymakers—must join together to tackle the kinds of research questions that will garner public attention in the coming decades. A third cluster centers on the research methodologies needed to cope with emerging issues. For example, developing deeper and more nuanced understandings of the intricacies of comparative and team work approaches will greatly enhance the ability to work across cultures and perspectives, making it more possible to gain useful insights into phenomena whose impact is both widespread and local.

Work plan

The January 1998 meeting resulted in a work plan to be implemented over the coming months. As a device for focusing the committee's energies it was agreed to set the goal of a major conference in 2000, which would itself produce a volume intended as a seminal analysis of trends, conditions and competencies, while at the same time offering tools for fixing the problems that have been identified.

With this goal in mind, the committee will begin to work along four tracks. By the next meeting of the Human Capital Committee in November 1998, we expect to have made progress along each of these tracks, providing documents, drafts and data of various kinds to assist the committee in designing next steps toward the conference.

Track 1. The articles by Lisa Anderson and others on "Human Capital in the Social Sciences" that appear in this issue of *Items*, along with several other pieces, will be reprinted as the initial volume in a new Council Working Paper Series on Building Intellectual Capital for the 21st Century.[1] Using the work of one author as a foil against which others can comment, react and demonstrate alternative perspectives is a model which, if successful in this initial experiment, may be used regularly in the working paper series.

Track 2. As a way of framing the discussion of each of the three issue clusters that form the initial agenda, working papers have been commissioned on the following five topics: The role of the intellectual in a changing world; communications and language, new technologies and research, impact of internationalization and the relationship between intellectuals and both the sources and audiences of their work outside the borders of the academy. Authors will write from their own national, disciplinary and institutional perspectives. These essays will be a first take at defining the large issues that the committee hopes to address in preparation for the conference. They may be publishable as stand-alone essays or, more likely, they may serve as points of departure for further discussion, working groups, meetings and commentary on the road toward developing publishable 50-100 page monographs in the working paper series.

Track 3. One of the most successful elements of the planning meetings that launched this initiative was the members' spontaneous thumbnail sketches of human capital conditions in diverse parts of the world. We believe an important early step we can take is to develop "maps" of each world region which will enable us to understand what issues, capacities and constraints (institutional, political, economic, etc.) characterize each region with respect

* Mary Byrne McDonnell, an historian, is executive program director of the SSRC.

[1] Volume 2 is also in production. It results from the planning meeting held in Bellagio, Italy in July 1997 and will use cases from the African experience to examine the question of building intellectual capital through network formation.

to the formation of intellectual research capacity.

Later in the process, they may be linked together within a single working paper to form a global map. This map will be useful in and of itself for programs and institutions involved in academic programming around the world. At the same time, it would allow us to see commonality and differentiation on a broad scale, providing a sense of areas that require special attention (additional working papers, a working group or a spot on the conference agenda), where synergies of interest might be fostered in the search for solutions to problems or where others (foundations, ministries of education, NGOs) may want to focus energy and attention.

As a first step, we have asked a few qualified individuals, some from the committee and some others, to provide a 3-5 page informal letters in response to three questions from us. The three questions are those that drove our original planning process:

1) What are the areas and issues that will require intellectual firepower in the future?
2) What is globally competent social science research capacity? That is, what types of "ideal" global-local researchers are required given the research needs you have identified?
3) What are the institutional constraints that inhibit the production of an adequate supply of appropriately trained, sustained and utilized researchers?

We see the Councils' system of Regional Advisory Panels (RAPs) as central to the process of developing these essays on regional conditions.[2] Thus, we have circulated the regionally focused letters we have received to the RAPs for their comments, critiques and elaborations. We will ask each RAP to prepare a response about its region through discussion among its members, with members of other RAPs and with members of the Human Capital Committee. It is worth noting that all RAP members will receive all the letters. Although a RAP will only be asked to respond to the letter about its region, we expect that RAP members will be stimulated by reading about conditions around the globe. Therefore, we imagine that the individual RAP responses will be enriched and enlivened by comparison with conditions in other parts of the world. We expect that this system-wide conversation will not only assist the human capital program but will also work to bind the RAPs into the system more closely than if an annual meeting were the main source of contact.

It is our intention to organize this conversation—-among members of single RAPs, across RAPs and with the Human Capital Committee—largely via electronic means. We are in the process of developing a technology plan to enable the Council to better act as a facilitator of international scholarly conversations. We have recently acquired the capacity to generate private e-mail lists that include internet addresses. Over time we also hope to be able to stimulate topically focused conversations among the full international system or any of its parts via list-server or user-net technology.

Track 4. During the January meeting, the Human Capital Committee consistently identified the uses and roles of networks as its top priority. This complicated and multidimensional subject will likely require the formation of a working group to pull together the various threads. These threads range from practical questions such as what kinds of networks (topical, disciplinary, domestic, international, binational, multinational, regional) exist, for what purposes and under what conditions, to the more forward-looking issues of how to ensure that they thrive and contribute significantly to the creation, maintenance and dissemination of social science research and knowledge on particular topics. A related but broader take on the subject would look at the role of networks in the development of the individual professional. We would like to think about networks both in the formal and bounded sense of research networks on a particular topic and in this broad sense of linkages and contacts that form communities, which themselves contribute to the professionalization of individual researchers and of the social sciences.

It was agreed that there was no single implementation strategy for working on this broad issue and that we should start to work along multiple paths.

[2] The SSRC/ACLS Regional Advisory Panels (RAPs) are composed of scholars from various world regions. RAPs address a broad array of intellectual and infrastructural issues of concern within their regions; they work with each other in areas of concern across world regions.

The Africa RAP is planning workshops based on the results of the Bellagio conference. These will provide analysis of existing research networks within Africa with an eye to determining in what areas new networks might be developed and defining new organizational strategies for creating networks that function well in underdeveloped institutional environments. We also expect some discussion of networks to emerge in the letters produced as part of Track 3.

An additional early strategy will begin to look at networks as sets of professional linkages or nascent communities. Beginning from the notion that there are today social scientists who embody the "ideal" researcher of the future, the task is to query these individuals about their networks—calendars, linkages, contacts—and determine what their professional lives look like and what they think is important to do. A related question is to what extent these networks foster better social science research and better uses of that research. This study could include not only networks as in people and institutions, but journals. It should provide a useful picture of what networks, contacts and demands are required today to be a member of the global research community.

We discussed whether or not we should look at best practices beyond what the Africa RAP is currently doing. For example, in Asia, research networks are highly developed on a subset of issues—-security, agro-food—and not in other areas. Further, we assume that different institutional environments mean that different kinds of networks become valuable and that different topics or disciplines may generate different uses for networks. It will be important to examine some of these issues as we move toward the 2000 conference. ■

Social Sciences Around the World

The Social Sciences in Latin America

*by Elizabeth Jelin**

I start with a question and an anecdote. The question is, Is it good or bad for social sciences in Latin America or in general in the world that a president of one of the largest countries in the world, Brazil, is a world-renowned social scientist? It's also possible that the next president of Chile will be a world-renowned social scientist. We also have several ministers and other government officials.

Next the personal anecdote. I lived through military dictatorship in Argentina from 1976 onward. I traveled a lot, and every time I would enter or leave the country I had to fill out an immigration form. One of the items in the form was occupation, and I would systematically leave it blank. The immigration official would usually write "housewife, *ama de casa*." I wasn't going to lie but I also wasn't going to say that I am a sociologist. I was afraid of saying that in a government immigration office.

Now, what do these two things—my friend Fernando Henrique Cardoso being the president of Brazil and my fears regarding my professional identification as a sociologist during the dictatorship—have in common? I think they are indicators of the politicization of the social sciences in Latin America. Social science is part of public and political life in close relationship to power and to power struggles.

There are good historical and structural reasons why this is the case. First, Latin America has a tradition of public universities, and in particular, highly politicized public universities. For example, it's the president of Mexico who selects the president of UNAM, the Mexican National University, and it's a political appointment. Student movements have long been important in Latin American politics. This year marks the 80th anniversary of *la reforma universitaria*, a major student movement that started in Argentina and spread elsewhere, calling for the democratization of public universities. Student strikes are still common.

Another reason for the politicization of social sciences stems from the fact that basic funding for research, or basic lack of funding for research, comes from public funds. The science budgets in Latin American countries are extremely low and do not meet the minimum international standards in terms of their percentage of GNP. Within them, social science gets very, very little, and has to struggle politically to get anything. Finally, and this is a major fact in the region, social science has been subject to the whims of political instability, and we have had a long history of political instability.

But there is more to it than these structural and institutional reasons. Latin America has a culture of social science activity that draws on a model of intellectual and academic life—the *ensayista* tradition, the essayist who looks at reality, comments on it intelligently and participates actively in political debate. After the Second World War and especially from the late 1950s onward, modern social science was introduced into the region, with specialized professional training in sociology, anthropology and political science. These disciplines were introduced in academic environments, implying the growth of specialized expertise.

The resulting tension between the social scientist operating as an intellectual and the social scientist doing narrowly defined research projects is one of the most interesting features of Latin American social science today. When I look at those who are making it in politics today, they combine both. It's not the intellectual debate in the *ensayista* tradition, and it is not the narrowly defined, research-oriented social science, but it's the combination of both.

What are the important developments nowadays? First, there is the growth of private universities, but of a very special type; it's not the Harvards and the Yales. The universities that are expanding in Latin America are professional schools, usually offering business administration courses geared to the demand of the rich business class who can pay high tuition for the education of their children. These new universities are not creating new conditions for the expansion of social science research. Meanwhile, public universities are in big financial trouble. There is a push

* Elizabeth Jelin is professor of sociology at the Universidad de Buenos Aires.

toward what is called sustainability, which means get your own money for research from private funds, which leads to the commodification of social science through contract research. These trends accompany the economic policies that are being implemented in the region, geared to efficiency, to open markets, to results that have immediate application, to satisfy demand through the marketplace.

Yet the social sciences as a community of scholars are quite lively. If we look at financial investment in Latin American social science and look at output—I am not thinking of quantitative but of qualitative output (good ideas, depth of interpretation, creativity, rigor in research)—we see surprising efficiency. Why is it so? I would say that political commitment, political engagement and moral outrage are a very strong source of motivation to pursue knowledge. It is not that we have to counterpoise political commitment and objective social science. Rather, one is pushing the other.

A second important element is links to the outside world. Latin American social sciences and the *ensayistas* before that have been international from the start. In the late 1940s, for instance, São Paulo was much more cosmopolitan than the United States. Translations of old European literature were plentiful; intellectual debates were lively. Max Weber was translated into Spanish about 30 years before he was translated into English. Gramsci was translated into Spanish much earlier than into English. So intellectual and political elites have long been quite geared to (European-oriented) internationalism.

And this is where the SSRC comes in, because I think that support from the outside—not only financial support but also intellectual support and dialogue—are crucial assets for the development of social science in Latin America. The SSRC joint committee served that purpose for more than 40 years. Given the politicization of social science, being part of an international community and dialogue provides a continuous check against the danger of falling into political dogmatism.

A further reason why productivity is relatively high in the context of scarcity and diminishing resources is related to the process of democratization, beginning in the 1980s. Democracy is creating more room for diversity and for dialogue—between intellectual debate and professional expertise, and among the disciplines. Yet this is a very special type of democracy, a democracy with increasing income polarization and increasing inequality. The discrimination and polarization that pervade society are also present in the social sciences. The gaps between those intellectual and academic elites that are part of the international circuit (including me!), other colleagues who earning enormous incomes from contract research, and the rest—I am thinking of provincial university professors anywhere in Latin America and mid-career locally-trained professionals—are widening. It is critical now to design strategies and ways to help to counterbalance this polarization.

Internationalizing Social Science in Eastern Europe

*by Michael D. Kennedy**

In the last ten years, a truly global network of scholars and practitioners has been formed around the making of transition in Eastern Europe and Eurasia. This population of ministers of finance, consultants, economists, sociologists, political scientists and others has been produced by some marvelous educational initiatives—for instance, the Center for Economic Research in Graduate Education (CERGE) in Prague—and has been coordinated by such bodies as the William Davidson Institute at the University of Michigan. This culture is of course rife with debates, but it nonetheless is organized around a basic narrative that anticipates the future in terms of global economic integration and views the past in terms of an anachronistic statist or socialist culture.

This transition culture is, however, quite selective, and dependent on the various types of capital located in different national sites. Consider the number of studies that have made Hungary and China central to the transition debate in sociology. This is not because Hungary and China are somehow more decisive than Russia and Poland or any of the other countries for defining the systemic transformation. Their centrality derives from the global circulation of intellectual cap-

* Michael Kennedy is director of the Center for Russian and East European Studies at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. Please address comments to the author at the Center for Russian and East European Studies, 1080 South University, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109 or to midake@umich.edu. See also <http://www.umich.edu/~iinet/crees/>

ital that is associated with Hungarian and Chinese social science capacities. In the case of the former, indigenous and émigré Hungarian scholars and their Western collaborators are remarkably prominent in the sociology debates. The Chinese diaspora and the American area studies project in Chinese studies has produced a nearly equivalent set of scholars. If one moves over to economics and business studies, Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic and Russia are overwhelmingly important for defining the social science problematic, with the first three providing many of the positive lessons, and the last case posing some of the greatest potential threats to transition at a global level.[1]

An increasingly sophisticated debate about the dynamics of transition thus is taking place with a systematic bias built into the research. Those places with the most intellectual capital, those places perceived to be exemplary and those places perceived to be the greatest threat to the transition project are the sites that provide the experts, experience and data for formulating theories and questions for research.

The problem, then, for internationalizing social science in post-communist countries is not only to question how quickly various national traditions of social science might be brought into a global conversation about transition, but also to question how privileging the concerns of those people already advantaged by their intellectual capital or by the promise or threat of their places for an implicit global future is shaping the development of international social science in and about that region. The question of privilege is also important for considering the relationship between the development of indigenous social sciences and international practice.

Even as networks of scholarship are being internationalized, the indigenous social science infrastructure of post-communist countries is being transformed and occasionally destroyed. The destruction wrought by wars in the former Yugoslavia deserves its own discussion which I can't provide here. More generally, however, Academies of Science, once the pinnacle of prestige, now fight with institutions of higher learning over claims to scholarship. State universities and private universities compete for the attention of the accomplished. Scholars with international social science qualifications, especially if they are younger than forty-five, are likely to be drawn into much more lucrative market research opportunities or multinational employment or directly into politics. Social science projects become projects of policy research, whether for one's own state or for the multinational organizations that want to learn about human rights, women's rights, minority rights or industrial upgrading. Social science research in Eastern Europe and Eurasia has been commodified through its dependence on state power, private capital and the financial support of multinational organizations and collaborations.

While in most places scholars are no longer politically constrained, they are economically constrained to pursue projects that pay. Whether it is a worldwide comparative study of injustice, or EU-sponsored work on accession to the European Union, this commodification of scholarship has of course produced many excellent studies. Many scholars in the global circuit are thriving and even overwhelmed by the number of opportunities presented to them. But because these networks are well-worn and increasingly exclusive, internationalizing social science tends to augment indigenous inequalities in scholarly capacities. This tendency can, however, be softened by strategic action on the parts of international partners and indigenous actors. There are many patterns that I have seen, but I might just mention one for illustration.

Lviv State University in Ukraine, from an extremely rudimentary social science foundation in the early 1990s, has through judicious use of international funds associated with Soros, USIA, the Ford Foundation and other sources developed a distinctive collaborative capacity that simultaneously draws upon old and newly-acquired strengths in focus group and oral history studies. It maintains a local historiographical concern with the distinctions of Polish, western Ukrainian and eastern Ukrainian identities and social relations. Lviv State University has taken the resources it has acquired and used them to develop institutional capacities that benefit others through a combination of teaching and exemplary research. It is also developing a capacity to integrate local experiences as points of theoretical intervention and not just as data points in international social science.

One can distinguish strategies in the cultivation of

[1] See, for example, *From Plan to Market: World Development Report,* 1996.

international social science according to the depth of internationalization they invite and the ease with which it is distributed. Transition culture exemplifies one that is closely tied to power, has relatively ample resources, invites systematic data collection and vigorous debates and succeeds to the extent it convinces a wider range of international scholars and practitioners to participate. At the same time, recruitment into that project depends upon a broad political orientation, a relatively particular knowledge base and at least a basic English language capacity. The international survey research community is less obviously political, but like transition culture it has the capacity to assess competence in relatively unambiguous ways. Evaluating the quality of sampling strategies, questionnaire design and other skills enables the community to identify who can become members and who cannot. Both traditions can extend their research projects rather smoothly by the addition of new members from across the world. The core scholarship of both communities thrives with the internationalization of their practices of knowledge production.

Neither of these fields invites the strong vision of internationalization that Arjun Appadurai recommends in which the research ethic is itself put into question.[2] To a considerable extent, women's studies and identity studies do. In the case of the former, the definition of expertise varies depending on the ways in which feminist paradigms articulate with indigenous cultural and intellectual politics. As a consequence, gender studies promises substantial intellectual transformation in its encounter with East European lifeworlds. Those networks that use identity as their catchword have less obvious political challenges, but have more problems associated with theoretical range. The virtuosity required to navigate the variety of discourses associated with identity poses barriers for many scholars, not only for those whose English is a second or third acquired language. Nevertheless, identity's polysemy demands substantial theoretical innovation (and occasional confusion) among those who would use it to organize international scholarship.

These four cases illustrate an important point for the internationalization of social science. The most easily distributed social science practices are those that minimize the epistemological uncertainties of inquiry, which claim to be beyond politics, and which require a relatively narrow set of discursive competencies that do not require elaborate English language skills. The most challenging are those communities of discourse whose constitutions require theoretical virtuosity across a wide range of disciplines and contesting epistemologies, and whose global definition is open to contest by local reformulations. In this case, we run the risk of narrowing the scholarly conversation ever further to those with sufficient English language facility to challenge paradigms and reframe the articulation of global and local cultural formations. One of the central questions for the internationalization of social science, therefore, is whether ways might be found to broaden access to international social science practice while nonetheless cultivating theoretical agility beyond those already privileged by the reigning distribution of global practices and resources.

A strong program of internationalization requires a measure of reflexivity that some modes of international collaboration are unlikely to cultivate. At the same time, this deep internationalization is likely to privilege those already most accomplished on the global circuit of scholarship. Appadurai's project deserves support, but I also think SSRC and the foundations should help extend that vision to include those less theoretically versatile and adept in English. In particular, by encouraging types of data collection that feature not only transparent behaviors or categorical responses, but also problematize modes of representation and expression as well as the challenge of translation, we can offset the privilege associated with access to the reigning cores of theory production and greater experience working in English. Thereby we might not only globalize our research community. We could expand our conventions of knowledge production to meet the challenge issued by deep internationalization of social science research even as we

[2] By which he means the "commitment to the routinized production of certain kinds of new knowledge, a special sense of the systematics for the production of such knowledge, a quite particular idea of the shelf life of good research results, a definite sense of the specialized community of experts who precede and follow any specific piece of research, and a positive valuation of the need to detach morality and political interest from scholarly research." Arjun Appadurai, "The Research Ethic and the Spirit of Internationalism," *Items* vol. 51, no.4 (1997), p.59.

diversify the criteria through which membership in that international social science community can be recognized.

The Social Sciences in the Middle East

*by Rashid Khalidi**

The social sciences in many countries of the Middle East, like most of higher education in that region, are in crisis. This is partly a crisis of states and societies, which have failed to fund the universities sufficiently. It is partly a crisis of the universities themselves, which have failed to develop into centers of excellence in teaching and research. And it is partly a crisis of the social science disciplines in the Middle East, which have failed to address important problems and stake out vital research territory, thereby passing up the opportunity to establish a position of influence and respect for themselves.

Some Middle Eastern countries such as Israel and Turkey have avoided a few of these problems, while private universities in Turkey, Lebanon, Egypt and Jordan are better off in certain respects than their larger public counterparts. And many gifted social scientists are able to operate even in these conditions. But the general picture is a grim one of grossly underpaid and overworked scholars, teaching huge numbers of students in overcrowded facilities, with poor research support and little access to international scholarship, operating under a variety of political and social pressures.

Beyond these daunting material challenges lie a plethora of political and intellectual ones. The postcolonial era seems to have lingered on in the Middle East longer than elsewhere. Whether it is the continuing effects of French rule in North Africa, or the backwash of a conflict between Arabs and Israelis rooted in the British mandate period or the seemingly unending repercussions from many decades of heavy-handed external interference in the affairs of Iran, issues left over from the colonial era often retard debate and stultify the intellectual atmosphere.

The wars, conflicts and tension that grow out of these "old" issues particularly benefit the military and the security forces, which can wreathe themselves in a national security mystique. Their heavy hand can be seen in every Middle Eastern state without exception, including even those with established democratic systems, like Israel and Turkey. Such a situation tends to freeze the intellectual agenda, and make it all the harder to address issues like democratization and civil society versus the power of the state.

Where are social scientists to stand in a society polarized between authoritarian, repressive states dominated by sclerotic regimes clinging to power at any cost while the people remain divided, repressed and poor, and oppositions which claim to be democratic but are often violent, intolerant or dominated by obscurantist religious bigots? The choice is not always so stark, but this description applies in some measure to well over a dozen states, including a number of the largest and most populous ones. These are not conditions conducive to productive scientific work. In the most extreme circumstances, social scientists frequently find themselves in the front lines, whether over issues of freedom of speech or the ethnic rights of Kurds in Turkey, issues of religious freedom in Egypt—or simply because they are secular intellectuals in Algeria.

Because so many colonial and postcolonial era conflicts have not been resolved, there is lingering resentment of the West, which is seen as having caused them, and of the United States in particular. This has led to a continuing suspicion of Euro-American scholarship, and of much else which is Western, in a number of Middle Eastern societies. There is nevertheless extensive intellectual collaboration between Euro-American and Middle Eastern social scientists, partly because many of the latter are eager to obtain access to the latest findings of Euro-American social scientists, and to participate in joint activities and thus share the comparatively lavish resources they command.

All too often, however, this collaboration ignores the most serious issues on the regional agenda, often in favor of flavor-of-the-month approaches imported from the West. What results is therefore often less collaboration than cooptation of regional social scientists. In other cases, a few well-connected Middle Eastern scholars in each country tend to dominate access to the international academic circuit, blocking others and monopolizing resources, and showing up

* Rashid Khalidi is professor of Middle East history and director of the Center for International Studies at the University of Chicago.

at panel after panel and in one edited volume after another.

What future is there for the social sciences in the Middle East? Clearly, most of the problems I have outlined are not amenable to easy solution, and are in any case far beyond the capacity of individuals to affect directly. Until and unless they are resolved, the predicament of the social scientist in this region is unlikely to improve significantly. Perhaps, however, social scientists in the Middle East, in collaboration with others elsewhere, can help to chart out the path to the resolution of such conflicts, which after all part of what we as social scientists are supposed to be about.

The Social Sciences in South Asia

*by Veena Das**

While it is true that the traditions in the social sciences cannot be said to correspond with national boundaries, it is also a fact that these boundaries interact with scholarly enterprises in complex ways. Hence as an Indian, I can only speak of social sciences in the other countries in the region from my perspective as a social scientist practicing from within the context of an Indian university. I can bear testimony though to trials and tribulations of co-operative ventures and the vulnerability of collaborative enterprises in these regions.

It is not possible to understand the organization of knowledge without some reference to the colonial enterprise within which questions of modernity were first posed in these societies. In brief, one can say that the organization of knowledge under the colonial regime in South Asia assumed continuity in the patterns of life for centuries. Much of colonial knowledge and intervention was premised on the idea that societies in South Asia had remained completely static; that they lacked a sense of history and that novelty was introduced by the benign and enlightened rule of the British. It may appear surprising to many that many social scientists, almost until the 1960s, seemed to have shared this framework. Since the static nature of society in South Asia was taken for granted, many believed that the task of creating an Indian society was one in which social sciences and national traditions were in opposition to each other.

Thus this particular imagination of India (and by analogy other countries in the region) led to a counter discourse produced by scholars in South Asia (but not only by them) of placing the ideas and interests of Western scholars *within* the field of inquiry rather than seeing them as records of disinterested observers. For a while then social sciences and the processes of nation-building came to be seen as conjoint enterprises. The relationship between Western social science, colonialism, nation-building and the creation of national traditions in social sciences was not a simple one. In the case of India, there was a hunger on the part of social scientists to claim their traditions. It was clear, though, that to make these traditions vibrant and alive they would have to be brought into relationship with new concerns arising both out of the new knowledge and the new demands of nation building. The tension in much of the writings of social scientists in this region in the first two decades after independence reflects this. There has also been a strong influence of social scientists in national enterprises in India. This might be the induction of economists in the drafting of planning; the collaboration of historians in writing history textbooks that would reflect a more nationalist and secular past than the writings of British historians; or the creation of a public discourse by the active collaboration of social scientists with the print media.

I believe that the Emergency in India in 1976, when basic human rights were suspended, marked a watershed in the self-definition of social scientists. The critique of nationalist historiography by the subaltern school is now well known. What is less known but is of equal importance is the knowledge generated by economists on estimations of poverty, debates on what constitutes well-being and how far had the state in India succeeded in addressing these issues. It is interesting that questions of *swaraj* (self-rule) in science were posed, but the idea of national traditions was shifted to the domain of civil society rather than the state. The role of conflict, inequality and the underside of development all received attention. Institutionally the growth of social movements and what came to be known later as NGOs was important. While there was a distancing from the state, there was also a certain romanticization of "people." There was an elusive search for "authenticity" in the knowl-

* Veena Das is a professor of sociology at the University of Delhi.

edge produced in the countries in this region.

The 1980s were a period of sharp rise in local movements. Issues relating to the environment, violence against women the and search for greater local autonomy came to the forefront. Ironically this was also a period of the centering of an identity politics which led to fundamentalist movements, growth of tension between religious and ethnic groups and a great increase in collective violence in Sri Lanka, Pakistan and India. The 1980s also saw the beginning of collaboration between social scientists in the region. Examples can be drawn from the books produced on collective violence, the Partition of the subcontinent, the democracy movement in Nepal and the organization of voluntary action in Bangladesh. As universities collapsed because of the state of civil war in Sri Lanka, or the demands of fundamentalist movements in Pakistan or corruption in India, voluntary organizations such as BRAC, ICES, Sharkatgah and others played a leading role in forging these co-operations. These enterprises however were fragile, vulnerable and subject to political pressure. The escalation of suspicion between India and Pakistan following the testing of the nuclear bombs in this region point to the vulnerability of building sustained communities of social scientists whose interests are not dictated by national jingoism.

The importance of the South Asian Diaspora also became evident in the 1980s. The importance of constructing traditions in locales other than that of their home countries; of hybridity as a form of identity; of travel, transportation and circulation rather than rootedness—in other words the experience of being "unhomed"—came to the center of discussion in American universities. This led to lively debates within the region as to whether the voices of those who were locked in their localities would be lost to social sciences. Many scholars in India have also pointed to the manner in which magazines like *India Today* and the internet have become major sources of data leading to high theory with thin data.

The decline of universities in this entire region has serious consequences for the future of social sciences. This decline has been accompanied by the growth of global institutions that have influenced the production of knowledge in the region in accordance with their own agendas. On the grounds that universities are tied up in inflexible bureaucratic rules (which is correct), global institutions have increasingly turned to NGOs or independent network of scholars to do the research they need in order to promote new ways of thinking. Unfortunately this has led to the growth of spurious knowledge because there is more interest in generating consensus on new programs than in generating a critical assessment of them.

The question is further complicated by the fact that a good deal of local knowledge is required for the implementation of globally programmed initiatives. Yet the decline of universities, especially the neglect and simultaneous politicization of regional universities and colleges, means that the scholars recruited to collaborate with global institutions do not always have the conceptual resources to critique the paradigms within which these programs often work. Hence it is not difficult to get social scientists to collect data according to the agendas set by global institutions. I do not wish to imply that all the projects initiated by global programs suffer from these deficiencies, but only to suggest that this has happened in many instances. The problem is confounded by the lack of resources for research in universities and by the fact that criticism of globalization in the public discourse tends to be in the nature of rhetorical shadowboxing. A sustained analysis of the institutional changes that result from globalization has yet to be undertaken. This is a major challenge for understanding globalization and its impact on the social sciences in the region.

From what I have said it would be clear that the social sciences are in a critical period. From my point of view the most important task in this region is to develop a community of social scientists that cuts across national boundaries. The example of International Centre for Ethnic Studies in Colombo is particularly important because it has provided leadership in times of great danger to the whole region. The question of international collaboration thus needs to be addressed at several levels. Further, the consequences of the simultaneous decline of universities and the growth of global institutions produces a troubling configuration. It is in the interest of social sciences and all who are engaged in translating social science findings into policy that competent and critical studies are produced.

The Social Sciences in Africa

*by Michael Chege**

These are very personal perceptions of what the status of social science in Africa happens to be today. As in all other regions of the world, we have huge arguments and conceptual differences about where we stand, where we came from and where we are going. This in itself is positive. I consider that the principal weakness that afflicts social sciences in Africa today is a problem that affects social scientists in general in other parts of the globe. Many of the tenets of Social Science Methodology 101—separating values from facts, distancing oneself from tendentious political positions and the process of making paradigms, testing hypotheses and reconstructing paradigms again as a result—appear to have been lost sight of. This could very well constitute the origin of our disagreements.

The dominant paradigms informing African social scientists and their work after the Second World War could be roughly summarized under three general headings. First there was a dependency perspective, which reached its high water mark in the 1970s and has not fully dissipated yet. Its emphasis is not on the internal social scientific variables but rather, the external, primarily economic variables, particularly colonial exploitation and imperialism. To the extent that they are part of the scene, local actors appear either as accomplices of Africa's external tormentors, or as their implacable foes. Walter Rodney's *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa* is the clearest example of this approach. Dependency perspectives sought to contradict, via homegrown analysis, the dominant "modernization" and liberal "development" paradigms that appeared in the West after the war, and their accomplishment in bringing history and external factors to bear on African development studies should not be underrated.

Second, there is another important school drawing primarily from the humanities, predominantly from literature, but also from the social sciences. It doted on back-to-the-roots, back-to-traditional African perspectives and an attempt to rediscover local socio-cultural origins and use them to come to terms with the social difficulties of the present. This is evident in the history of Cheikh Anta Diop, in some versions of African humanities, in African literature and in the poetry of Léopold Senghor, for example. African socialism, "negritude," African personality and so on were the school's defining terms and watchwords.

Third, we have recently witnessed the rebirth of the classic liberal humanistic approach. Enshrined primarily in democracy and neo-classical economics, it came into full blossom after the fall of communism in 1989, culminating in the liberation of South Africa from apartheid in 1994. To some extent this is as much the product of past failures as it is the result of political and economic pressure emanating from the World Bank, the IMF and Western bilateral donors. This line of thought has sought to reconstruct on African soil the ideas of liberal democracy and market-based economics once disparaged by African socialism and allied nationalistic doctrines.

In the meantime, much has been written on the decline of social sciences in Africa, some of it true. I do not believe that the disintegration of the social science community on the continent is as uniform as is often supposed. Some African institutions have done well under the circumstances, even as others collapse. Nor is it true that Africa lacks a creative community of social scientists despite the evident institutional distress in many local universities. Most of the work that is coming from Africa is no longer being done in universities but rather in clearly established independent institutional networks, though sometimes working with specific university research centers. I have in mind here the Council for the Development of Social Research in Africa based in Dakar, Senegal; the Organization for Social Science Research in Eastern Africa, based in Addis Ababa; the Southern African Political Economy Series in Harare, Zimbabwe; the African Economic Research Consortium based in Nairobi, Kenya—all of them glued together, or glued separately I might say, by meetings, conferences, competitions, publications, books and in three cases, regular academic journals. It is saddening to see how little this work is referred to, in North America especially, by social scientists unfamiliar with most of its contents, some of whom repeatedly pontificate on the poor standards of social

* Michael Chege is director of the Center for African Studies, University of Florida.

science research in Africa.

The real truth is that there are rigorous debates symptomatic of a vibrant, if still small, African social science community. Not just in South Africa but indeed on the internet recently, there's been a great debate on the relevance of the experience of the rest of Africa to South Africa after apartheid. This was stimulated by the publication of Mahmood Mamdani's book *Citizen and Subject* (Princeton University Press, 1996), which draws on some of the work from CODESRIA and OSSREA and some of the work done in universities like Dar es Salaam. I was impressed by the published work of OSSREA between 1993 and 1997, which I recently reviewed on behalf of one of its major European donors. Some of it supersedes the much-vaunted research on Africa published in the West.

I think therefore that it is important, especially for social scientists, for Africanists, not to mourn prematurely the death of critical social science in Africa—something which we read about much too often for our own comfort these days. Rather, the challenge is to go back to Methodology 101, under which African publications should be judged critically by the same standards as the others. Show us what is wrong with the hypothesis the existing African material espouses, show us what is wrong with its empirical data, show us what is wrong with these conclusions drawn from both. Better still, expound the paradigm that better reorders African empirical reality. That is how social science is going to grow and develop in Africa. That is the only way we are going to make progress, not by endless debates on some mystical all-African decline and the need for a sure-fire methodology (like rational choice) that might reverse it.

I'm particularly saddened by a certain tendency towards polemical, platitudinous statements by social scientists, often backed up by statistical data banks and models that have absolutely nothing of value to add to our understanding of the continent's contemporary predicament. In Africa this unfortunate polemical tendency takes the perspective of, Look, we are not responsible for our own situation and the problems we are going through; it's they over there, the colonialists, the imperialist exploiters and their local allies, the outsiders who have conspired to produce this tragedy. The mirror image from North America or from Europe tends to be, Oh no, we have it figured out up here, especially after the fall of communism. Liberal democracy and market economics, that's all you need to develop. These Africans and their baleful cultures are entirely responsible for the development mess in the continent. Their cultures hinder them from seeing the light of neo-liberal paradigms, from being more like us.

From both approaches, there's a tendency to want to look at things too much, you have to excuse me, in black and white, something that I consider especially unacademic and dogmatic. To cite just one example, I'd like to draw your attention to an article by William Easterly and Ross Levine, both distinguished development economists affiliated with the World Bank, that appeared in the *Quarterly Journal of Economics* last November. It argues, on the basis of 30 years of accumulated statistics on individual country growth rates and ethnicity in sub-Saharan Africa and Southeast Asia, that close to 50 or 60 percent of the economic growth differential between the two regions can be explained by one and only one fact: too many ethnic groups in Africa. (And, of course, the proclivity of African ethnic groups to quarrel over sensible macro-economic policy, education, infrastructure and sound financial management.)

Any reader with even a cursory understanding of Africa will appreciate how ridiculous such an explanation is when cited to explain economic regress in Tanzania (which the article surprisingly does) or the record high growth rates in Botswana (where ethnic "homogeneity" is said to be a causal factor) while ignoring the tragedy of even more homogenous Somalia. There is no room in this supposedly detached analysis, for example, to explain why it was possible for South Africa to overcome its handicap of cultural, racial and ethnic diversity in 1994, despite a conflict-driven historical situation; or why, for example, Rwanda and Burundi, with an extremely low degree of ethnic diversity, happen to be among the most unstable and deadly places on the continent.

Indeed, several colleagues and I who are currently working on a panel that examines the entire span of growth in Africa from 1965 find that, statistically speaking, wider distribution of ethnic identity tends to be positively associated with economic growth. This is not to say that one causes the other; causal relationships cannot be automatically deduced from statistical associations. Ross and Levine's study gives

many intervening variables short shrift in the rush to prove how ethnically perverse Africans are, and how that translates into negative growth statistics.

In the same manner, dogged efforts to legislate a single universal paradigm—rational choice—for area studies can only damage African studies within Africa. Rational choice (like all models, including those of African ethnic diversity and economic growth) must prove its mettle by how well it fits empirical observations, how accurately it predicts relationships between social and economic variables. It cannot claim the moral high ground on the basis of alleged mathematical rigor alone.

As after the Second World War—a brutal experience born of slipshod social theories—we need to revisit the basics in social research and reconcile them with empirical findings in Africa as they are, rather than as we wish them to be. That requires informed debate on both sides of the Atlantic. Shoddy "scientific" findings create an acrimonious and tendentious environment, characterized by more intellectual heat than light. Despite many disappointments, African scholars have played a part that is seldom recognized by the heat-seeking intellectual missiles of their antagonists. As the SSRC enters its next 75 years, we hope we can use it as a forum to diffuse that heat. ■

Second Round: The International Dissertation Field Research Fellowship Program

*by Kenton W. Worcester**

The selection committee for the International Dissertation Field Research Fellowship Program (IDRF)[1] held its second meeting on April 18-19, 1998, to award fellowships for area-based research. The committee named 49 fellows for 1998, out of a pool of 883 completed applications. The IDRF program is administered by the SSRC in partnership with the American Council of Learned Societies. Funding for the program is provided by the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. The program, which was founded in 1996, represents one of the larger and more prestigious sources of support for advanced graduate training in the social sciences and humanities.

The purpose of the IDRF program is to enable students of outstanding promise to develop sophisticated research projects addressing issues of compelling significance that resonate across disciplines and areas. It seeks to promote scholarship that treats place and setting in relation to regional, global and transnational phenomena as well as particular histories and cultures. The fellowships are intended to encourage doctoral candidates to use their knowledge of distinctive areas, cultures, languages, polities, economies and histories, in combination with their disciplinary training, to address issues that go beyond their disciplines or area specializations. Following the completion of field research, fellows participate in cross-disciplinary workshops that are designed to facilitate network-building and help fellows identify the broader implications of their research projects.

The program is open to full-time graduate students in the humanities and social sciences—regardless of citizenship—enrolled in doctoral programs in the United States, and it invites proposals for field research on all areas of the world, as well as for research that is comparative, cross-regional and/or cross-cultural. Proposals that identify the US as a case for comparative inquiry are welcome; however, proposals that require no field research outside the United States are not eligible. Proposals requesting support for a second year of field research are funded only under exceptional circumstances.

Announcements for the 1998 program were sent to university departments, research centers, disciplinary associations, regional studies centers and to individuals who contacted the program directly. Information about the program was also made available on the SSRC website and through electronic scholarly information networks. An announcement specifically targeted at potential applicants in the humanistic disciplines was prepared by ACLS.

Applications to the 1998 competition were prescreened at the staff level for eligibility and minimal competence. Each application that made it past the pre-screening stage was read by three screeners (in 1997 the program only used two). A total of 82 screeners, seven more than last year, reviewed up to 30 applications each in their area of disciplinary, thematic and/or area specialization. Ratings and evaluations provided by screeners were used to identify a pool of 94 finalists. These applications were forwarded to a 14-member selection committee, chaired by Rayna Rapp, Department of Anthropology, New School for Social Research.

Applications were received from doctoral candidates at 116 institutions, up 13 from the previous year. The fellows are drawn from a total of 26 institutions, of which 12 are usually described as public. Five of the fellows are based at the University of Chicago; four each are based at Columbia University, Harvard University, Yale University and the University of Pennsylvania. These five universities represent the home institutions for just over 40% of the fellows; in 1997, the top five institutions were responsible for 53% of the fellows.

* Kenton W. Worcester, a political scientist, is program director of the International Dissertation Field Research Fellowship Program.

[1] Selection committee: Anthony Appiah, Harvard University; Valerie Bunce, Cornell University; Rhonda Cobham-Sander, Amherst College; Pamela Crossley, Dartmouth College; Caroline Ford, University of British Columbia; Ellis Goldberg, University of Washington; Terry Karl, Stanford University; Ivan Karp, Emory University; Juarez Brandão Lopes, Ministry of Labor, Brazil; Margaret Nesbit, Vassar College; Rayna Rapp, New School for Social Research; John Rogers, Tufts University; Juliane Schober, Arizona State University; Dae-Sook Suh, University of Hawaii, Manoa.

University, Number of Fellows, %

University of Chicago	5	10%
Columbia University	4	8%
Harvard University	4	8%
University of Pennsylvania	4	8%
Yale University	4	8%
University of California, Berkeley	3	6%
Cornell University	2	4%
Emory University	2	4%
University of Michigan	2	4%
Northwestern University	2	4%
University of Texas, Austin	2	4%
Claremont Graduate School	1	2%
Duke University	1	2%
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	1	2%
Michigan State University	1	2%
New York University	1	2%
Princeton University	1	2%
Rutgers University	1	2%
Stanford University	1	2%
Temple University	1	2%
University of California, Davis	1	2%
University of California, Santa Barbara	1	2%
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign	1	2%
University of New Mexico	1	2%
University of Washington, Seattle	1	2%
University of Wisconsin, Madison	1	2%
TOTAL	49	100%

A majority of both the applicants and fellows are women. In 1997, 62% of the fellows were women, whereas in 1998, 53% of the fellows are women. Forty-two of the 49 fellows are US citizens or permanent residents. An overwhelming majority of the fellows applied to the program in the third or fourth year of graduate school (40 out of 49). The remainder were in the fifth (7), sixth (1) or 8th (1) year.

Gender, Number of Fellows, %

Men	23	47%
Women	26	53%
TOTAL	49	100%

Citizenship, Number of Fellows, %

US Citizens & permanent residents	42	86%
Non-residents	7	14%
TOTAL	49	100%

Of the 49 fellows, roughly 33% are in anthropology, 29% are in history and 18% are in political science. As a result, and disappointingly, fully 80% of the 1998 fellows are drawn from these three disciplines. The remainder are in the fields of art history, geography, literature, religion, sociology and urban planning. A total of 22 disciplines were represented in the applicant pool, which means that slightly under 25% of these 22 disciplines are represented in the list of awardees.

Discipline, Number of Fellows, %

Anthropology	16	33%
History (incl. History of Science)	14	29%
Political Science	9	18%
Sociology	3	6%
Language/Literature	2	4%
Religious Studies	2	4%
Art History (incl. Architecture)	1	2%
Geography	1	2%
Urban Planning	1	2%
TOTAL	49	100%

The geographic mix of the applicants and fellows is broadly reminiscent of the 1997 competition. In 1998 just over 30% of the fellows will be conducting field research in Latin America or the Caribbean; 18% will be working in Western Europe; 14% will be working in Southeast and/or East Asia; and 10% will be working in Sub-Saharan Africa. These five world regions are responsible for 72% of the fellowships. The figures for 1997 were 22% Latin America; 13% East and Southeast Asia; 7% Africa; and 11% each for Western Europe and the former Soviet Union. The percentage of fellows working in Africa, Latin America, South Asia and Western Europe rose in 1998; the percentage of fellows working in Eastern Europe, the former Soviet Union and the Near and Middle East fell in the same period. The fact that the 1998 competition failed to provide any fellowships to applicants working in the Near and Middle East is particularly regrettable.

In its first year the program classified 11% of the fellows as "cross-regional" in that their projects required substantial field work in more than one world region. In 1998 the number fell to 6%. Given the extraordinary demands that are placed on graduate students pursuing projects in more than one world region, the percentage of cross-regional applications is expected to remain smaller than the percentage of applications that only require field research in a single site, nation or region.

As before, fellows are working on a rich and diverse range of topics, all the way from the "ascendancy" of mathematics to the politics of squatting in

Nepal, and from Italian architecture in North Africa to labor market reform in Germany and the Netherlands. Interestingly, fewer projects featured the word "identity" (or "identities") in their titles in 1998—three—than was the case in 1997, when the number was more than three times as high (11). A number of the projects are concerned with themes that are of broad intellectual interest that cut across area lines. These include the politics of economic reform; intellectuals and the state; reforming educational systems; and the status of women within particular societies and/or cultural frameworks. As was the case in 1997, the projects use a variety of methodological approaches, including discourse analysis, quantitative analysis, ethnographic participation and semi-structured interviews.

Finally, the post-field research workshops are an integral component of the IDRF program. They are intended to provide a lively intellectual environment in which fellows can present and discuss their own and each others' research projects; compare research strategies and methods; consider the problems associated with linking field knowledge with discipline-based forms of knowledge; identify the broader implications of specific research projects and build and replenish scholarly networks that span disciplinary and geographical boundaries.

The first 1997 fellows' workshop will be held at the Institute for International Research and Exchange in Amsterdam on October 2-6, 1998; the second will be held at the University of San Francisco on January 8–12, 1999. The three- to four-day workshops will be organized around fellows' presentations and structured discussion sessions. Each workshop will also feature guest speakers, local tours and a group dinner. Workshop participants will receive a packet of readings on issues connected to international field research to foster cross-disciplinary exchange.

The deadline for the 1999 competition is November 18, 1998. For further information or application materials, please contact the IDRF program. ■

Region, Number of Fellows, %

Latin America/Caribbean	15	31%
Western Europe	9	18%
Africa	5	10%
East Asia	4	8%
South Asia	4	8%
Cross-Regional	3	6%
Former USSR/Russia	3	6%
Southeast Asia	3	6%
Polynesia/Oceania	2	4%
Eastern Europe	1	2%
Australia/NZ	0	0%
Near and Middle East	0	0%
North America	0	0%
TOTAL	49	100%

Notes:
Cross-regional refers to projects in which field work will occur in more than one region.
East Asia=China, Japan, Mongolia, North Korea, South Korea, Taiwan
South Asia=Bangladesh, India, Nepal, Pakistan, Sri Lanka
Southeast Asia=Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Myanmar (Burma), Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, Vietnam

International Dissertation Field Research Fellowship Program
1998 Fellows

Jessica Allina-Pisano, political science, Yale University. Local Power, Institutional Capacity and Informal Constraints: Land Reform in the Russian and Ukrainian Chernozem, 1990-97

David Attis, history of science, Princeton University. The Ascendancy of Mathematics: Mathematics, Politics and Education at Trinity College, Dublin

Andrew Baker, political science, University of Wisconsin, Madison. Economic Reform and Voting Behavior in Latin America

Narquis Barak, anthropology, Harvard University. Ethnography of Trauma, Shock and Stress in Vietnam

Caroline Beer, political science, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque. Democratization of the Mexican States: Political Recruitment, Institutional Change and Public Policy

Catherine Bogosian, history, University of Pennsylvania. The Deuxième Portion: Forced Labor, Resistance and Memory in the French Sudan, 1926-1946

Sarah Brooks, political science, Duke University. Social Protection and the Market: Pension Reform in the Era of Neoliberalism

Andrew Buck, sociology, Cornell University. Local Renewal or Provincial Relapse? Networks of Informal Governance in Post-Socialist Russia

Daniel Buck, geography, University of California, Berkeley. Constructing China's Capitalism, Connecting Shanghai's Urban and Rural Industries

Shefali Chandra, history, University of Pennsylvania. The Social Life of English Women and Language in British India

Matt Childs, history, University of Texas, Austin. The Aponte Conspiracy in Cuba, 1812

Emiliano Corral, history, University of Chicago. Labor Control, Race and Politics: Mexico and the US South, 1865-1930

Raymond Craib, history, Yale University. All the Documents in Their Power: State Cartographies and Vernacular Landscapes in the Formation of Postcolonial Mexico

Kathleen Dill, anthropology, University of California, Davis. Silent Negotiations: Women, Human Rights and Citizenship in Post-War Guatemala

Ellen Foley, anthropology, Michigan State University. In Sickness and in Health: Responding to Disease and Promoting Health in Senegal

Elisa Forgey, history, University of Pennsylvania. Confronting Germandom: Colonial Law, African Experience and Identity in Germany, 1884-1945

Caroline Fox, history, Harvard University. Detention Camps and the Rehabilitation Process during the Mau Mau Emergency

Kathleen Gallagher, anthropology, Harvard University. The Politics of Survival: Squatting, Democracy and the Nepalese State

Jennifer Gaynor, anthropology and history, University of Michigan. Liquid Territory and the Place of "Sea People": Storied Pasts and Constructed Spaces in the Straits of Tiworo, Indonesia

Landon Greene, anthropology, University of Chicago. Medicine as Global/Local Politics in the Peruvian Selva

Melinda Herrold, political science, University of California, Berkeley. Economic Reform, NGOs and Cranes in Russia and China

Maimuna Huq, anthropology, Columbia University. Women in Islamic Activism in Bangladesh

Joseph Jupille, political science, University of Washington, Seattle. Institutions, Interests and Procedural Politics in the European Union

Richard Kernaghan, anthropology, Columbia University. Reforming the State, Educating the Frontier: Schools and the Moral Ethos of "Return" in Peru's Upper Huallaga Valley

Yong-Sook Lee, urban planning and policy, Rutgers University, New Brunswick. Does Geographical Proximity Matter? The Spatial Dynamics of the Japanese and South Korean Automobile Industry

Marc Lerner, history, Columbia University. Liberalism During the Transformation of the Swiss State, 1789-1848

Susan Levine, anthropology, Temple University. Children's Work in the Winelands of the Cape, South Africa

Rick López, history, Yale University. Art, Politics and Culture in the Formation of Mexican Postrevolutionary Nationalism, 1920-1947

David Lurie, literature, Columbia University. A Genealogy of Japanese Inscription: Maníyoshu

Writing Systems and their Scholarly Reception

Debra McDougall, anthropology, University of Chicago. The Land Goes through Women: Political Agency, Social Value and the Authority of Kastom in the West Solomon Islands

Brian McLaren, art and architectural history, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Meditteraneita and Modernita: Architecture and Culture During the Period of Italian Colonization of North Africa

Keith McNeal, anthropology, Emory University. Transforming Race in Two Trinidadian Possession Religions

Donna Murdock, anthropology, Emory University. Ethnographic Investigation of State-Supported "Women's Empowerment" in Medellín, Colombia

Paula Pickering, political science, University of Michigan. Minority Strategies in Post-War Bosnia-Herzegovina

Matthew Reed, history, Claremont Graduate School. Making the Case: The Evolution of the Psychiatric Case Study and the Formation of Modern Identities

Susan Schomburg, religious Studies, Harvard University. The Kilakkarai Qadiri Sufi Center/Madrasah and its Role in Muslim Women's Religious Education in Tamil Nadu, South India, 1800-1999

Mark Setzler, political science, University of Texas, Austin. Local Political Elites and Associational Activity: Accounting for Variable Forms of Political Representation and Policy

Susan Snyder, history, University of California, Santa Barbara. Lay Religiosity and Family Structure in Late Medieval Bologna and Toulouse

Jennifer Sowerwine, sociology, University of California, Berkeley. Property, Gender and Power: Ideological and Ecological Transformations of Highland Vietnam

Rolf Strøm-Olsen, history, Northwestern University. Courts Without Kings: Crisis and Consensus in Early Modern Spain and Burgundy

Yuka Suzuki, anthropology, Yale University. State Imaginings and the Discourse of Wildlife Management in Zimbabwe

Matthew Tomlinson, anthropology, University of Pennsylvania. Religious Language and Modernity in Kadavu, Fiji

Bruce Tyler, sociology, Cornell University. Communities and Institutions in Movements of Change

Christina Van Wijnbergen, political science, Northwestern University. The Political Dynamics of Labor Market Reform: Efforts at Change in Germany and the Netherlands, 1982-1995

Richard Weiss, religious studies, University of Chicago. Charisma and Science in Tamil Nadu: A History of Authority in Siddha Healing Practice

Erica Wortham, anthropology, New York University. Indigenous Media in Mexico: New Tools of Self-Determination

Yiching Wu, anthropology, University of Chicago. Taking the Plunge: The Market and Reconstruction of Intellectual Identities in Contemporary China

Ariel Yablon, history, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign. Patronage, Corruption and Political Culture in Argentina, 1880-1916

Mei Zhan, anthropology, Stanford University. Reconfiguring Traditional Chinese Medicine: A Comparative Transnational Study in China and the United States

Current Activities at the Council

New Directors and Officers

At its meeting on January 23, 1998, the Council's board of directors elected Arjun Appadurai of the University of Chicago and Elizabeth Jelin of the University of Buenos Aires as directors-at-large. They began serving three-year terms in June, as did Sidney Verba of Harvard University, who was elected as the representative of the American Political Science Association.

The SSRC's officers for 1998-99 were elected or re-elected at the board of directors' meeting on June 12. They are: Paul Baltes, Max Planck Institute for Human Development and Education (Berlin), chair of the board; Michelle White of the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, treasurer; Kenneth Prewitt, SSRC, president; Kristine Dahlberg, SSRC, chief financial officer. Iris Berger, State University of New York, Albany, was elected secretary.

New Staff Appointments

Beverlee Bruce was named program director for the Mellon Minority Fellowship Program effective June 1. Most recently Ms. Bruce, an educator, social anthropologist and international development specialist, directed the Mellon Migration Seminars Project housed at Clark Atlanta University, School of International Affairs and Development. Designed to provide African-American students with information about careers in refugee and immigrant services, the project brings a panel of experts to talk to students at selected historically black colleges and universities.

Ms. Bruce has taught at Marymount Manhattan College, The City University of New York, Columbia, Temple, Harvard, Northeastern and Howard Universities, as well as at the Universities of Liberia, Massachusetts (Boston) and California (Los Angeles) and at Wellesley College.

Her research centers on the AME Church and Liberia, West Africa, where as a graduate student at Harvard University she conducted the research for a dissertation entitled, "Transcending Boundaries: An Anthropological Study of the African Methodist Episcopal Church in Liberia." Subsequent to her fieldwork, Ms. Bruce served in Liberia as Country Director of the Peace Corps and as Chief Technical Adviser to the UN Self-Help Village Development Project in Southeastern Liberia.

Her publications include articles about students of color and higher education as well as reports on the situation of refugee women and children around the world. Most recently, Ms. Bruce was the writer for the Expert Working Group responsible for the theme paper on Peace and Security for the National Summit on Africa.

Ms. Bruce serves on a number of boards including the Africa Panel of the American Friends Service Committee; Adventures in Health, Education and Development (AHEAD); the Women's Commission for Refugee Women and Children (which she chairs) and the Women's Foreign Policy Group.

Elsa Dixler joined the professional staff as SSRC editor on March 23. Ms. Dixler, most recently senior editor at *The Nation* magazine, was also managing editor of The Feminist Press and managing editor of *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*. She received a Ph.D. in American Studies from Yale University and taught U.S. history and women's studies at Vassar College. Ms. Dixler has written about women and the left (her dissertation examined the role of women in the Communist Party of the USA during the 1930s) as well as about American social and cultural politics.

Centroamérica en restructuración

From July 7–10 more than two hundred people from universities, government agencies and NGOs as well as interested members of the public attended presentations in Guatemala City, San Salvador and Tegucigalpa, Honduras, of the recently-published collection of essays on *Centroamérica en restructuración* [see p. 64]. The three events provided an occasion to distribute studies that focused on issues of fundamental impor-

tance for the future of the region. In addition to the editors of the three volumes, participants in the panels included leading intellectuals from Guatemala, El Salvador and Honduras. The event in Guatemala City was co-sponsored by FLACSO-Guatemala and the Secretaría de Integración Centroamericana (SIECA) and included commentaries by leaders of those institutions and by Gert Rosenthal (former Secretary-General, UN Economic Commission on Latin America). In San Salvador, commentary was provided by Héctor Dada and Roberto Rubio, Directors of FLACSO-El Salvador and FUNDE, respectively. In Tegucigalpa, the event featured remarks by Honduran Finance Minister Gabriela Nuñez de Reyes and by Alcides Hernandez, president of the Colegio Hondureño de Economistas, which co-sponsored the event along with the local office of the Pan-American Health Organization. The books are a product of an initiative designed by the SSRC Joint Committee on Latin American Studies and funded by the Ford Foundation.

Abe Fellows' Retreat

On January 15–18, 1998, the Abe Fellowship Program held its second annual retreat at the Silverado Ranch in Napa, California. The retreat is designed to bring active fellows together in an informal setting to exchange ideas about their research and facilitate networking. Seventeen fellows were joined in this effort by Abe Fellowship Program Committee member Emiko Ohnuki-Tierney and former committee members Charles Hirschmann of the University of Washington and James White of the University of North Carolina.[1]

Much of the two-and-a half-day meeting was taken up by lively discussions of individual research projects by small groups of fellows. This portion of the retreat allows fellows to expose their work to reactions from individuals with different disciplinary, theoretical, methodological and national backgrounds, as well as differing amounts of international research experience.

Afternoons were devoted to less structured group discussions. Methodological problems and processes in comparative research were the subject of a session led by Charles Hirschmann. James White moderated a session focusing on the current East Asian economic crisis, and Emiko Ohnuki-Tierney led one on the question "Is There a Global Culture?"

[1] Participants included: Muthiah Alagappa, East-West Center; William Alford, Harvard University; Mary Yoko Brannen, University of Michigan; John C. Campbell, University of Michigan; Jay Choi, Columbia University; Mark Fruin, University of British Columbia; Michael Gerlach, University of California, Berkeley; Kimberly Gould Ashizawa, Center for Global Partnership; Andrew Gordon, Harvard University; Heidi Gottfried, Purdue University; Theresa Greaney, Syracuse University; Akiko Hashimoto, University of Pittsburgh; Tsutomo Kono, the Ralph Bunche Institute, City University of New York; Satu Limaye, US Institute of Peace; Mark Medish, US Treasury Department; Patricia Robinson, New York University; Mark Tilton, Purdue University; Kenneth West, University of Wisconsin. Staff: Frank Baldwin, Mary Byrne McDonnell, Sheri Ranis and Suzy Kim.

CGP-SSRC Seminar Series

In collaboration with the Japan Foundation Center for Global Partnership, the SSRC and ACLS have organized a series of workshops to bring together Abe fellows who are researching a common theme or set of themes with Abe Fellowship Program Committee members and outside experts from academia and policy circles.

The first cycle of these theme-based events has taken place over a two-year period. Following up meetings held in 1997 in the United States, the two 1998 workshops were entitled "Care and Meaning in Late Life: Culture, Policy and Practice in Japan and the United States" and "Multilateralism and Trade in Services" respectively. The intellectual leadership of the workshops was provided by both active members of the Abe Fellowship Program Committee and the fellows themselves. In an effort to foster new connections of scholars and vary locations, both 1998 workshops were held at the Shonan International Village, an international conference facility in Hayama, Japan.

Care and Meaning in Late Life: Culture, Policy and Practice in Japan and the United States

The task of assembling a research volume based on papers produced by the first workshop on health and aging held in Ann Arbor, Michigan in April 1997 made significant progress at the February 26–March 1, 1998 workshop in Hayama. Guided by

Abe Fellow Susan O. Long of John Carroll University, who is serving as editor for the multi-author book, the twenty participants considered the common conceptual and comparative themes driving their research on the health and care of the elderly in the United States and Japan.[1] They responded to critiques of draft chapters from other project members and from outside experts.

The volume itself will focus on national differences in policy concerning elder care and the different cultural meanings of aging. It will also examine caregiving in the context of the patients themselves, the institutions, families and individual caregivers. Currently titled *Who Cares: People, Practices and Policy for Late Life in Japan and the United States*, the book is being prepared for publication sometime in 1999.

[1] Organizers: Susan Long, John Carroll University and Frank Baldwin, SSRC. Participants: Kiyoshi Adachi, University of Kyushu; David Barnard, Milton S. Hershey Medical Center; Douglas Bradham, Human Services Research and Developmental Center; John C. Campbell, University of Michigan; Ruth Campbell, Turner Geriatric Clinic; Satoshi Chihara, Seirei Mikatabara Hospital; Michael Fetters, University of Michigan Medical Center; Yuko Flaherty, Friedens Haus; Phyllis Braudy Harris, John Carroll University; Akiko Hashimoto, University of Pittsburgh; Shinya Hoshino, Japan Women's University; Keiko Ikeda, Doshisha University; Yukiko Kurokawa; University of Tokyo; Daisaku Maeda, Rissho University; David Plath, University of Illinois; Glenda Roberts, University of Tokyo; Masahiko Saito, University of Tokyo; Takako Sodei, Ochanomizu University; Peter Whitehouse, University Alzheimer Center. Staff: Frank Baldwin and Takuya Toda.

Multilateralism and Trade in Services

A persistent theme of the May 1997 workshop on US-Japan trade disputes was the strengthening of multilateral trade regimes such as the World Trade Organization (WTO), and questions about how they would handle trade in services as opposed to manufactured goods. Co-convenors Takatoshi Ito of Hitotsubashi University and Gary Saxonhouse of the University of Michigan organized a second workshop around these questions, which drew scholars of economics, law, business and political science as well as members of the banking and finance communities.[2]

Driven by the news about the East Asian economic crisis, which caused some not unexpected attrition among participants on call to various ministries and global organizations, the May 15-17, 1998 workshop was organized as panel presentations on key issues followed by extensive free discussion. The first panel on multilateral trade dispute resolution focused on the various dispute settlement mechanisms available to aggrieved nations and the progress of multilateral agreements and dispute resolution protocols in service areas such as telecommunications and financial services. The second panel looked at the management of the international financial regulatory system, with extensive discussion about the appropriate forums for multination discussions of financial market access and the adoption of international or nationally-based standards of regulation.

The third panel looked at multinational organizations and their role in instigating or pressuring for change in domestic economic policies of Asian nations. With particular attention to recent actions by the International Monetary Fund in Thailand and Indonesia, the participants considered various models of international and national capital control and their implications for global trade and finance. A summary report of discussions held during the workshop will be produced by Leonard Schoppa of the University of Virginia with a tentative publication date of late 1998.

[2] Organizers: Takatoshi Ito, Hitotsubashi University; and Gary Saxonhouse, University of Michigan. Participants: Geza Feketekuty, Monterey Institute; Tony Freyer, University of Alabama; Mitsuhiro Fukao, Keio University; Yoshihisa Hayakawa, Rikkyo University; Robert Hudec; University of Minnesota; Kazumasa Iwata, University of Tokyo; Akira Kojima, Nihon Keizai Shimbun; Toru Kusukawa, Fuji Research Institute; Kazuo Ogawa, Osaka University; Leonard Schoppa, University of Virginia; Yoshihiko Wakumoto, Japan Foundation Center for Global Partnership; Masaru Yoshitomi, LTCB Research Institute. Staff: Frank Baldwin, Sheri Ranis and Takuya Toda.

Spanish-American-Cuban War of 1898 Research Workshop

The ACLS/SSRC Working Group on Cuba sponsored a two-week research workshop for young historians in the Washington, DC area from July 27–August 7, 1998. It enabled five historians from Cuba and

five from the United States to conduct research in collections at three archives in Washington that are critical to the study of the Spanish-American-Cuban War of 1898. The workshop was coordinated by Dr. Louis Pérez, a member of the Working Group and professor of history at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill and Dr. Carmen Almodóvar, professor of history at the University of Havana. This activity represents one of the ways the working group is linking the scholarly and intellectual communities in Cuba and North America and promoting enduring networks among Cuban scholars and their counterparts in North America.

SSRC-Mellon Minority Fellowship Summer Conference

As a means of addressing the underrepresentation of American racial minorities in the ranks of Ph.D.'s in the arts and sciences in institutions of higher learning around the country, the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation has funded, since 1988, the Mellon Minority Undergraduate Fellowship Program. Identified in the sophomore year, Mellon fellows are encouraged to pursue Ph.D.'s in the humanities, social sciences and the physical sciences in preparation for joining the academy. Each year a summer conference is held to which Mellon fellows who have entered doctoral programs in one of the Mellon fields are invited. The purpose of the conference is to provide opportunities for fellows to network, to present their current research, to benefit from presentations by other fellows as well as by senior scholars and to learn the intricacies of the graduate experience.

This year, from June 11–14, 1998, the seventh annual summer conference was held at Bryn Mawr College in Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania.[1] Funded by the Mellon Foundation and administered by the Social Science Research Council, the conference featured presentations by three senior scholars, six workshops that addressed the practicalities of graduate school ("Preparing for Qualifying Exams in the Social Sciences and Humanities," "Pedagogy for the Teaching Assistant"), a panel on publishing and another by recent Ph.D.'s who discussed the transition from graduate student to professional. In addition, 14 fellows who presented their current research were ranked excellent by 67% of the respondents to the conference evaluation [there was a 74% response rate].

Of the 125 fellows who attended the conference, 85 are graduate students, 37 are entering graduate school and 3 are recent Ph.D.'s. Joining the Mellon fellows were 16 members of the Bryn Mawr faculty who served as moderators, panelists and workshop leaders, in addition to Mellon Foundation and SSRC staff and Ford Foundation fellows.

In evaluating the conference, 61% of the respondents reported that it met their expectations, as in the case of two fellows just entering graduate school who now find the next six years more imaginable and less abstract. On the other hand, a continuing graduate student sees the conference as "a great way to exchange ideas, ask questions and hear some exciting work."

SSRC Higher Education Program

The Program on U.S. Higher Education held its second workshop on April 3–4, 1998 at the SSRC offices in New York City.[2] The workshop explored two central themes: the shifting boundaries of higher education institutions and the increasing interactivity of the public and private sectors in the U.S. system of higher education. Sessions devoted to the first theme considered the determinants of the size and scope of colleges and univer-

[1] Presenters: John Stewart, University of California, Davis; Russell Thornton, University of California, Los Angeles; Arthur B.C. Walker II, Stanford University. Staff: Beverlee Bruce and Sara Robledo.

[2] Organizers: Charles Goldman, Rand Corporation and David F. Weiman, SSRC. Presenters: Irwin Feller, Pennsylvania State University; Susan Gates, Rand Corporation; Charles Goldman; Henry Hansmann, Yale University; Geraint Johnes, Lancaster University; Scott E. Masten, University of Michigan; Richard Nelson, Columbia University; Andreas Ortmann, Bowdoin College; Sharon Oster, Yale University; and Robert Zemsky, University of Pennsylvania. Other participants: Jesse H. Ausubel, the Sloan Foundation and Rockefeller University; Thomas Bailey, Columbia University; Norman Bradburn, NORC; Clare M. Burnett, TIAA-CREF; Paul DiMaggio, Princeton University; Patricia J. Gumport; Stanford University; and Perry Mehrling, Barnard College. Staff: David Weiman, Sheri Ranis and George Samuels.

sities and the extent of their competitive and complementary interactions. Those focusing on the second theme examined differences and similarities in the corporate form and governance structure of higher education institutions and private, for-profit firms as well as the increasing competition between public (including private, nonprofit) and private, for-profit higher education institutions. Recognizing the convergence of discussions on the public-private theme during the first two workshops, the Steering Committee decided to continue the conversation through subsequent workshops on the changing role of community colleges in the higher education system and on the growth of business education—both under- and postgraduate.

Japan Studies Dissertation Workshop

The SSRC Japan Studies Dissertation Workshop is convened annually to nurture the development of a multidisciplinary network of advanced graduate students and senior faculty.[1] It is designed to address the needs of students in creating innovative and insightful research, in planning, executing and analyzing fieldwork. The workshop targets those students whose work is especially promising or ambitious, who seem particularly in need of critical feedback or who do not attend universities with major Japan Studies centers.

The twelve students selected from a highly competitive pool of nearly forty applicants for the 1998 workshop represented both traditional and interdisciplinary fields, and ten institutions. During the four-day workshop, held from January 8–12 at the Asilomar Conference Center in Monterey, California, these students, in varying stages of the dissertation process, engaged each other and four faculty members in critiquing and debating substantive issues and methodologies. Each year time is allocated to allow for concentrated discussions of each dissertation, small-group sessions for those in closely related fields and large-group, multidisciplinary discussions on both intellectual issues and practical fieldwork, writing and job search techniques.

International Peace and Security Program Fellows' Conference and Summer Institute

On May 17–23, 1998, the International Peace and Security Program sponsored it 12th annual SSRC-MacArthur Fellows' Conference in San Salvador, El Salvador. The conference featured several plenary presentations and highlighted a number of security issues facing El Salvador and the region such as military demobilization; poverty, development and democracy; civil society and human rights; and postconflict reconstruction and international intervention.

Fellows had the opportunity to participate in discussions on the program's new NGO Fellowship and a workshop panel on Research Methods and Approaches to Security as well as to deliver seminar presentations about their own research and training activities. More than 50 people attended the conference, including 1996 and 1998 SSRC-MacArthur Foundation Fellowship recipients, local speakers and panelists, members of the Committee on International Peace and Security, MacArthur Foundation officers and SSRC staff.[2]

Immediately following the Fellows' Conference in El Salvador, on May 24–27, the International Peace and Security Program sponsored a Summer Institute on Failing States in Antigua, Guatemala. The institute was co-organized by Tom Callaghy from the University of Pennsylvania and co-sponsored

[1] Faculty: Hugh Patrick, Columbia University School of Business; Mariko Tamanoi, University of California, Los Angeles; Stephen Vlastos, University of Iowa; Janet Walker, Rutgers University. Staff: Mary Byrne McDonnell, Frank Baldwin and Jennifer Winther.

[2] Speakers, panelists, and local participants: Andrés Fontana, Undersecretary of State for Strategic Policies, Argentina; Raúl Benitez, Centro de Investigaciones Interdisciplinarias en Ciencias y Humanidades, UNAM, Mexico; Salvador Samayoa, Roberto Rubio, FUNDE; Carlos Briones, FLACSO; Mario Lungo, OPAMSS; Carolina Alas de Franco, FUSADES; Alberto Enríquez, FUNDE; Héctor Dada, FLACSO; Benjamin Guellar, UCA; Herman Rosa Chávez, PRISMA; Oscar Campos Anaya, CAEE; Alfredo Aly Parker, FUNDACAEE. Staff: Robert Latham, Amy Frost and Mark Shoffner.

by CIRMA in Antigua. Participants gathered to discuss the increasing number of flailing and failing states in the world, addressing in particular the following topics: states in crisis and flux; political forms of crisis and flux; security and violence in failing and reconfiguring states; the political economy of failure and reconfiguration; new and alternative forms of governance and social reality; external and domestic aspects of conflict settlement and reconstruction; and normative, policy and disciplinary implications. Participants included current and former SSRC-MacArthur Foundation fellows, members of the Committee on Peace and Security; and leading local and international researchers.[3]

Transformations in Immigration and Immigration Research: A Research Fellows Conference

Focusing on new research and the changing backgrounds of scholars in the field of immigration studies, the International Migration Program's first fellows conference, titled "Transformations: Immigration and Immigration Research in the United States," took place on June 11–14, 1998 at Columbia University. The conference was coordinated by Nancy Foner (anthropology, State University of New York at Purchase) and Rubén G. Rumbaut (sociology, Michigan State University) and organized by Josh DeWind and Christian M. Fuersich of the SSRC.

Attended by 24 of the program's predoctoral and postdoctoral fellows whose research has been supported between 1996 and 1998, the conference's focus on "transformations" covered not only the contributions of the fellows' research to immigration studies but also the evolving backgrounds and perspectives of the newest generation of immigration scholars. The research findings were presented within thematic sessions that looked at economic incorporation and markets; transnational networks; political incorporation and state policies; and ethnicity, race, culture and community.

A concluding address by Herbert J. Gans (sociology, Columbia University) presented an overview of topics for future research including: people who do and do not migrate; how immigrants and their children are faring; the role of macro factors in shaping immigrant adaptation and the role of funders in shaping research. He also suggested that researchers' own social identities and values as immigrant group "insiders" or "outsiders" shape their selection of topics and the conclusions they draw from their research.

The extent to which immigration is transforming the social backgrounds of immigration researchers was explored by committee member Rubén G. Rumbaut in a presentation of the findings of a survey conducted by the program of over 700 immigration scholars who are members of the American Anthropological Association, American Sociological Association and the Immigration History Society, or who have applied to the SSRC for research fellowships. The survey found that nearly half of these scholars (48 percent) are either first- or second-generation immigrants. The impact of this phenomenon on the nature of the field will be further explored in future analyses of the survey and essays being prepared by committee members on the relation of immigration studies to social science disciplines.

The conference organizers will edit a special issue of the *American Behavioral Scientist* and a book, which will include selections revised from presentations at the conference.

The Aral Sea Basin

On May 19-21, the Eurasia Program sponsored on three-day workshop in Tashkent, Uzbekistan on the Aral Sea Basin. Heavy water divergence during the Soviet era has drained the Aral Sea to only 30% of its original size. The resulting health and policy issues pose a challenge for the new independent Central Asian states. The SSRC

[3] Outside participants: Tom Callaghy, University of Pennsylvania; Jeffery Herbst, Princeton University; Carolyn Nordstrom, University of Notre Dame; William Reno, Florida International University; and William Stanley, University of New Mexico. Local participants: Tani Adams, CIRMA, Guatemala; Licdo. Bernardo Arevalo; Demetrio Cojti Cuxil; Victor Galvez; Juan Mendez; Edelberto Torres-Rivas; and Helen Mack. SSRC-MacArthur Fellows: Abiodun Alao; Kanchan Chandra; Helen Kinsella; Darini Rajasingham; Amy Ross; Shannon Speed; Dan Wessner; and Vadim Volkov. Committee: Jack Snyder; Charlie Hale; Kathryn Sikkink; and Steve Smith. Staff: Robert Latham and Mark Shoffner.

workshop was designed to bring participants in the Council's former Committee on Global Environmental Change and other scholars together with Central Asian water experts and activists.[1]

The workshop was organized around seven formal papers. Participants first reviewed "The Historical and Cultural Perspective on Water Regimes in Central Asia" followed by a presentation of the "Competing Water Needs" of the different states, "Water, Health and the Quality of Life," "How Principal Institutions Govern Water Allocation" and "Water Issues in Comparative Perspective." There was a lively discussion of "Strategic Choices and Socio-economic Prerequisites," centered on a controversial proposal to create a new type of international private corporation to help the various states manage their scarce water resources.

The workshop concluded with a brainstorming session which generated new directions for future social science research in four main areas that were deemed critical: water economics and pricing, institution building, historical/comparative cases and human health and ecology.

[1] USA: Heather Carlisle, Netherlands Organization for International Development Cooperation; William Davoren, Aral Sea International Committee; William Fierman, Indiana University; Greg Gleason, University of New Mexico; Dale Henry, Tashkent Institute of Engineers of Irrigation & Agricultural Mechanization (TIEIAM), Tashkent; Roger Kasperson, Clark University; Jeff Klaucke, Resource Exchange International, Tashkent; Daene McKinney, University of Texas; John McNeill, Georgetown University; Philip Micklin, Western Michigan University; Ian Small, Doctors Without Borders; Adam Smith Albion, Institute of Current World Affairs; Robert Sorenson, Environmental Affairs, U.S. Embassy, Tashkent; Jennifer Utrata, Development Alternatives, Inc., Tashkent; Erika Weinthal, Stanford University; Jim Wescoat, University of Colorado.

EUROPE/RUSSIA: Elisa Chait, London School of Economics; Thomas Dorenwendt, OSCE Liaison Office in Central Asia, Tashkent; Luis Viega da Cunha, Scientific and Environmental Affairs Division, NATO, Belgium; Andre Ptichnikov, Russian Academy of Sciences, Institute of Geography, Moscow; Jochen Renger, Robert Bosch Foundation, Germany; Rainer Reissl, Aerospace Center, Germany.

CENTRAL ASIA: Arustan Joldasov, Center for Social and Marketing Research, Tashkent; Yusup Kamalov, Union for Defense of the Aral Sea and Amu Darya, Nukus; Akhmal Karimov, Irrigation Institute, Tashkent; Jusipbek Kazabekov, TIEIAM, Tashkent; Abdurakhim Khasanov, Tadjik State University; Igor Dushanbe Khodjanuberdoev, Ecologist Club, Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan; Said Mirzaev, TIEIAM, Tashkent; Sapar Ospanov, Academy of Sciences, Almaty, Kazakhstan; Abdulkhakim Salokhiddinov, TIEIAM, Tashkent; Eksender Trushen, Macroeconomics and Social Research Institute, Ministry of Macroeconomics and Statistics of Uzbekistan, Tashkent; Oleg Tsaruk, Law and Environment Eurasia Partnership, Tashkent. Staff: Judith Sedaitis and Hazel Boyd.

Recent Council Publications

Centroamérica en restructuración. San José: Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales (FLACSO)-Costa Rica. Sponsored by the Joint Committee on Latin American Studies (1959-96). Vol. 1, **Mercado laboral y pobreza en Centroamérica**, edited by Edward Funkhouser and Juan Pablo Pérez-Sáinz. ix + 373 pp. Vol. 2, **Integración Regional en Centroamérica**, edited by Victor Bulmer Thomas. viii + 349 pp. Vol. 3, **Ciudadanía y Política Social**, edited by Bryan Roberts. viii + 380 pp.

As the 20th century draws to a close, Central American societies are undergoing changes unprecedented both in their scope and in the speed with which they are taking place. Many of these developments are positive, and indeed, advances in the region during the 1990s exceed even the most optimistic predictions. The achievement of historic peace accords in Nicaragua, El Salvador and Guatemala has put an end to protracted and destructive hostilities in those countries, and throughout the isthmus there has been a dramatic decline in human rights violations. Freely elected leaders now govern throughout the region, opposition parties exert influence through legislative bodies and subnational administrations, and legitimate authorities face few explicit constraints from military or civilian elites. Thanks in part to the restoration of political stability, Central American governments have taken tentative steps toward reviving regional efforts to promote economic integration and other forms of cooperation. A majority of the population continues to live in poverty and lacks access to adequate health care, education and social protection, but for the first time there appears to be a consensus, at least rhetorically, that the benefits of economic development should accrue to all.

These impressive signs of progress are all the more remarkable considering the economic circumstances that have confronted Central America over the past decade. Structural adjustment programs in each of the five principal countries of the region have coincided with an overall decline in living standards. Magnifying these programs' impact, economic aid to the region declined in the 1990s and remains too low to have a significant impact on development. All of this takes place in the context of processes of economic globalization that undermine many productive sectors, in Central America as elsewhere, that traditionally provided opportunities for steady employment.

The desire to contribute to deeper conceptualizations of this watershed moment in Central American history, and to assist in the formation of a cohort of highly trained junior researchers dedicated to basic research, led the Social Science Research Council and FLACSO to organize the research projects that gave rise to this three-volume collection. The books contain essays by leading social scientists from Central America as well as from elsewhere in the Americas and Europe.

Designed by the SSRC Joint Committee on Latin American Studies and funded by the Ford Foundation, the projects addressed three areas of fundamental importance for the future of the region, each of which is the focus of a volume. Volume 1, edited by Juan Pablo Pérez Sáinz and Edward Funkhouser and organized jointly by the Council and FLACSO, analyzes the impact of structural adjustment programs on labor markets and, through employment, on distribution.

The second volume, edited by Victor Bulmer-Thomas, assesses the problems and prospects of efforts to advance Central American regional integration. The final volume, edited by Bryan Roberts, considers the implications of trends in social policy in a region where social exclusion formerly precluded meaningful debates about social citizenship.

Community Conflicts and the State in India, edited by Amrita Basu and Atul Kohli. Sponsored by the Joint Committee for South Asia (1970-1996). Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1998. xii + 287 pages.

Political conflicts around religion, caste and regional identities have multiplied in India. This volume brings together original essays by eminent analysts of Indian society and politics that focus on changes in the expres-

sion of community identity in relationship to changes in the character of the state. They address such questions as: Why is there apparently more violent conflict around identity politics in India today than at any time since independence? To what extent do the character and intensity of recent conflicts differ from those of the past? What are the implications of caste, ethnic and religious nationalist movements for democracy? What measures might alleviate the widespread destruction of life and property and create the sense of predictability on which all social order rests?

Most of the essays originated as papers at a conference on "Political Violence in India: The State and Community Conflicts" held at Amherst College on September 23–24, 1995, and several of them appeared as a special issue of the *Journal of Asian Studies* (vol. 56, no. 2, May 1997).

Amrita Basu is professor of political science and women's and gender studies at Amherst College. Atul Kohli is professor at the Woodrow Wilson School and Department of Politics, Princeton University.

"Regional Integration in Central America." Special section of *World Development*. Vol. 26, no. 2, February 1998. Victor Bulmer Thomas, guest ed. Sponsored by the project on Central America, Latin American Program. These four essays focus on the economic dimension of the new Central American Common Market. They cover the transformation of the old CACM in the 1990s into the "open regionalism" favored by international agencies, trade creation and trade diversion, intraindustry trade, and intraregional trade in agricultural products and the impact of trade liberalization in the agricultural sector.

Social Scientist, Volume 23, Numbers 10–12, October-November 1995.

In December 1993 the Joint Committee on South Asia organized a workshop, "New Literature, New Power: Literary History, Region and Nation in South Asia" in Hyderabad, India. The workshop resulted in a special issue of *Social Scientist* (Delhi) on literary history in South Asia. In his introduction to the issue, Sheldon Pollock explores the movement in histories of literature to recognize the fundamental sociality of literature. In "Coconut and Honey: Sanskrit and Telugu in Medieval Andhra," Velcheru Narayana Rao shows how the question of what language to adopt for making literature in the Vijayangar empire helped shape the consciousness of the ruling elites. Pollock's "Literary History, Indian History, World History" explores the use of Sanskrit in western and northern India at the beginning of the common era and Kannada at the kingly centers. The essay by S. Nagaraju, "Emergence of Regional Identity and Beginnings of Vernacular Literature," uncovers the social history in which to locate the first literizations of Telugu poetry. The essay by Shamsur Rahman Faruqi on Muhammad Hussain Azad explores the origins and influence of what might be called comprador historicism and collaborationist aesthetics. Sitanshu Yashaschandra examines the history of modern Gujarati prose and literary production under colonialism. Mahasweta Sengupta's contribution on Bengali literary historiography shows how literary history is the critical arena within which the story of the nation is narrated. Jancy James demonstrates the complex histories to be excavated through a reading of women's literature in Malayam.

Serials:

Abe News, vol. 8, Spring 1998. Produced by the Abe Fellowship Program Tokyo office.

SSRC-MacArthur Foundation Newsletter, vol. 10, February 1998. "Technology and the Future of Security." Produced by the SSRC-MacArthur Foundation Program on International Peace and Security.

Also noted:

Our Babies, Ourselves: How Biology and Culture Shape the Way We Parent, by Meredith F. Small. New York: Anchor Books, 1998, 336 pp. *Our Babies, Ourselves* brings the insights of ethnopediatrics to the general reader. The book was inspired by several activities of the Ethnopediatrics Working Group of the Committee on Culture, Health and Human Development. In discussing "how biology and culture shape the way we parent," Small acknowledges the ideas of the working group's co-directors, Carol Worthman and Ron Barr.

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 appoints committees of scholars which seek to achieve the Council's purpose through the generation of new ideas and the training of scholars. 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

ADDRESS SERVICE REQUESTED

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