The civil rights revolution, the war on poverty and a variety of other federal and private initiatives of the 1960s generated an interest among social scientists in producing systematic social indicators to measure our well-being. Over the decades, the federal statistical system developed a variety of signposts about the economy: the monthly unemployment rate, quarterly estimates of growth of the Gross Domestic Product, annual estimates of personal income and earnings and the rate of inflation that is used for many purposes including the once-a-year adjustment in Social Security payments. These measures, widely viewed as accurate and crucial, have also come to play a role in the political arena, since the rates of unemployment and inflation are used to judge whether an administration managed the national economy competently or poorly.

Starting in the late 1960s, there was a movement to devise similarly important and unambiguous social indicators that would tell us how well we were doing with regard to health, education, social mobility, racial equity and other quality-of-life issues. The hope was to develop such measures, popularize them and then have them calculated regularly by the federal statistical agencies and their counterparts in the private sector. This movement ended by the early 1980s, but our need for information about Americans’ health, education, social mobility and racial equality is as strong as ever.

The enumeration of 2000 is the ideal occasion to initiate a new discussion about social indicators. Data from the census will give us fresh information about families, about who is doing well and who is not, about educational differences and about which locations are prosperous and which are falling further...
behind the national average. It will report unique information about racial differences and about gender change, especially gender change in education, occupations and earnings. Presumably any array of social indicators for the United States in the new millennium will use data from next year’s enumeration as the starting point.

Fortunately, our statistical system already provides information about economic trends, and about favorable social trends including a rise in educational attainment and a much longer lifespan. Does the decennial census need to ask Americans several dozen questions about their housing, their education, their employment and their sources of income? Let me emphasize that while there is vibrant controversy about using sampling to complete the count and to adjust for net undercount, there is no controversy about using a sample in the census to obtain social and economic information. Although census results will be used to paint an important national self-portrait, the social and economic questions are mandated by Congress for the purpose of sensibly allocating federal programs and expenditures.

National samples give us precise information about trends across the country but their size is such that they cannot tell us about local areas or smaller groups. Consider the important issue of which groups benefited from the economic growth of this decade and which fell behind. Throughout the 1990s incomes and earnings rose, but there is clear evidence of polarization as the gap between those at the top and bottom got larger. Did this occur in all parts of the United States, or is it more pronounced in some cities and states than in others? If so, why? Is the shift toward greater economic inequality evident for all educational groups or only for some? What about occupations? Evidence from the census of 1990 suggested that earnings inequality was growing within specific professions and job categories. Did that continue in the 1990s? Only the census will inform us. The overall poverty rate is decreasing but it remains high for some groups, especially minority children. The census will inform us about such issues and will shed some light on the success or failure of ameliorative programs.

A comparison of findings from the two most recent censuses shows that young women made considerable progress in the labor market in the 1980s as they were increasingly represented in occupations formerly dominated by men. The gender gap in earnings also grew smaller. Did this continue in the 1990s? We need a very large sample size to determine if the gender change among veterinarians, insurance adjusters and bartenders continued.

The 1990 census reported modest decreases in black-white residential segregation as substantial numbers of African Americans moved from central cities to the suburban ring. Did this trend, perhaps encouraged by the Fair Housing Act of 1968, persist? The Asian and the Hispanic-origin populations are now growing extremely rapidly. They have traditionally been much less residentially segregated than blacks from non-Hispanic whites. Is that still the case? The census is the only source of information about which racial groups live on each block.

In addition to giving us information about local geographic areas and groups far too small to show up in meaningful numbers on national surveys, the census inquires about important topics not investigated in other studies. Three such topics are migration within this country, commuting from home to work and international migration. The census of 2000 will ask one American in six where he or she lived in 1995, allowing us to describe who is moving where. Are many retirees still moving from the Midwest and Northeast to Florida and Arizona? In this prosperous era is there a substantial or only a modest flow of low-skill workers from places of high unemployment to places where jobs are plentiful? Are many rural counties across the nation losing population or is there new evidence of a rural renaissance similar to that one that occurred briefly in the 1970s, propelled, perhaps, by low energy costs? Are there many high-tech workers in the computer industry who are moving themselves and their jobs to locations in rural Colorado or Vermont where the scenic amenities are great but, until recently, jobs were few?

What types of people commute to which jobs? How long does it take them to get there? Do they use public transit or go in a car or van? If so, are they traveling by themselves or are they riding with others? Will the census supply us with evidence that minorities who remain in central city ghettos are missing out on good jobs located far out into the suburban ring, perhaps because of the absence of public transit, or does place of residence have little to do
with employment or occupation? Answers to these questions have significant implications for local planning and for understanding how labor markets favor some workers and disadvantage others. But these questions can only be answered by scrutinizing data for the decennial census.

Approximately one-third of our total population growth is due to immigration but these new arrivals are hardly distributed evenly across the country. Rather they are highly concentrated in six states and 18 metropolises. Are immigrants filling jobs that American workers do not take either because they lack the credentials that immigrants bring or because Americans are reluctant to work at low-paid jobs in the service sector and agriculture? Are immigrants and their children geographically segregating themselves into enclaves or are they, unlike the African American population, pretty much dispersed across metropolitan areas including suburban rings? How do immigration streams differ from one another? We know from Census Bureau surveys and from Immigration and Naturalization Service data that Filipino immigrants report exceptionally great educational attainment while those from Mexico, south China and Central America generally enter without much in the line of schooling. Only the census will give us detailed information about immigrants, their educational credentials and their occupational achievements or failures in this country.

Two innovations make the census of 2000 different from earlier enumerations. The largest sample of households will be asked if a grandchild is living there. If so, the respondent will be asked to report whether a grandparent cares for a grandchild and, if so, for how long. For the first time we will be able to analyze specialized and comprehensive information about the frequency of grandparenting and the economic welfare of grandchildren—a topic currently of great interest, since press reports suggest that quite a few mothers who lose AFDC payments turn their children over to their own mothers.

Even more closely watched will be results from a new approach to obtaining answers to an old question—one that has appeared on every census. Census procedures have always assumed that each person could be identified with only one race. Now the census question about race has been fundamentally altered. Interracial marriage has increased since the 1960s, and with it multiracial children. In 2000, people will be told to mark all races that apply. Will only 1 or 2% of the population indicate that they are multiracial? Or will it be 5 or 7% who identify with two or more races?

This new procedure will give us, for the first time, a count of the increasing multiracial population and information about their education, their earnings and with whom they live, including the race of their spouses, sibs and children. However, it also means that there will be no one number telling us how many whites, or blacks or Asians live in a city, state or electoral district. We will have a count of those who said, for instance, that African American was their only race and then a larger count of those who identified themselves as black along with one or two or three other races. The implications for civil rights litigation and for the drawing of electoral districts are uncertain. We can expect more than a few lawsuits since there will be competing valid counts of each racial group. And, for purposes of redrawing districts in state legislatures, it is possible that different states will use different definitions of race.

There have been lively controversies throughout our history about how the census should be taken and how census results should be used to apportion congressional seats. But since 1996, conflicts have been exceptionally bitter about the use of sampling to complete the count of population and then use of the subsequent post-enumeration survey to adjust for net census undercount. Indeed, this vociferous debate makes it likely that we will forget that the decennial census provides the nation with crucial information about who we are, where we have come from and where we are going in this era of fast-paced social and economic change.
The framers of the Constitution created the census as a mechanism to apportion political power and tax dollars among the various constituencies of the population. Every 10 years the federal government would count the population and reappropriate Congress on the basis of the results. Like elections, the census and reapportionment process shifts political power in the United States. And as with elections, the losers have to concede to the winners. Over the past two centuries, the census has basically accomplished its goal. Congress has managed to reappropriate successfully despite profound population growth and migration, ethnic and racial and political, social and economic change.

The concept of “census undercounts” is a function of the development of modern probability sampling methods and their use in statistical methodology. Census officials from George Washington and Thomas Jefferson to the present have been aware of the extraordinary difficulties of counting a dynamic, diverse and mobile population. Until the 1940s, census officials had hunches but few tools to measure accuracy, and certainly no mechanism to “correct” for undercounts, overcounts or discounts beyond doing the enumeration over again. Beginning in the 1940s, statisticians and demographers perfected methods of measuring census accuracy, using the techniques of demographic analysis and dual systems estimation. Sample post-enumeration survey (PES), statistical inference from sample to national rates and comparison to the vital registration system through demographic analysis replaced the hunches and laments about census error with increasingly reliable point estimates of error and intervals of confidence about those estimates.

Since 1940, the Census Bureau has conducted evaluation studies based on probability samples of subsets of the population to measure the level of accuracy of census results, in terms of both coverage errors—that is, under- and over-enumeration—and content error—that is, incorrect information on the characteristics of the population. The often reported statistic of the net undercount, 1.8% in 1990, represents, at the national level, the net undercount once undercounts are subtracted from overcounts and erroneous enumerations. It does not mean that 98.2% of the population was counted accurately. The evaluation studies of census coverage have themselves improved over the past 20 years, incorporating new measures of accuracy, including measures of gross error in the census—that is, the sum of overcounts, undercounts and erroneous enumeration.

The purpose of the 1950 PES was coverage evaluation, with the goal of identifying areas in which to increase accuracy. At about the same time the Census Bureau expended considerable resources to develop a statistical model for census error. The measure of correlated response error due to interviews led, for example, to the trial in 1960 of the mail-out, mail-back approach to enumeration which worked to eliminate the role of the interviewers. With the recognition during the 1980s that most coverage improvement efforts had failed to address the differential undercount, attention focused anew on using the PES to correct to raw enumeration results. In the end, the 1990 design was a compromise, a traditional census complete with coverage improvement programs and a PES for possible use in correcting the count.

The sample size of the 1990 PES, of approximately 165,000 households, was a compromise between the original design of 300,000 households and the Republican administration efforts to eliminate the PES. Despite the generally acknowledged success of the 1990 adjustment as an improvement over the raw enumeration counts, the small sample size had two major impacts on accuracy. First, the level of sampling error was a serious component of the overall census error; and second, the data at low levels of geography were sufficiently sparse as to require smoothing of the adjustment results, even across state lines. The public discourse on the 1990 census and adjustment has conflated “sample size”
problems with a more general condemnation of sampling in the context of censustaking, and has led to the myth that “sampling” itself is a suspect enterprise.

The 2000 census plan proposes to employ some time-honored methods of counting and some innovations. The time-honored methods include the use of a mail census as the primary means of contacting households. The mail census was first used in 1970. In that year about 60% of American households received their census form in the mail and were instructed to fill it out and mail it in. In 1980 and 1990 over 90% of households were contacted by mail. For the parts of the country that cannot be reached by mail, the Census Bureau uses enumerators to canvass a particular geographic area, the fundamental enumeration procedure from 1790 to 1960. The Census Bureau will also use enumerators to contact households that do not return the mail census form in a timely manner, in the counting phase known as the nonresponse followup. The 2000 plan proposes collecting additional detailed information on the population through the use of a long form sample (which began in 1940) in conjunction with the short form complete count. And the Census Bureau will evaluate the quality of coverage of the count with a post-enumeration sample survey, a procedure used in one form or another since 1950.

The new methods envisioned for 2000 originally included sampling for nonresponse followup. It is this new procedure that generated some of the most heated objections in Congress. Census officials know from past experience that residents at about one-third of the addresses will forget to fill out and mail back a census form, will ignore the form or perhaps not receive it in the first place. The Census Bureau follows up by sending an enumerator to the address. This phase of the count starts in late April, and is designed to retrieve information from the households that have not responded to that point. In 1970, 1980 and 1990, nonresponse followup was conducted for all households that did not mail back their census forms. The evaluation results of the last two censuses indicted that the quality of data collected by enumerators from nonresponding households got much poorer the longer it took the enumerators to collect it. That is, response gathered from households in June or later were significantly more error-filled than those collected in April and May. Thus the Bureau concluded that a higher quality sampling process for nonresponse followup would produce better data than 100% followup because the process could use better-trained employees and be done much more quickly. The census plan guarantees that 90% of the households in each census tract will be counted; they will make inferences for the residual nonresponders derived from the sampled nonresponse followup households. The opponents of sampling for nonresponse followup, as noted above, claim that the Census Bureau has given up the effort to contact everyone, and will make up people, a process that could be manipulated to the benefit of Democrats.

The other significant and controversial innovation of the 2000 Census Plan was the integration of the post-enumeration survey process into the traditional enumeration. In 1990 the Census Bureau took a post-enumeration survey and produced adjusted census counts on the basis of the survey results. But the 1990 census did not fully integrate the PES and the traditional enumeration to produce adjusted census counts on the basis of dual systems estimation. Rather the bureau released the results of the April, or traditional, enumeration in December 1990 and then released adjusted results in June 1991. There were eight years of litigation on the quality and legality of the two sets of figures. This decade, the Census Bureau proposed a one-number census—that is, procedures that would produce a final census count which could not easily be disaggregated into the traditional enumeration and the adjustments made on the basis of the results of dual systems estimation. Again, critics charge, the adjustment process is subject to political manipulation, to making up people.

In its January 25, 1999 ruling in Department of Commerce v. House of Representatives, Nos. 98-404 (1999), the Supreme Court held that the Census Act prohibits the proposed uses of statistical sampling to determine the population for congressional apportionment purposes. The ruling invalidated the Census Bureau’s plans to use statistical sampling for the nonresponse followup phase of the enumeration, but it did not explicitly ban sampling in the census for uses other than apportionment. The major use of sampling in the Census 2000 plan would be via a post-enumeration survey, the results of which could be used to adjust those from the “traditional” enu-
The bureau’s plans for the PES discussed above were intended to produce direct state estimates for apportionment and thus called for a very large sample of 750,000 households. Without sampling for nonresponse followup, the bureau will need to spend more time in the field doing traditional followup, which will delay the start of the PES. As a consequence, it plans to reduce the size of the PES sample to about 300,000 households and to relax requirements for direct state estimates.

We agree with the leaders in Congress who point out that there are political implications of using one or another counting technique. Deciding to use integrated coverage measurement can move a seat in Congress from one state to another, as can a “computer mistake.” But we would like to direct attention to the discussion of how best to avoid mistakes, and to enhance the accuracy of the census. Many other decisions about census or apportionment methodology also move seats among states. Deciding to count the overseas military in the apportionment totals may shift a seat. So may changing the apportionment formula or the size of the House. We expect that Congress will continue to focus on the details of census taking in the year ahead. Changing census methods may move seats in Congress between states, not the two dozen seats some claim, but one or two.

It is not a coincidence that the undercount controversies emerged on the heels of the Supreme Court “one person, one vote” decisions of the 1960s. Once the courts required congressional districts to adhere to that rule, not only did urban representation increase dramatically, but the accuracy of state populations with reference to one another, and for within state districting, also became very important to the political life of the nation. The differential undercount of racial minorities is also a differential undercount by state, and a differential undercount that impacts on districting within states. And at these lower levels of geography the national net differential undercount of a few percent gets magnified many times over. As a consequence, the differential undercount is a partisan issue because of the political fact that minority groups in the United States vote heavily Democratic. And thus the litigation that has emerged, and the political splits within Congress, pit Democrats against Republicans, and apportionment losers against apportionment winners.

Thus, in an apparent paradox, as the technical capabilities of the Census Bureau to measure and adjust for the differential undercount have improved over the past three censuses, the political controversies of the legality and constitutionality of doing so have heightened. To resolve the controversies, one must separate the technical questions from the political questions and determine who has responsibility and authority to address each.
Census 2000—Science Meets Politics

by Kenneth Prewitt*

This article was reprinted from Science 283 (February 12, 1999), p. 935. Interested readers can find the original there.
Census Challenges

by Kenneth W. Wachter*

On January 25, 1999, the Supreme Court ruled that the Census Act as revised in 1976 “prohibits the proposed uses of statistical sampling to determine the population for congressional apportionment purposes.” However, the Census Bureau may still decide to generate a set of census results adjusted for estimated undercounts and overcounts—on the basis of a sample survey from its ICM or integrated coverage measurement program—for purposes other than apportionment.

Political posturing has hampered the independence of the Census Bureau and overshadowed the scientific debate over adjustment methods. The methods proposed for 2000 are a larger-scale version of the methods rejected by the Secretary of Commerce for the 1990 census. A key problem for 2000 is the threat of “differential correlation bias.” This bias occurs when people of some kinds missed in the census are also systematically underrepresented in the ICM survey, more in some parts of the country than in others. In 1990, contrary to expectation, adjustment would have actually reduced the shares of Northeastern states with large inner-city and other minority populations like Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, New York and Ohio. Differential correlation bias is the likely cause.

Another challenge for 2000 is the inherent sensitivity of the ICM to small decisions and unnoticed mistakes, which raises fears of possible manipulation. Actual stakes, in terms of changes in shares for states, cities, and jurisdictions, are much smaller than the rhetoric would suggest. But choices about census sampling have become a battle of symbols.

A more detailed overview of “Statistical Controversies in Census 2000” may be found in a multiauthored technical report on the web at www.stat-berkeley.edu/tech-reports. It is report number 537.

*Kenneth W. Wachter, a professor of demography and statistics at the University of California, Berkeley, represents the American Statistical Association on the Council’s board of directors.
Collective Memory of Repression: Comparative Perspectives on Democratization Processes in Latin America’s Southern Cone

by Eric Hershberg*

During the 1980s, transitions to civilian rule marked the close of a traumatic period in the Southern Cone of Latin America (Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Paraguay and Uruguay). State-sanctioned abuses of human rights—including politically motivated disappearances and kidnappings, assassinations and torture of dissidents, arbitrary arrests—had directly affected tens of thousands of people and fostered a “culture of fear” (Corradi, Fagen and Garreton, 1992). But while citizens no longer live in fear of repression by state agencies or their proxies, human rights violations remain a central theme of contemporary politics in the region. Truth commissions convened to investigate abuses under the dictatorships and to forge consensus accounts of the past have achieved some important successes, but their findings, and the judicial proceedings that ensued in Argentina and Chile, have not generated closure. Amnesties granted to violators continue to elicit protest from victims and their advocates, for whom the slogan “Nunca mas” (never again) typically implies both a complete accounting of what took place under the dictatorships and punishment for the perpetrators. State officials, by contrast, have demonstrated little inclination to revisit the painful experiences of authoritarian repression, and emphasize instead the need to avoid divisive arguments about the past.

Social mobilizations in Chile following General Augusto Pinochet’s entry into the senate in March 1998 and his arrest in London seven months later on charges of genocide and crimes against humanity offer a particularly dramatic example of what Alex Wilde (1998) calls “irruptions” of memory in the contemporary Southern Cone. Indeed, struggles over how to remember human rights abuses, give public recognition to the victims and officially commemorate their suffering, constitute a persistent feature of the political landscape in much of the region. As in other parts of the world emerging from periods of officially sponsored violence, the outcome of these conflicts is proving central to the process of crafting democracy and, at a more fundamental level, that of forging individual and collective identities.

Although emotions continue to run high across the political spectrum, sufficient time has passed since the end of military rule to begin systematic inquiries into the processes through which conflicts over memory are unfolding in the Southern Cone. The questions that emerge are hardly unique to the region: How do societies remember, and how do the ways in which both citizens and institutions articulate memory forge individual and collective identities and establish boundaries between “us” and “them”? How do struggles over what to remember and how to characterize the past channeled through and reflected by public institutions, norms and policies, and how are the institutions and norms of new democracies crafted by social and political actors precisely in an effort to shape collective memory? How does contestation over the nature and relevance of memory itself give meaning to identities, and motivate attitudes and behavior? What are the broadly held societal views of memory, of the importance of coming to grips with—or suppressing—a past that evokes feelings of anguish, conflict and hatred? What are the implications of these attitudes for efforts to legitimize “agreement to disagree” in societies long plagued by low levels of tolerance?

Answers to these questions require sensitivity to the multiplicity of memories and the different meanings they engender. Researchers must attempt to understand and explain perspectives not only of the victims but also of the perpetrators, consideration of whose actions may be especially painful, on ethical and political grounds. A satisfactory understanding of social memory cannot arise from the study of culture to the exclusion of institutions, or of practices and norms to the exclusion of identities and subjectivities. Indeed, the intellectual challenge is to bridge these dichotomies, infusing them with the tension and ambivalence that real world processes imply. This is an opportune moment to pursue this agenda in the

* Eric Hershberg is a program director at the SSRC. He is indebted to Elizabeth Jelin and participants in the November 17-18, 1998 workshop on “Memoria colectiva en el cono sur” for sharpening the ideas contained in this essay.
Southern Cone because there has been relatively little scholarship devoted to the topic in the region.

Responding to this gap, in July 1998 the Council’s Regional Advisory Panel (RAP) for Latin America launched a multi-year program of research and training on collective memory of repression in the Southern Cone. Funded by the Ford Foundation and directed by Elizabeth Jelin, a member of the RAP based at the University of Buenos Aires, the initiative has three separate but related aims. The first concerns the opportunities for theoretically informed research to enrich debates about the sources and nature of memory, its role in constituting collective identities and the consequences of struggles over memory for social and political practices in societies emerging from dictatorship. The second involves the need to nurture a new generation of methodologically and theoretically sophisticated academic researchers prepared to articulate fresh perspectives on collective memory, as well as on other pressing issues that will emerge in the Southern Cone in the future. Finally, the project aims to help create an enduring network of researchers concerned with collective memory.

Preparing a new generation of researchers

We hope to foster the development of a new generation of internationally-networked intellectuals who are engaged with processes of collective memory and who can be expected to articulate these concerns subsequently through research, teaching and activism. Opportunities for young researchers in the Southern Cone to receive high quality social scientific training or to hone their skills through involvement in analytically-driven investigations have been limited. The decline of public universities during the dictatorships and their continuing stagnation due to falling levels of funding is partly to blame, and this has been accentuated by the economic difficulties of independent academic centers. Lacking opportunities to conduct basic research in academic settings, junior researchers become increasingly dependent for income on short-term consultancies which seldom strengthen their research skills and which discourage efforts to engage theoretical scholarship. Thus, the social sciences confront a serious risk of generational rupture. Concerted effort is needed to ensure that during the coming decades Latin American societies will be able to draw on the expertise and perspectives of independent, theoretically-mind-minded researchers. By training a carefully selected cohort of junior researchers in methods for conducting comparative research, oral histories, archival work, institutional analysis and other techniques, and by exposing them to an analytically-driven research experience, the project aims to create a critical mass of social scientists and humanists in the region who will enrich understandings of collective memory.

The program also targets the needs of junior Latin Americanists in the United States. Funding for dissertation field research in Latin America remains extremely scarce, far below that available for pre-dissertation or postdoctoral study. Yet the doctoral dissertation is the most important piece of research for young scholars in the American academic system. At a time when the importance of careful empirical fieldwork is questioned in many universities and departments, the Council is especially determined to provide incentives for students who wish to do extended fieldwork in Latin America.

Fostering creation of networks

Research networks are essential for the development, dissemination and maintenance of knowledge over time. Networks expose researchers to innovation and to new ideas, and afford opportunities for them to collaborate with colleagues. International networks help to prevent debates in any one place from developing in isolation from intellectual trends elsewhere. Moreover, networks that engage on equal footing individuals from the South and the North provide a useful corrective to the all-too-common tendency for Northern researchers to neglect the research of their Southern counterparts, which typically is never published in English and which circulates outside the academic journals that tend to define scholarly quality in the United States and Europe.

This project aims to construct enduring networks along several dimensions: substantive, involving researchers, across discipline or country, with shared interest in issues relating to memory or in analytical approaches to the topic; generational, both within a cohort of junior researchers and between that cohort and more senior investigators; regional, both within the Southern Cone and between the region and other parts of the world; and institutional, involving individuals based at research organizations of different
kinds—such as universities, independent academic centers and activist organizations.

An evolving program

A November 1998 meeting [see p. 22] at Centro Latinoamericano de Economia Humana (CLAEH) in Montevideo, Uruguay, brought together an international group of approximately 20 researchers to discuss the state of scholarship on collective memory in the Southern Cone and to help in the design of the training component of the program. Several participants will remain associated with the project as contributing faculty in training seminars and/or as academic advisors to the project and to program fellows. While the program will continue to evolve, training is expected to focus on enabling fellows to:

a) trace processes of intergenerational and intercohort transmission of memories and of struggles about the meanings of individual and collective traumas;

b) reveal distinct “layers” of memories (Jelin and Kaufman, 1999). Dictatorships typically attempt to erase previous identities and to foster oblivion, but recognizing these erasures does not imply going back to the past. In this sense, identities inevitably reflect the violence and oblivion that has been inflicted on diverse layers of memories;

c) analyze the subjective dimensions of memory: victimization, resentment and blame on the part of those who consider themselves and are defined by others as “victims” (an identity that must itself be deconstructed); guilt and complicity, at times shame and repentance, on the part of the “guilty.” Here it is essential to analyze how the trajectories of both of these groups are shaped by official policies, such as those of pardon and reconciliation, which have typically been applied in the Southern Cone; and

d) explore linkages between the public and private spheres. Analysis of struggles over public commemorations requires sensitivity to the meanings that different political and social actors give to the experience of repression.

These tasks will be assumed by program fellows, working under the supervision of an international team of faculty led by Ms Jelin. Nineteen junior researchers—15 from the Southern Cone and 4 from the United States—took part in an initial training workshop held in La Lucila del Mar, Argentina, during the first two weeks of March 1999. Subsequently they will carry out empirical case studies designed to illuminate some of the issues outlined above. A second training workshop, scheduled for the first two weeks of December 1999, will provide an occasion to critique draft papers and for further methodological training. The fellows are:

Argentina
Ana Laura Pereyra, Facultad de Ciencias Sociales, Universidad de Buenos Aires
Silvia Ines Jensen, Universidad Nacional del Sur, Bahía Blanca
Laura Cecilia Mombello, Facultad de Ciencias de la Educación, Universidad Nacional del Comahue
Federico Guillermo Lorenz, Facultad de Filosofía y Letras, Universidad de Buenos Aires
Claudia Viviana Feld, Universidad de Buenos Aires y la Universidad del Centro de la Provincia de Buenos Aires

Brazil
Simone Dubeux Berardo Carneiro da Cunha, Instituto de Filosofía e Ciencias Sociais, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro
Ludmila da Silva Catela, Instituto de Filosofía e Ciencias Sociais, Universidade Federal de Rio de Janeiro
Samarone Lima de Oliveira, Universidade de Sao Paulo
Valdenia Brito Monteiro, Universidade Católica de Pernambuco

Chile
Claudia Rojas Mira, Consejo Nacional de Población
Azúl Candina Polomer, Centro de Estudios del Desarrollo
Marco Antonio Ensignia Zapata, División de Organizaciones Sociales, Ministerio Secretaría General de Gobierno
Ximena Tocornal Montt, Instituto de la Mujer, Centro de Estudios Municipales Cordillera, Instituto Latinoamericano de Salud Mental y Derechos Humanos

Paraguay
Myrian Angelica Gonzalez Vera, Centro de Documentación y Estudios
Uruguay
Aldo Marchesi, Centro Latinoamericano de Economia Humana

US
Claudio Duran, modern thought and literature program & cultural anthropology, Stanford University
Gabriela Fried, sociology, University of California, Los Angeles
Victoria Lawless, history, Yale University
Tamara Teghillo, anthropology, University of California, Irvine

A second cohort of fellows, to be chosen in a competition during 1999, will hold fellowships for training and field work during 2000.

All program fellows will take part in a sequence of workshops devoted to reviewing the critical literature relating to collective memory; addressing issues of research design (including methods of comparison) and grappling with methodological challenges involved in work related to memory (e.g. interviewing for oral histories). Fellowships also will enable all participants to conduct field work on memory-related issues in the Southern Cone. They will produce analytical papers for inclusion in a regional research project supervised closely by senior faculty, and it is anticipated that revised versions of their papers will be published as part of a series of volumes.

The fellowships we are providing for Southern Cone fellows are tailored to the specific needs of junior researchers operating in a “thin” institutional environment in which opportunities are limited both for advanced training and for conducting basic research in the social sciences and humanities. Unlike that of most fellowship programs, this approach is highly structured. The model of “research apprenticeships” would generally not make sense in the US or in other settings in which universities provide a mechanism for replenishing the ranks of highly trained researchers. Indeed, because the needs of the US participants are different, their fellowships are different as well. It is imperative that the work of US participants be geared toward successful and timely completion of doctoral dissertations supervised by advisors on their home campuses. Participation in program workshops and input from program faculty will likely facilitate their dissertation research, but US fellows will not be expected to fit their research into the collaborative volume.

The SSRC has established a small library, located in the Facultad de Filosofia y Letras of the University of Buenos Aires, to make academic work on collective memory available to researchers throughout the Southern Cone. The library will provide services to project fellows (including bibliographical searches, provision of photocopies and distribution of papers) and to researchers in the field.
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Building Bridges with the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences (CASS)

by Mary Byrne McDonnell*

In November 1998, the Council signed an agreement of cooperation with the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences—the largest social science institution in the People’s Republic of China. The agreement was signed on the occasion of the visit of an unusually high-ranking CASS delegation that included the new CASS president Li Tieying. It is an agreement “in principle,” based on similar agreements the Council has negotiated with a variety of international academic institutions.

CASS and the Council have agreed to a set of principles, including reciprocity and non-exclusivity—that facilitate research and training efforts such as communication, visas, sponsorship and hosting. The range of issues we may work on together is large, encompassing all the current SSRC portfolio of interests and then some. Cooperation is to take three forms initially: delegations and training missions, research and infrastructure development and workshops and scientific meetings. In the coming year we have agreed to develop a concrete plan for further cooperation and to convene two workshops, one in each country, for staff of CASS and SSRC to exchange information and to provide recommendations for local participants at the request of either organization. CASS is interested primarily in the Council’s problem-oriented work and sees an opportunity to interact with staff and scholars associated with these programs.

The formal signing ceremony presided over by SSRC Interim President Orville Gilbert Brim and the CASS president came after a year of negotiation with CASS. More important, it represents the culmination of a long effort to re-engage the Council with China and Chinese scholars, which began when former Council president David Featherman and I visited Beijing at CASS’s invitation in the summer of 1991.

At that time, we wanted to re-open the possibility of work in China in order to involve China and Chinese scholars in the Council’s emerging transnational and comparative research agenda.

The Council has been engaged in China since 1966 with the joint founding of the Committee on Scholarly Communication with the People’s Republic of China (CSCPRC) by SSRC, the National Academy of Sciences and the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS). The first decade of contact under CSCPRC auspices focused on the sciences; CASS itself was formed in 1977 and social sciences then began to emerge as a significant part of CSCPRC programs. The Council, and its president at the time, Kenneth Prewitt, was a key player in those early years, hosting, for example, the 1979 visit of Huan Xiang, the vice-president of CASS. His visit, heading the highest-ranking delegation of social scientists to date, followed closely the signing of an agreement enabling social science to be a real part of CSCPRC work. The large-scale exchange that followed resulted in the training of those who are now the middle generation of China scholars here, as well as enormous numbers of Chinese students in the social sciences.

Despite interest on both sides, very little was possible in 1991. Social sciences were still in disrepute following Tiananmen Square, and CASS was in the early stages of privatization after years as a line item in the national budget. Conditions for creative social science appeared to be at a low ebb in both Beijing and Shanghai. On the home front, the Joint Committee structure assigned responsibility for working with China to ACLS. These factors meant that the

*Mary Byrne McDonnell, an historian, is executive program director of the SSRC.
idea of forming a partnership with CASS was put on the back burner.

Many things have changed in the past six years. SSRC now has an East Asia program that de facto includes China as a subject and Chinese as participants. In addition, the Committee for Scholarly Communication with China (CSCC, formerly CSCPRC), the conduit for CASS contacts with the American Academy and vice versa, is considerably less active than it was in the 1970s and 1980s, following severe funding cuts. Meanwhile, CASS has emerged from its post-Tiananmen restructuring stronger both financially and politically; no longer able to depend solely on CSCPRC, it is searching for partners.

The emergence of social science as a force for improving social conditions in China is in part signaled by the appointment of Li Tieying. As the eldest son of one of China’s foremost revolutionaries, Li was for many years senior among “the princes” and was considered likely to attain one of the country’s highest offices. He is a member of the politburo of the Central Committee and this is the first time CASS has ever been headed by so powerful a political leader. He traveled to New York with a secretary and a bodyguard and was attended here by a full complement of Chinese-language press. For CASS, this appointment is a milestone in its efforts to raise the visibility and effectiveness of social sciences within China; for Li, it may be an effective sidelining from the top ranks of political power.

At our meeting in New York Li’s forceful intellect, curiosity and openness to new ways of thinking was evident despite the formal setting and the constraints imposed by interpretation. It was clear that he has the personal strength and political clout to create the conditions to allow a creative and thoughtful social science to develop at CASS. Given his senior position within the ruling elite, he should be able to minimize bureaucratic impediments to international collaboration between CASS and foreign partners. Scholars we spoke with at CASS hope that such a powerful president makes it more likely that their work will be read in high government circles, and that real data may actually come to have an impact on policy formulation.

The institutional bridge we are beginning to construct has clear benefits both to CASS and the SSRC. Throughout its history, the Council has served as a bridge—linking disciplines, researchers from many walks of life and countries around the world. By drawing on and bringing into productive intercourse the interests and abilities of the academy, the foundations, government and the publics who support and may find useful the work emerging from its activities, the SSRC has sought to enrich the store of knowledge available for managing generations-old social problems.

As social science unfolds once more in China, the Council may again be in position to contribute to its development and deployment while enriching our own work in areas of consequence to us all. As a first step, we hope to build a relationship of trust and cooperation between the Council and CASS with the intent (as a second step) of increasing the participation of Chinese scholars and of their research in the wider relationships and conversations we facilitate.

Today it is almost unimaginable to work on East Asia or on many thematic problems of regional or global concern without including China as a case and Chinese scholars as knowledgeable researchers. It is crucial to our work to be able to engage with research in China on issues of importance to us and to have easy access to Chinese scholars and develop our networks there. With this new agreement we hope that we will be able to provide access within
China for our fellows, and will gradually be able to hold the kinds of conferences and research planning meetings that have been so successful elsewhere.

Changes at the Council and at CASS, coupled with our new agreement, provide the conditions that will make it possible to reach these goals. Our task remains to develop an East Asia program that fully includes China, and to engage some of the questions involved with “building the social sciences” in China as we have elsewhere. While some aspects of our emerging work with China may be bilateral—the development of social sciences through research and training projects, for example—other aspects will be multilateral, connecting Chinese scholars and scholars into emerging networks on larger regional and global questions.

We will begin small, by linking China to other projects already underway at the Council in areas of mutual interest. For example, we hope to add Chinese members to our emerging networks on poverty, on labor issues or on memory and society. We plan to appoint a scholar from CASS to our East Asia Regional Advisory Panel; we want to increase linkages between Chinese scholars and other researchers in other parts of Asia around topics of mutual interest. As the East Asia RAP becomes a board for the region we may consider other offices in Asia to complement our Tokyo office. On their side, CASS’s privatization is generating funds that can be used to bring Chinese scholars to events and projects abroad.

Both bilateral and multilateral approaches will ensure that Chinese scholars have a strong role in the international community of social scientists fostered by Council activities in the coming years.
Good Fellowship: Fellows’ Conferences at the Council

by Sheri Ranis, Beverlee Bruce, Ellen Perecman and Diane di Mauro*

The Social Science Research Council’s fellowship programs are much more than a transfer of funds. Besides underwriting research, the programs attempt to facilitate intellectual and personal interaction among our fellows and with people and institutions to whom they might not ordinarily have access.

The Council runs numerous fellowship programs with a variety of themes, goals and target audiences. During the 1998 calendar year, some 14 different fellowship competitions awarded approximately 400 fellowships, with an associated 35 fellows’ events. (Note that this does not include all fellowship competitions or training workshops.)

The staff members who manage the program competitions spend a great deal of time exploring new ways for SSRC fellows to hook up. Several programs, for example, use newsletters to contact their members. In the early 1990s an e-mail reflector for all grantees was established under the auspices of the International Predissertation Fellowship Program (IPFP), and the Sexuality Research Fellowship Program has a listserv. We also continue to search for higher interactivity through the SSRC website. Examples of this effort are the web-based searchable database begun by the SSRC-MacArthur Program on International Peace and Security last year and the recently-established experimental e-mail list for the Applied Economics program’s fellows. Nevertheless, face-to-face meetings are still the most popular means of stimulating interaction.

Most of the fellows’ events have a number of features in common. These are:

**Networking.** We seek to build a sense of the group—identification with the cohort and therefore with the program and its goals. We also hope to create social support systems and professional net-

works among the fellows.

**Diversity.** We deal with diverse populations—different disciplines, career stages, research interests, methods and approaches. Depending on the program’s particular goals, reconciling or highlighting these differences is a key part of any event’s design.

**Cohort building.** We don’t rely on natural forces to create a sense of the group among our fellows. Most of our meetings are engineered for internal cohort building—for example, they may mix former fellows with new ones, or involve committee members and other faculty.

**Structured exercises.** Meetings always involve a variety of exercises, many based on models developed at the Council. These formally structured exchanges often concern interdisciplinarity or methodology; some attempt to bridge the gaps between academic research and policy-relevant work.

**Free time.** Unstructured time is often the most productive time of all. Unexpected outcomes—intellectual sparks, proposals for collaboration, innovative ideas for format change or follow-up meetings spring from meals, late-night talks or walks on the beach.

**Tracking.** The outcomes of fellows’ events are monitored through participant evaluations and through the record of collaborations they engender.

In the pages that follow, several program directors—Beverlee Bruce of the SSRC-Mellon Minority Fellowship Program, Ellen Perecman of the International Predissertation Fellowship Program, Diane di Mauro of the Sexuality Research Fellowship Program and Sheri Ranis of the Abe Fellowship Program—discuss the fellows’ conferences on which they have worked. Descriptions of other fellows’ conferences can frequently be found in the “Current Activities at the Council” section of *Item*.

**SSRC-Mellon Minority Summer Conference**

The SSRC-Mellon Minority Fellowship Program is the graduate component of the Mellon Minority Undergraduate Fellowship Program (MMUF). In the MMUF, qualified African American, Latina/o American and Native American students enrolled in private institutions around the country and majoring in arts and science disciplines designated as Mellon fields are selected as fellows in their sophomore or junior years. Once a Mellon fellow is admitted to

---

*Sheri Ranis, Beverlee Bruce, Ellen Perecman and Diane di Mauro staff, respectively, the Abe Fellowship Program, SSRC-Mellon Minority Fellowship Program, International Predissertation Fellowship Program and Sexuality Research Fellowship Program of the SSRC.*
graduate school, private or public, here or abroad, to pursue a Ph.D. in preparation for an academic career in a Mellon-designated field, s/he is eligible to attend the annual Summer Conference and to apply for the Predoctoral Research Grant. The conference and the grant, both managed by the Social Science Research Council, demonstrate the foundation’s commitment to racial diversity in American higher education.

Unique among Council programs, the SSRC-Mellon Minority Fellowship Program has a student conference planning committee that works with SSRC staff. In the five years of Council leadership conferences have been held at Clark Atlanta University (1995), Stanford University (1996), Hampton University (1997), Bryn Mawr College (1998) and Brown University (1999).

The conference provides a venue for students of color to network with Mellon fellows similarly situated; to attend workshops that address such issues as balancing family life, surviving the first year, preparing for qualifying exams, writing the dissertation and getting published; and to present their work in a variety of contexts including conversations by discipline, methodological roundtables, thematic panels and poster sessions. Invited speakers, usually senior scholars, present their current research and serve as role models.

On average, 160 students attend the conferences each year. At the Bryn Mawr conference, 30% of the fellows were first-year graduates, 68% were continuing graduates and 2% were recent Ph.D.’s. Students complete a comprehensive evaluation that serves as the template for the committee and staff deliberations that shape each conference. Communications are maintained through a listserv and the SSRC-Mellon Minority Fellowship page on the Council’s website (www.ssrc.org/fcom8.htm) where abstracts of and excerpts from conference presentations are posted.

Beverlee Bruce

**International Predissertation Fellowship Program**

For the last eight years, the IPFP has sought to strengthen research on the developing world by offering training fellowships that enable students to pursue language training and multidisciplinary area study as part of their graduate training. The goal of the program, which is funded by the Ford Found-

ation, has been to create an environment on American campuses that promotes and rewards locally grounded social science research.

As part of the fellowship, about 30 current and former fellows meet for three days at an annual fellows’ conference. The conference offers the opportunity to get a broader perspective on plans for dissertation research and to trade practical information.

Conference faculty conduct plenary sessions on research design and methodology. For the past few years, we have invited someone to talk to the group about his or her experiences developing a research project—both successes and failures. Others are invited to talk about when it is appropriate to use archives, oral history, surveys, census data or ethnography in research, and when those tools would not be useful in answering the question being asked.

In preparation for concurrent workshops, fellows submit memorandums describing their plans for research. These are circulated in advance and fellows spend many hours at the conference in small workshops exploring each others’ research plans. Ten to twelve fellows and three faculty from a variety of disciplines and with varied regional interests are assigned to each workshop. Here they challenge each other to think more broadly about their plans for research in a supportive environment. Many fellows have told us that the fellows’ conference is among the most valuable experiences of their graduate careers.

Other scheduled events at the conference include optional meetings for students interested in the same region or discipline. Fellows are also encouraged to organize impromptu discussions on topics of interest.

Each year fellows’ conference materials include readings on different tools and strategies recommended by our former and current conference faculty. This cumulative bibliography is reviewed and updated annually. It now includes 360 references.

Another resource for fellows is the information culled from fellows’ final reports to the program. Fellows are asked to indicate important academic resources at the overseas training site (libraries, language programs, etc.); to provide names and addresses for particularly helpful contacts in the area and to comment on the availability and cost of housing, banking procedures and so on. These reports are made available to fellows of all SSRC fellowship programs, and 10 of them are now available on the
IPFP page on the SSRC website.

The increasing internationalization of the scholarly community places a burden on those responsible for training social scientists to see to it that students are equipped to communicate across language barriers, cultural divides and differences in academic and scholarly traditions, as well as across disciplinary boundaries. In 1993, we initiated a modest effort to sensitize students to the need to be so equipped by establishing a workshop series entitled “Conducting Social Science Research in the Developing World.” Workshops have now been held in 16 countries.

Modeled after the workshops at the annual fellows’ conference, these 4-5-day workshops—which take place in developing countries—involve a small, multidisciplinary group, usually including 10 students and two faculty. Half of the students are SSRC fellows and half are students from local universities or research institutes. Local scholars typically serve as workshop faculty.

The IPFP encourages fellows to share their knowledge and experience on the SSRC fellows’ e-mail reflector. The reflector was established in 1993 by an IPFP fellow who thought his colleagues should have some way to share the kind of information he found so valuable at the fellows’ conferences he attended. All recipients of SSRC grants and fellowships are invited to subscribe to the reflector.

Ellen Perecman

Sexuality Research Fellowship Program (SRFP)

The SSRC initiated the Sexuality Research Fellowship Program (SRFP) with funds from the Ford Foundation in 1995 to provide dissertation and postdoctoral support for social and behavioral research on sexuality conducted in the US. Our overall objective has been to build constituencies among sexuality researchers that can publicly promote the usefulness of such research, strengthen existing research networks within the social sciences and improve research dissemination. Initiating and strengthening research networks is an important component of the program, one that is built into the application process.

The annual fellows’ conference takes place over three days. It is typically co-hosted by research institutes and academic departments focusing on sexuality research. This arrangement provides an opportunity for fellows to conduct archival research and meet with researchers at the institutes. In 1997, our conference was co-hosted by the Kinsey Institute at Indiana University, and last year it coincided with a research meeting organized by the Human Sexuality Program at San Francisco State University.

In promoting productive alliances with other fellows and with senior researchers, the conference makes optimal use of the diverse group of participants. While this diversity is obviously connected to the cross-disciplinary nature of the program, the fellows’ work—even within the same discipline—often focuses on topics that require diverse methodological approaches. The mix includes selection committee members, invited speakers, a small number of fellows from the previous year and a range of current fellows just beginning their tenure—from postdocs and dissertation fellows to scholars recently advanced to candidacy.

Prior to the meeting, all participants receive a packet of abstracts, one-page outlines of each of the fellows’ research projects. Upon arrival at the conference, each fellow is given an index card—we call it a “dance card”—containing six lines for the names of “dance partners.” We refer to this dance card activity by its acronym, ODO, for “orchestrated discourse opportunity.” Designed to encourage focused discussions, this exercise provides for six 30-minute conversational dances, during which fellows participate in one-on-one discussions with other fellows or with selection committee members or program staff. Using the abstracts packet to become familiar with each other’s work, fellows make their dance reservations during the first day of the conference. This activity has been an unqualified success, enabling the fellows to begin a networking process that does not leave making contacts to chance. Suggestions for conversational topics—such as research obstacles or difficulties, preliminary research findings, comparisons across topics and disciplines, the benefits or disadvantages of specific methodological designs or techniques—are provided.

Other conference activities include more traditional formal presentations on different topics—ethical issues in sexuality research, public and private sector research in sexuality and so on. There are also 3-4 small group discussions, to which fellows are assigned by discipline and/or topic.
The conference concludes with a useful discussion between current and former fellows. Each year, a small number of fellows who have completed their tenure are invited to share their insights about the fellowship year with a group of four or five fellows. One focus is the program’s requirement that dissemination and outreach be part of a fellow’s research plan. Former fellows share with current ones information about how they engaged other researchers both within and outside of academia.

The Sexuality Research Fellowship Program’s emphasis on networking, both in the program and in its meetings, is designed to ensure that collaborative efforts initiated during the fellowship year endure long after the fellows’ conference has ended.

Diane di Mauro

Abe Fellowship Program

The purpose of the Abe Fellowship Program, which is funded by the Japan Foundation Center for Global Partnership, is to encourage multidisciplinary research on topics of pressing global concern and to facilitate new networks of such researchers based in the US and Japan and around the world. The three main themes of Abe-sponsored research are global issues, problems common to advanced industrial societies and issues relating to the improvement of US-Japan relations.

Abe Fellowships are individual awards designed to provide 12 months of support for both academic and non-academic researchers. Since 1991 between 15 and 20 awards have been given out each year—currently 50% to individuals in the US and 50% to those in Japan. Our fellows represent a wide range of academic social science specialities as well as expertise as lawyers, policy analysts and journalists. The program displays a similarly broad career spectrum—from freshly minted Ph.D.’s to very senior individuals.

The Abe program has both internal and external networking goals. On the internal front, the program hosts an annual retreat to build identification as a cohort among active Abe fellows. We also produce a newsletter twice a year and hold presentations, lectures and holiday events for fellows in both the US and Japan. External networks are fostered through a workshop series focused on critical research themes that gathers together fellows, committee members and outside experts.

The challenge for the Abe Fellowship Program is to plan activities that will be meaningful to busy, highly motivated researchers. These are not graduate students but academic meeting veterans who can be resistant to being “trained.” Often they do not share disciplinary background or research interests.

We’ve used several strategies to address this problem. We try to isolate our fellows in a retreat-like setting so that they can focus on each other without distractions. We’ve shortened our events to a maximum of three days to accommodate demanding schedules. And we prepare ourselves to drag our participants (often protesting) into exercises in which they will not always be comfortable. So, for example, at our retreat we use a variation of the standard SSRC research presentation exercise in which fellows purposefully mixed by nationality, discipline and specialty critique each other’s work. We also hold methodology workshops that mix them up again.

Recently we created an ambitious exercise called the “problem-solving workshop,” a quasi-simulation or thought experiment. We selected key issue areas such as aging, rapid technological change and global regulation. We collected extensive current readings for each topic group. Then we invited senior practitioners from the policy world to join with fellows and academic experts to make presentations on specific scenarios. For example, the UN group was asked to draft an agenda on UN reform for an upcoming session of the General Assembly; the aging group was asked to provide advice to the OECD on the best way to provide healthcare and pensions given limited fiscal and bureaucratic resources. This was a complicated session to construct and run, but it got positive reviews from participants.

And then, of course, there are the unexpected outcomes. Some of our best ideas for workshops and networking activities grew out of walks on the beach.

Sheri Ranis
Eleanor C. Isbell Dies at 94

*by David L. Sills*

Eleanor C. Isbell, who served the Council as a staff associate from 1940 until her retirement in 1975, died in a nursing home in Connecticut on February 24 at the age of 94. She had lived since her retirement at her childhood home in Columbia, Connecticut.

When Eleanor Isbell retired, the headline of the front-page story in *Items* noted that her departure marked the “end of an era” at the Council. She had nurtured its growth from a small scholarly society funded largely by a few foundations to a large, international organization with the broad support of a large number of foundations and government agencies.

She was born in Columbia on April 24, 1904, the daughter of Hubert P. and Frannie Lyman Collins. She attended the Columbia elementary school, Windham High School and Smith College, from which she graduated magna cum laude in 1924. She married Roger S. Isbell but was prematurely widowed.

After working as a traffic engineer at both the New York and New Jersey telephone companies, and undertaking graduate study in sociology at Yale University, Ms. Isbell served as a research assistant to the famous sociologist Dorothy Swaine Thomas during her study of population migration in Sweden. Later she worked for the even more famous Swedish economist Gunnar Myrdal during his classic study of American race relations, published in 1944 as *An American Dilemma*.

In 1940 Ms. Isbell joined the staff of the Council on the enthusiastic recommendation of the sociologist W. I. Thomas. When asked what she would do at the Council, Donald Young, then the junior member of the Council’s two-man professional staff, replied with characteristic pithiness, “I don’t know what she would do, but I know that she would find something that needs doing and would do it well.”

Mr. Young’s prediction was correct. For 35 years, Ms. Isbell was an important key to the Council’s growth, eminence and success. She served as editor, board secretary, archivist and public information officer. She was the founding editor of *Items*, and soon became both the conscience and the keeper of the Council, the largely anonymous person who kept the organization functioning on a day-to-day basis during many periods of leadership turnover. For the hundreds of scholars who benefited from her editing and encouragement, she was one of those who are referred to in *The Book of Common Prayer* as “saints known and unknown.”

While living in retirement in Columbia, Ms. Isbell was active in the American Association of University Women and the Columbia Historical Society. She also assisted the Class of 1924 in its support of the Smith College Alumnae Fund.

In addition to her former associates at the Social Science Research Council, Ms. Isbell is survived by a sister, Beatrice C. Grimm of Bridgeport, Connecticut; a nephew, Thomas H. Collins of Columbia; two nieces also of Columbia, Janet Erickson and Linda Spector; and a niece, Virginia Gould, of Brielle, New Jersey.

* David L. Sills, the Council’s Executive Associate Emeritus, has written frequently about Council history.
Current Activities at the Council

Local Governance and International Intervention in Africa: A Correction

Due to an editorial error, the names of participants at a workshop on “Local Governance and International Intervention in Africa” held at the European University Institute (EUI) in Florence, Italy on March 28-29, 1998, were omitted from the December 1998 Items. They were:

Musa Abutudu (Institute for Advanced Study and University of Benin, Nigeria), Michael Barnett (University of Wisconsin, Madison), Thomas Callaghan (University of Pennsylvania), Frederick Cooper (University of Michigan), Karin Dokken (University of Oslo, Norway), Kajsa Eckholm-Friedman (University of Lund, Sweden), Oyvind Hansen (Research Council of Norway), Ron Kassimir (SSRC), Gilbert Khadiagala (School of Advanced International Study), Audie Klotz (University of Illinois, Chicago), Robert Latham (SSRC), Carolyn Nordstrom (University of California, Berkeley), Hildegarde Scheu (GTZ) and Hans Peter Schmitz (University of Konstanz, Germany).

International Dissertation Field Research Fellowship Program Fellows’ Workshop

Twenty-four fellows attended the second SSRC-ACLS International Dissertation Field Research Fellowship (IDRF) fellows’ workshop at the University of San Francisco on January 8-12, 1999. Catherine Boone, professor of political science at the University of Texas and Douglas Holmes, professor of anthropology at the University of Houston, Clear Lake were the facilitators. Guest lecturer Michael Watts (geography, University of California, Berkeley) spoke about his work in Africa and participated in a lively discussion about issues in international field research.

Fellows presented their projects and field research experiences at a series of six panels, organized loosely around thematic and methodological similarities. Each presentation was followed by a brief question and answer period, and each panel concluded with a longer discussion of the substantive intellectual issues raised by the panelists’ work. Panel members were also given time to discuss their work among themselves.

Most of the fellows were finishing or had recently completed their dissertation research. As at the first IDRF workshop in Amsterdam (October 2-6, 1998), that experience, in conjunction with a shared commitment to scholarly dialogue across disciplines, served to bring together researchers with widely disparate interests and affiliations. Their discussions were informed by a set of readings distributed prior to the workshop, including articles and book chapters by Lisa Anderson, Arjun Appadurai, K. Anthony Appiah, Albert Hirschman, Ira Katznelson, Sherry Ortner, William Sewell, Jr. and Immanuel Wallerstein.

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

Japan Studies Dissertation Workshop

On January 8-12, 1999, twelve outstanding students and three faculty members came to Monterey, California for the fourth annual Japan Studies Dissertation Workshop. The workshop targets those students whose work is especially promising or ambitious, who seem particularly in need of critical feedback or who are not affiliated with institutions recognized as Japan Studies centers.

The program brings together students at varying stages of the dissertation process and from varying disciplinary backgrounds who might not otherwise have the opportunity to interact. The workshop aids students in designing innovative and insightful research and in planning, executing and analyzing fieldwork. Over the course of four days, students present and critique individual projects and meet in small groups with faculty and peers to discuss crosscutting themes and methodological issues.

The 1999 workshop participants were selected from a pool of more than 40 applicants and represented 9 disciplines from the social sciences and humanities and 11 institutions nationwide. This year many proposals focused on such topics as intermediary organizations in Japanese civil society and politics and various groups that have been
marginalized historically within Japanese society. The program, which is funded by the Japan Foundation, accepts applications annually in October.

Faculty: John C. Campbell, University of Michigan; Edward B. Fowler, University of California, Irvine; Patricia G. Steinhoff, University of Hawaii. Staff: Mary Byrne McDonnell, Jennifer A. Winther, Thurka Sangaramoorthy

Abe Fellows’ Retreat

The Abe Fellowship Program held its third annual retreat on January 14-17, 1999 in San Diego, California. Twenty current fellows as well as program committee members and staff spent two-and-a-half days involved in research presentations, methodology workshops and discussion groups. The retreat was led by Abe Fellowship Program Committee chair James White of the University of North Carolina, and committee members Hideki Kan of Kyushu University and Alan Miller of the Global Environment Facility at the World Bank.

Research presentation sessions that allowed the fellows to expose their work to critiques from individuals with very different disciplinary, theoretical, methodological and national backgrounds, as well as differing amounts of international research experience, accounted for much of the retreat. Methodology sessions were group exchanges on two essays by Arjun Appadurai and Gabriel Almond, which Mr. White labeled works on “meta-methodologies” for social science. The fellows also participated in discussions focused on proposals for new global systems of environmental governance led by Mr. Miller and on US-Japan relations and American hegemony in the Asia Pacific led by Mr. Kan.

The meeting was designed to provide opportunities for inter-change both in sessions and more casually. The participants were unanimous in their appreciation of the multidisciplinary intensity; as one put it, “This kind of discussion isn’t found in the ivory tower.”

Participants: James White, Hideki Kan and Alan Miller of the Abe Fellowship Program Committee; Arthur Alexander, William Alford, Marie Anchordoguy, David Arase, Mary Yoko Brannen, Laura Campbell, Mark Fruin, Heidi Gottfried, Yoshihisa Hayakawa, David Johnson, Peter Katzenstein, Satoshi Kinoshita, Tsutomu Kono, Ellis Krauss, Yoko Nishimura, Kazuo Ogawa, TJ Pempel, Karl Schoenberger, Scott Snyder, Shinji Yamashita. Staff: Mary Byrne McDonnell, Frank Baldwin, Sheri Ranis, Fumika Mori.

Collective Memory in the Southern Cone of Latin America

With a November 15-17, 1998 workshop on “Collective Memory of Repression: Comparative Perspectives on Democratization Processes in Latin America’s Southern Cone,” the Regional Advisory Panel (RAP) for Latin America launched a multi-year program of research and training. Held at the Centro Latinoamericano de Economia Humana (CLAEH) in Montevideo, Uruguay with funds from the Ford Foundation, the workshop reviewed the state of the field. Its goal was to identify substantive and methodological issues that merit priority in activities designed to train junior researchers working on collective memory.

Nearly two dozen researchers analyzed a series of commissioned papers and discussed the curriculum for the training component of the program, which is being coordinated by Elizabeth Jelin of the University of Buenos Aires, a member of the RAP.

A selection committee met prior to the meeting to review applications from an initial cohort of program fellows. More than 75 applications were received from junior researchers based in Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Paraguay and Uruguay, and from doctoral candidates at universities in the US. The 15 Latin American fellows chosen represent a broad spectrum of disciplines, including law, journalism, sociology, anthropology, political science and social psychology. In addition to taking part in two intensive training workshops, one in March and another in December 1999, Latin American fellows will receive stipends to enable them to carry out field work as part of a collaborative regional research team analyzing social conflicts over contemporary efforts to commemorate experiences of repression. They will be joined by four US-based fellows, who received support to conduct field work on memory-related dissertation work on Chile, Uruguay, Brazil and Argentina.

A second cohort of fellows will be selected later this year to carry out research and receive training during the year 2000.

Information for prospective applicants, as well as more detailed information about the program, is available elsewhere in this issue [see p. 9], and on the SSRC Latin America page.
Participants: Hugo Achugar, Universidad de la República, Montevideo, Uruguay; Line Barea, Centro de Documentación y Estudios (CDE), Asunción, Paraguay; Louis Bickford, Ford Foundation, Santiago, Chile; Alfredo Boccia Paz, Asunción, Paraguay; Gerardo Caetano, CLAEH, Montevideo, Uruguay; Carlos Ivan Degregori, Instituto de Estudios Peruanos (IEP), Lima, Peru; Paul Drake, University of California, San Diego; Silvia Duténi, Instituto Mora, Mexico City, Mexico; Eric Hershberg, SSRC; Katherine Roberts Hite, Vassar College; Elizabeth Jelin, IDES, Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina; Susana Kaufman, Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina; Norbert Lechner, United Nations Development Program, Santiago, Chile; Leigh Payne, University of Wisconsin, Madison; Alessandro Portelli, Dipartimento de Anglistica, Università di Roma, Italy; Graciela Sapriza, Montevideo, Uruguay; Dora Schwartzstein, Facultad de Filosofía y Letras Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina; Catalina Smulovitz, Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina; Steve Stern, University of Wisconsin, Madison; Teresa Valdés, Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales (FLACSO), Santiago, Chile; Marcelo Viñar, Montevideo, Uruguay; Maren Ulriksen, Montevideo, Uruguay; Alexander Wilde, Ford Foundation, Santiago, Chile.

Forced Migration and Human Rights

The International Migration Program has received $450,000 from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation for a project on Forced Migration and Human Rights. The project will employ a human rights framework to facilitate collaborative research by teams consisting of practitioners from nongovernmental organizations and social scientists. They will explore a number of issues related to the causes of forced migration and the protection of forced migrants, particularly in Africa.

Ethnic Customs, Assimilation and American Law

The Working Group on Ethnic Customs, Assimilation and American Law of the Program on Culture, Health and Human Development at its first meeting at Stanford University on November 6-8, 1998, examined a wide range of issues. For example, in a session on “Assimilation and the Harvard Immigration Project” (led by Marcelo Suarez-Orosco), participants discussed how current patterns of immigration to the US are creating increasingly multicultural communities as well as such topics as return migration and the relationship between cosmopolitan elites and lower- and underclass segments of immigrant groups.

A session on “Perspectives on Female Coming-of-Age Ceremonies” (led by Corrine Kratz) explored the tension between respect for plural practices and the legal protection of groups on the one hand, and concern for individual human rights on the other. A related discussion of “Cases of Norm Conflict” (led by Alison Dundes-Renteln) focused on the response of child protection agencies and the legal system in the US to family practices that are considered problematic. Since some of these cases have received extensive coverage in the media, the ways in which the issues, and thus different segments of the community, are presented and represented was also considered.

Finally, in a session on “First Amendment Perspectives on the Free Exercise of Culture” (led by Arthur Eisenberg) the participants questioned whether conscientious behavior that is not explicitly or conventionally religious might be protected under the First Amendment of the US Constitution. On the basis of their research and experiences in a range of settings, the participants concluded that, at least in the US, conflict between diverse family practices and social institutions is frequent and widespread.

Since such discussions (and those that will take place at two more meetings in 1999) are directed toward the preparation of two prospective issues of *Daedalus* devoted to the Working Group’s agenda, the participants also considered the possible organization of the issues. Among other things, this involves the question of how to integrate international, comparative analyses into the group’s deliberations and research.

Participants: Caroline Bledsoe (Northwestern University); Josh DeWind (SSRC); Arthur Eisenberg (New York Civil Liberties Union); Phoebe Ellsworth (University of Michigan); Stephen Graubard (American Academy of Arts and Sciences); Corinne Kratz (Emory University); Hazel Markus (Stanford University, Cochair); Martha Minow (Harvard University, Cochair); Richard Nisbett (University of Michigan); Alison Dundes Renteln (University of Southern California); Austin Sarat (Amherst College); Bradd Shore (Emory University); Richard Shweder (University of Chicago, Cochair); Marcelo Suarez-Orosco (Harvard University).

Staff: Frank Kessel.

Sexuality Research Fellowship Program Fellows’ Conference

The Sexuality Research Fellowship Program (SRFP) held its 1998 fellows’ conference on November 5-10, 1998 at San Francisco State University in conjunction with the “Kinsey at 50” conference hosted by SFSU’s Human Sexuality Studies Program. The fellows’ conference...
was attended by all 1998 SRFP fellows, selected 1997 fellows, members of the SRFP selection committee, SRFP staff and guest speakers. The conference provided an opportunity for the fellows to form productive alliances with each other, discuss their work in progress and gain a greater understanding of important research issues. The conference consisted of formal presentations, large and small group discussions, and one-on-one “conversations.”

Formal presentations were made on the following topics: the policy relevance of sexuality research, media issues, methodological concerns and issues of researcher identity. The group had the opportunity to address fellows’ plans for outreach and dissemination activities and to discuss such topics as preliminary research findings, obstacles or difficulties encountered and the ethical issues of their research. One lunchtime session included small group discussions, each led by one of the former fellows in attendance, who provided recommendations and other useful information for those beginning a fellowship tenure.

The “Kinsey at 50” conference, attended by the SRFP fellows as well as other researchers and scholars working in the field of sexuality research, focused the influence of Alfred Kinsey’s work on American society, 50 years after the publication of his first research. Both conferences provided useful opportunities for networking and learning more about what it means to be a “sexuality researcher.”

**Bio-Behavioral-Social Perspectives on Health**

The Council’s collaborative project with the NIH Office of Behavioral and Social Sciences Research (OBSSR) received major impetus from the first meeting of its Co-Ordinating Group (COG), held at the SSRC on February 5, 1999. Given the project’s focus on the conditions that foster integrative interdisciplinary research on health, the agenda was comprised of three primary parts: First, the COG finalized the titles and scope of the project’s broad topical domains; in a related step, provisional decisions were made on the titles and substance of the case studies on integrative research that form the heart of the endeavor (along with agreement on the potential author-analysts for each study). Second, discussions served to sharpen and deepen the analytical framework, i.e., the issues and questions that will frame all the case studies. And third, the COG prepared a work plan and schedule.

The project will include five topical domains, each directed by a member of the Co-Ordinating Group: “Aging and the Life Course: In Search of Methuselah” (Linda Waite); “Impact of the Social World on Cardiovascular Health and Disease: Home Is Where the Heart Is” (John Cacioppo); “Affective/Cognitive Neuroscience and Health: Mind Matters” (Richard Davidson); “Positive Health: Mapping the Biology of Human Flourishing” (Carol Ryff); “Prevention and Management of HIV/AIDS: A Tale of Two Cities” (Neil Schneiderman). The domains’ case studies (two or three in each) will soon be chosen, along with their associated authors, and the studies themselves launched in the spring.

Participants: Norman Anderson (OBSSR); John Cacioppo (Ohio State University); Virginia Cain (OBSSR); Richard Davidson (University of Wisconsin, Madison); Patricia Rosenfield (Carnegie Corporation, Co-Ordinating Group Chair); John W. Rowe (Mount Sinai-NYU Medical Center); Carol Ryff (University of Wisconsin, Madison); Neil Schneiderman (University of Miami); Linda Waite (University of Chicago, NORC Center on Aging). Staff: Frank Kessel.

**Pledges of Aid**

“Pledges of Aid: Multilateral Donors and Support for Post-War Reconstruction and Systematic Transformation,” a project implemented jointly by the SSRC and the Center on International Cooperation (CIC) at New York University (NYU), has recently concluded with two major conferences. The project, supported by the Ford Foundation, centered on an analysis of the pledges of billions of dollars by the international donor community to countries emerging from violent conflict and/or undergoing political and economic transformation. Through grants, loans and other instruments, multilateral institutions and UN member states have supported war-torn and transitional societies to demobilize military forces, restore essential services, rebuild infrastructures, reform political and economic institutions and embrace structural adjustment and privatization of economic activity. Good intentions notwithstanding, there have in many cases been repeated
delays and recurrent gaps in aid disbursement, serious coordination problems among donors and evidence of limited absorptive capacity and the politicization of aid within recipient countries.

The project sought both to explain these problems and to offer policy recommendations through a comparative study of six recent cases: Cambodia, El Salvador, Bosnia, Mozambique, the Palestinian-Administered Territories (West Bank and Gaza) and South Africa. SSRC and CIC convened pairs of researchers from both donor and recipient states to produce in-depth reports that featured a shared methodology and set of questions concerning aid delivery, coordination and implementation. After a planning meeting (in September 1997) and an interim meeting (in May 1998) of the research teams and an advisory panel of scholars, practitioners and policymakers, the results of the case studies were presented at a conference at NYU on November 13-14, 1998, entitled “Investing in Peace: Donor Support for Post-Conflict Reconstruction and Transition.”

Several factors were identified as central to aid flow problems and variation in outcomes: the role of a lead donor in mobilizing assistance and negotiating with recipient country governments; the differences in donor organizations’ mandates, policies, ideologies and institutional structures and processes that often lead to sub-optimal cooperation; the uses of conditionalities on aid; and the political conflicts within donor countries that were occasionally eased but often exacerbated by struggles over access to aid flows.

From February 1-5, 1999, the results of the project were presented to representatives of a wide range of donor institutions at the conference “Underwriting and Coordinating Post-Conflict Recovery” at the Rockefeller Foundation’s Bellagio Conference Center in Bellagio, Italy (also supported by a grant to the CIC from the United States Institute of Peace). The conference featured frank discussion and reflection on obstacles to more effective collective action among donors, and between them and recipient country governments and nongovernmental organizations. Better tracking of aid pledges and disbursements, improved cooperation among donor agencies, deeper engagement with a wide range of voices within transition countries and more analytical attention paid to the politics of aid (including the conditions placed upon it) were highlighted at the meeting. There was basic agreement that the international community’s understanding of what is called the “triple transition” to peace, democracy and economic development is limited, and that policy can be better informed, improved and coordinated through comparative evaluation of past successes and failures.

Two publications are currently being prepared based on the activities of the “Pledges of Aid” project. CIC staff Shepard Forman and Stewart Patrick are editing a volume, entitled Good Intentions: Pledges of Aid For Post-Conflict Recovery, that will include the six case studies as well as an overview chapter by Patrick and con-
tional consortia. These efforts reflect a shared commitment to the reproduction of social scientific expertise in Latin America, and typically emerge from a deep preoccupation with the impact of institutional crisis on the capacity of training programs in the region to provide students with the analytical and methodological skills needed to carry out high quality social scientific research. Concern about these issues has shaped the content of several programs developed in recent years under Council auspices. However, the absence to date of any opportunity to share experiences across fields, countries and sponsoring institutions—and thus to better understand which approaches seem most promising for future initiatives at the Council and elsewhere—led the Regional Advisory Panel (RAP) for Latin America to convene this meeting, in collaboration with the Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales (FLACSO-Costa Rica), which has played a leading role in addressing advanced training needs in Central America.

Participants: Manuel Contreras, Maestrias para el Desarrollo, Universidad Catolica, Bolivia; Carlos Ivan Degregori, Instituto de Estudios Peruanos, Peru; Magdalena Leon, Universidad Nacional, Colombia; Orlandina De Oliveira, Colegio de Mexico, Mexico; Norman Girvan, Consortium Graduate School, University of the West Indies, Jamaica; Elizabeth Jelin, Universidad de Buenos Aires; Moacir Palmeira, Museu Antropologico, Brazil; Juan Pablo Pérez Sáinz, FLACSO-Costa Rica, Costa Rica.

Call for Book Donations to Cuban Institutions

The ACLS/SSRC Working Group on Cuba welcomes donations of current scholarly literature in a number of academic fields, and with assistance from the Academy of Sciences of Cuba, will facilitate delivery of donations to appropriate research institutions on the island. If you are interested in making a book or journal donation, please contact staff at cuba@ssrc.org.

Transitions and Futures in Southeast Asia

A workshop on “Transitions and Futures in Southeast Asia” was held in Cebu City, Philippines, February 3-4, 1999. This was the second in a series of workshops sponsored by the Southeast Asia Regional Advisory Panel (RAP) which seek to provide a forum for public intellectuals from across the region. Feeling that the series of crises that had devastated the region in the last year had led to a crisis of the imagination or, put less grandly, a difficulty in thinking beyond crisis-management, the workshop’s organizers chose the self-consciously utopian and fantasist project of the articulation of Southeast Asian “futures.” As they stated, this project sought to “air and critically imagine futures—from the most pedestrian and literal to the most utopian and seemingly far fetched . . . (But while) futures can depend on technology, can refer to art, can insist upon convergence, and only see difference . . . let us not read ‘future’ as ‘prediction’.”

A sample of the papers presented are likely to be published by Kasarinlan, the quarterly journal of the Third World Studies Center, Manila.

Participants were drawn from across Southeast Asia and included:

- Arief Budiman (University of Melbourne), Tun Aung Chain (Universities Research Center), Janadas Devan (Straits Times, Singapore), Maria S. Diodono (University of Philippines, Diliman), Francisco Nemenzo (University of Philippines, Diliman), Nirmala Purushotam (National University of Singapore), Joel Rocamora (Institute for Popular Democracy) as well as members of the Regional Advisory Panel, Leonard Andaya (University of Hawaii, Manoa), K. S. Jomo (University of Malaya), Resil Mojares (University of San Carlos), Craig Reynolds (Australian National University), Takashi Shiraishi (Kyoto University), Anna Tsing (University of California, Santa Cruz), and Diana Wong (Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia).

Russian Faculty Development Seminar

The Eurasia Program, with a grant from the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, sponsored a Social Science Seminar for Russian curriculum development from March 13-16 in Korolyov, Russia, just outside Moscow. The Eurasia Regional Advisory Panel (RAP), which organized the event, hoped to meet the need of Russian faculty for new curriculums by engaging in historically rich discussions of key theoretical paradigms in the West and how they impact on issues of transition. The seminar focused on developments in the two disciplines—political science and sociology—that were particularly isolated from Western scholarly developments, with an emphasis on political and economic sociology. It gathered Russian scholars and faculty to exchange experiences with one another and with several US colleagues.

Russian scholars in these disciplines now face demands to
deliver practical help in the transition process as well as to update their academic teaching. In order to address these needs, US scholars examined the intellectual history of their fields, debating crucial paradigms within sociology and political science. Victor Nee (Cornell University) and Neil Fligstein (University of California, Berkeley) compared the “new institutionalism” to more historical, constructivist institutional approaches. Ronald Suny (University of Chicago) lectured on Marxisms and agency theory, and Philippe Schmitter (Stanford University) raised the issue of “transitology” as a viable, distinct analytical approach. The US scholars then presented key western theoretical arguments on transition issues. Andrew Arato of the New School for Social Research discussed the role of civil society, Mitchell Abolafia (State University of New York, Albany) spoke on markets as culture, Mr. Suny talked about nationalism and Mr. Schmitter addressed democratization.

At each juncture, Russian scholars offered criticisms and shared their own distinct approaches to these issues. Russian participants included Tatiana Alekseivaia (Moscow State Institute for International Relations), Leokadia Drobizheva (Institute of Ethnography and Anthropology), Alexander Filippov (Moscow School of Social and Economic Science), Vladimir Gellman (European University, Russian Federation), Mikhail Ilyin (Russian Political Science Association), Leonid Ionin (Higher School of Economics), Antoni Kaminski (Institute of Political Science, Poland), Yaroslav Kyzminov (rector, Higher School of Economics, Russian Federation), Olga M. Maslova (Institute of Sociology), Andrei Melville (Moscow State Institute for International Relations), Vadim Radaev (Institute of Economics), Ovsey Shkaratan (Higher School of Economics and Sociology) and Alexander Soloviev (Moscow State University). A plenary session on publishing in Russia presented editors of journals and publishing houses, including Alexander Livergant, Open Society Institute, Alexei Salmin, Politeia, Leonid Shipov, Aspect Press, Andrei Sorokin, Russian Political Encyclopedia, Jean Toschenko, Sociis (Sociological Studies), and Oleg Zimarin, Ves’Mir. Representatives of various foundations in Russia also attended.

The ultimate aim of the seminar is to help narrow the divide in approaches to the common and crucial social and political issues the US scholars share with their Russian counterparts.

Staff: Judith Sedaitis, Jessica Olsen.
Recent Council Publications


What is crime? Who are criminals? In whose eyes and under what conditions of looking do crimes and criminals appear? The essays in this volume emerged from a conference entitled, “Crime and Punishment: Criminality in Southeast Asia,” held on March 20-22, 1997 at the Center for Asian Studies in Amsterdam under the joint sponsorship of the SSRC and the International Institute for Asian Studies. In this volume, editor and conference organizer Vicente L. Rafael has put together a number of essays that discuss the notion of the criminal within a variety of historical and national contexts.

The essays engage the relationship between criminality and the law in relation to state formation, nationalist thought, ethnic identity and contending notions of power. They offer ways to think about criminality comparatively less as a settled object of investigation than as an unsettling presence of figures—the jago, the preman, the bandit, the “Chinese,” the “foreigner,” the criminal of kriminalitas, subversive writers and others—that accompany the emergence of modernity in the Southeast Asian region. Notions of criminality can shift as bandits become national heroes and police become murderers.


*Studying Native America* addresses for the first time in a comprehensive way the place of Native American studies in the university curriculum. The book’s 13 contributors and editor Russell Thornton emphasize the incompatibility of traditional academic teaching methods with the social and cultural concerns that gave rise to the field of Native American studies. Beginning with the intellectual and institutional history of the field, the book examines its literature, language, historical narratives and ties to other disciplines. It considers what Native American studies has been, what it is and what it may be in the future.


Examining a century of American experience, *The Politics of Strategic Adjustment* illustrates how the United States chooses its security policies. While scholars have typically focused on international pressures and opportunities, this book shows that decisions about grand strategy are critically shaped by domestic politics—political ideologies, state structure and societal interests. At a time when America’s security needs and goals are changing rapidly, this book offers policymakers and scholars of international affairs new critical models for understanding the complex reality of security policy.


This volume emerged from a conference sponsored by a number of organizations including the Social Science Research Council and the Joint Committee on Eastern Europe of the American Council of Learned Societies and the Social Science Research Council.

The ethnographies it collects offer a surprising and compelling picture of change in Russia and Eastern Europe. Looking at the everyday processes by which individuals and groups forge new lives, the authors challenge the idea that we can understand this transformation by the predictable models—whether capitalism, postsocialism, modernity or postmodernity.
The collection brings together a wide-ranging group of authors from sociology, anthropology and political science to reveal the complex relationships that still exist between the former socialist world and the world today. Through evocative ethnographic research and writing, they bring to light the unintended consequences of change and show how the “slates” of the past enter the present not as legacies but as novel adaptations. Often what appear as “restorations” of patterns familiar from socialism are something quite different: direct responses to the new market initiatives. By showing the unexpected ways in which these new patterns are emerging, this book charts a new and important course for the study of postsocialist transition.

**Staff Publications**


In November 1998, *The Making of the Indian Atomic Bomb: Science, Secrecy and the Post-colonial State* by Itty Abraham was published by St. Martin’s Press. This book is the first historical account of the development of India’s nuclear program.

Mr. Abraham, the program director for the Council’s South Asia and Southeast Asia programs, argues that—contrary to orthodox interpretations—the atomic explosions in May 1998 had nothing to do with national security as conventionally understood. Rather they had everything to do with establishing the legitimacy of the independent nation state. Mr. Abraham demonstrates the links between the two apparently separate discourses of national security and national development.

*We Were So Beloved: Autobiography of a German Jewish Community* by Gloria DeVidas Kirchheimer and Manfred Kirchheimer was published in November 1997 by the University of Pittsburgh Press. The book, an oral history of the flight of some 20,000 German Jews to Washington Heights in New York City during the Nazi era, draws on interviews with several dozen people. The interviews, some of which were used in Mr. Kirchheimer’s movie of the same name, are reproduced in fuller form and edited and annotated by Ms. Kirchheimer, the Council’s former editor.

Jean Bethke Elshtain called the book “the story of a unique group of Americans whose way of life is here lovingly and lavishly recalled.”
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