



Centerpiece

The Center's Web address is: <http://www.wcfia.harvard.edu>

© 2005 President and Fellows of Harvard College

Newsletter of the Weatherhead Center for International Affairs at Harvard University • Volume 19 and 20 • Numbers 3 and 4 • Winter/Spring 2005

FROM THE DIRECTOR

Canada may be the single most important country for the United States; it is surely among the least studied in the United States. For nearly four decades, however, the Weatherhead Center for International Affairs has helped to counter that inattention. Research and teaching about Canada has long been a fundamental task within the Weatherhead Center, which has been home to Harvard University's program on the study of Canada.

On May 1, 1967, the Harvard Corporation voted to establish the William Lyon Mackenzie King Professorship of Canadian Studies with funds from U.S. and Canadian business firms through the Canada Council, and thanks to the leadership of David Rockefeller. The establishment of the chair sought to honor Canada's prime minister during World War II and his important contributions to the U.S.-Canadian alliance to defend North America and win that war. The terms of the endowment make it clear that "the income [is] only to be used for the support" of Canadian studies at Harvard.

The Center for International Affairs, founded nine years earlier, was given stewardship of the chair and proceeded to use the funds to sponsor visiting professors. In 1978, Harvard University President Derek Bok appointed a review committee to examine effective uses of this endowment. The committee, chaired by Professor A. Michael Spence, himself born in Canada, recommended that the program of visiting professors be institutionalized. In 1984, Spence became Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences and appointed a committee to make a permanent appointment to this professorship. This effort did not prosper and, instead, in 1989 Dean Spence confirmed that the Mackenzie King Professorship would remain one of four (now five) endowed professorships within the orbit of the Center for International Affairs; the Center retained responsibility for stewardship and continued with visiting appointments.



Pictured here at the Harvard Academy's first alumni conference (see pg. 9) are the three chairmen for the Harvard Academy for International and Area Studies to date: Henry Rosovsky (1986-1996), Jorge I. Domínguez (2004-present), and Samuel Huntington (1996-2004).

Upon becoming the Center's acting director in January 1994, I held two views with regard to the stewardship of the chair. First, it seemed right to launch a renewed effort to make a permanent appointment. Second, in the interim it also seemed right to invite more departments at Harvard University to co-host the visiting professors; the Departments of Economics and, especially, of Government had exercised a near duopoly on appointments. Although it is understandable that these two departments play a leading role in the stewardship of the chair, it should not be to the exclusion of other units engaged in research and study on Canada.

For various and at times odd reasons, our attempt to make the Mackenzie King Professorship a permanent Harvard University appointment did not succeed, despite considerable and sustained efforts. My disappointment lessened, however, when two years ago I asked for advice from a number of Canadian scholars. Many indicated that they thought it preferable for the chair to rotate among academic departments, for that would make it possible for a wider variety of people, disciplines,

Continued page 2

INSIDE

Ethno-racism and the Transformation of Collective Identities

Michèle Lamont

3

Not in My Back Yard: How State Agencies Handle Conflict with Civil Society

Daniel P. Aldrich

4

Settling Accounts? Truth, Justice and Redress in Post-Conflict Societies

Kimberly Theidon

6

Of Note

7

Measuring Identity as a Variable

Rose McDermott

8

Harvard Academy Alumni Conference

9

New Books

10

WCFA's New Home

12

From the Director ...

perspectives, and substantive considerations to benefit from this endowment. Some noted that the chair is held as a genuine mark of distinction among Canadian scholars. Perhaps, I began to think, we had been fortunate in *not* making a permanent appointment.

We did succeed at diversifying the participation of more Harvard units and, in so doing, met the high standards that our Canadian colleagues want the chair to uphold. Consider the eminence and variety represented by those who have honored Harvard and the Center with their presence during the past decade, or who have agreed to join us soon:

John F. Helliwell, Economics, 1991-94, 1995-96

Richard Johnston, Political Science, 1994-95

Marsha Chandler, Political Science, 1995-96

Raymond Breton, Sociology, 1996-97

Richard Simeon, Political Science, 1998, 2006-07

Joy Parr, History, 1999

Pierre Martin, Political Science, 1999-2000

Jeffrey G. Reitz, Sociology, 2000-01

Angelo Melino, Economics, 2001-02

Robert Vipond, Political Science, 2002-03

Rosemary J. Coombe,
Social Anthropology, 2003-04

Kerry Rittich, Law, 2004

Randall Morck, Economics, 2005

Laurier Turgeon, History, 2006

In time, the “chair” became more like a “living room” for the broad and multi-disciplinary study of Canadian social, cultural, economic, and political issues in their domestic, international, and inter-societal dimensions, thereby enhancing knowledge about a U.S. neighbor and ally, and its largest trading partner. The Mackenzie King Professor has regularly hosted a non-curricular Canada Seminar that invites public figures, scholars, artists, and experts from various fields and provides a forum for the lively exchange of ideas on a wide range of issues. The Weatherhead Center and the University have thus welcomed Prime Ministers Pierre Trudeau, Brian Mulroney, and Jean Chrétien. Prime Minister Kim Campbell served also for several years on the Weatherhead Center’s Visiting Committee.

The Mackenzie King Professors over the years have also organized an array of scholarly conferences to advance the frontiers of knowledge on many issues. Each Mackenzie King Professor can craft one or two such conferences, which have led often to many articles and books, singly or jointly authored.

The Weatherhead Center relies on various

procedures to oversee the management of this endowment. In December 2003, the Center’s Executive Committee voted to establish a formal William Lyon Mackenzie King Program of Canadian Studies to demonstrate that the endowment supported a variety of activities—not just a visiting professor—every year. The Center Director has also performed “double duty” as the Canada Program Director. The faculty committee for the Canada Program includes Professors Timothy Colton, Peter Hall, A. Iain Johnston, Michèle Lamont, and the Center Director *ex officio*. This committee vets all potential Mackenzie King Professorial appointments and makes recommendations to the Weatherhead Center’s Executive Committee, which formally votes on each appointment as a recommendation forwarded to the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. Mackenzie King Professors are formally appointed to Harvard departments where they teach courses. Moreover, the Executive Committee’s subcommittee for the peer review of all conference proposals (a.k.a. the Steering Committee) assesses all Canada conference or workshop proposals, advising the Center Director.

For decades the activities of the Canada Program’s have served well the teaching mission of the University: to engage students at both the graduate and undergraduate levels, faculty from all disciplines, and many from the wider Harvard community and the Boston metropolitan area. The courses and the non-curricular seminars have also served the interests of Harvard’s numerous Canadian citizens among faculty, students, and staff. And in 2003-04, Professor Rosemary Coombe co-taught her Harvard course with York University, engaging students on both campuses.

In addition, the Weatherhead Center’s Fellows Program has for years counted a Canadian diplomat among its members to enrich and supplement discussions about Canada. The Fellows Program ordinarily begins the academic year with a visit to Canada to alert its members to the different experiences of the peoples of North America.

Through the creativity and leadership of the visiting professors, the engagement of many Harvard faculty, Fellows, and students, and in recent years the extraordinarily capable support of Canada Program Coordinator Helen Clayton, intellectual life at Harvard has been enriched by the Canada Program. Although orphaned at times, in the long term the Canada Program has been enormously successful in fostering scholarship and learning about issues of wide interest, salience, and common concern. The Mackenzie King Program, which may be the largest endowed Canadian studies program in the United States and Harvard’s most multi-disciplinary

Ethno-racism and the Transformation of Collective Identities

by Michèle Lamont

“Ethno-racism and the Transformation of Collective Identities” was the theme of a conference supported by the Weatherhead Center in January 2005. The workshop brought together an international group of social scientists that is in the process of developing a collective project aimed at comparing the de-stigmatization strategies of “negros” in Brazil, Francophone Québécois in Canada, Catholics in Northern Ireland, Palestinian citizens of Israel, and African-Americans. Drawing on 400 in-depth interviews in Belfast, Montréal, Rio de Janeiro, Tel Aviv/Jaffa, and Philadelphia, this project will analyze how members of stigmatized groups work toward the transformation of their collective identity. It will compare individuals in their late teens and early twenties with individuals in their fifties—as well as people from both the middle and working classes—to examine the cultural frameworks mobilized to challenge group stereotypes.

This project will examine how different frameworks help individuals navigate conflict and the challenges of cultural conformity and assimilation. It is also concerned with the dynamics of human behavior, which ties mental processes with processes of social change at the individual and collective levels. Research shows that racism and perceived discrimination have negative effects on a range of health outcomes. The way in which groups interpret and confront exclusion is a key intervening factor in how that social reality is experienced by individuals and expressed in their mental and physical health. Understanding these interpretive schemas is essential to developing a better understanding of the conditions that generate more successful societies.

This project will open new directions for the study of antiracism that, to date, has been mostly philosophical and normative, or focused on politics and social movements. Considering everyday de-stigmatization strategies is essential to understanding changes in the dynamics between ethnic and racial groups. The research group plans to inventory

available strategies and to consider how these strategies vary with the degree of permeability of group boundaries; when the inter-group boundaries (e.g., in Israel and Ireland versus Québec and Brazil) are less permeable, the range of de-stigmatization strategies used is wider.

Once the range of de-stigmatization strategies has been documented, the research group will develop hypotheses concerning how various discursive and behavioral strategies meant to cope with stereotypes and discrimination are correlated with mental health status. Several hypotheses are appealing. One such hypothesis is that individuals who challenge stereotypes more actively and affirm the value of their group identity are less likely than others to be at risk of experiencing mental health problems. However, under certain circumstances, it is possible that “exit” is a more effective strategy than “voice” (to borrow Albert Hirschman’s categories); i.e., avoiding confrontation over stereotypes will result in better health outcomes, especially when group boundaries are strongly (and violently) policed and permanent.

Many other directions for analysis will emerge as the research group learns more about how members of stigmatized groups think about the challenge of transforming their collective identity and negotiate new rules of interaction. To give only a few examples, the research group anticipates developing hypotheses concerning: 1) the interplay between the repertoires of widely available representations of “we-ness,” personal psychology, structural context (resource distributions, existing laws and other rules), and strategic context (what others are doing or expected to do); 2) the contexts in which leading members of stigmatized groups disconfirm or celebrate their differences, adopt individual (distancing) or collective (mobilizing) de-stigmatization strategies, or deploy more agency in engaging in struggles about the meaning attributed to their collective identity; 3) the impact of prominent transnational discourses

Michèle Lamont became a professor of sociology at Harvard University in February 2003. She has published widely in the fields of cultural sociology, inequality, race and immigration, comparative sociology, the sociology of knowledge, and contemporary sociological theory. Her most recent book, *The Dignity of Working Men: Morality and the Boundaries of Race, Class, and Immigration* (Harvard University Press and Russell Sage Foundation, 2000; French translation 2002, *Presses de Science Po, Paris*), won the 2000 C. Wright Mills Award from the Society for the Study of Social Problems and the 2001 Mattei Dogan Award for the Best Comparativist Book, Society for Comparative Research. Professor Lamont is a faculty associate of the Weatherhead Center for

Continued page 7

Not in My Back Yard:

HOW STATE AGENCIES HANDLE CONFLICT WITH CIVIL SOCIETY

By Daniel P. Aldrich

Daniel P. Aldrich is an assistant professor of Political Science at Tulane University. He received his Ph.D. from Harvard University in Political Science, and was a Graduate Student Associate of the Weatherhead Center. He has published articles in Comparative Politics, Political Psychology, the Asian Journal of Political Science, and the Journal of East Asian Affairs, and has a chapter forthcoming in the book Managing Facility Siting edited by S. Hayden Lesbirel and Daigee Shaw.

Bombs explode in the offices of governmental authorities. Molotov cocktails are tossed at police stations, guardhouses, and riot police. Masked attackers assault the chairmen of political committees. These violent incidents are not taking place in the Sunni Triangle within Iraq, or in zones near the border of Afghanistan; they are typical reactions from local communities around the world that have been chosen by the state for construction of controversial facilities. Projects that generate “Not In My Back Yard,” or NIMBY, responses include nuclear power plants, bioterrorism laboratories, airports, and even hospices. The manner in which state governments react to civil society’s protest against the local siting of controversial facilities, or “public bads,” is a critical and poorly-understood issue.

The governments in three advanced industrial nations—Japan, France, and the United States—utilize various methods to prevent or manage communal resistance to controversial facilities. During two and a half years of fieldwork in Japan and in France, I gathered archival data and interviewed over 100 bureaucrats, politicians, anti-project activists, and local citizens. I investigated two stages of the implementation of government policies. First, I analyzed the strategic decisions that underlie where governments decided to locate these public bads. Why are certain locations selected for the development of public bads? (One can appreciate why Yucca Mountain, Nevada, was selected as the long-term repository for nuclear waste.) Second, I illuminated how bureaucracies responded to the almost inevitable contestation that arises even from the best-sited nuclear power plants, dams, and airports.

Much recent literature accuses governments and private developers of environmental racism, which occurs when authorities place unwanted projects like waste dumps and incinerators in areas with higher populations of racial and ethnic minorities. Proponents of this theory claim that authorities do not site these facilities at random, nor do they utilize neutral geographic or geologic criteria such as proximity to groundwater or strong, stable bedrock that can withstand earthquakes. Rather, controversial facilities are placed in com-



munities with more minorities (people of color in America, or Koreans and *burakumin* in Japan). I agree that when it comes to locating controversial facilities, state planners do not base their decisions on purely technocratic variables. I would argue, however, that state agencies use a political logic in siting them and place these facilities in locations with the lowest resistance.

I analyzed the decisions made by Japanese bureaucrats to build or not build airports, dams, and nuclear power plants in approximately 500 towns in Japan during the postwar period. Authorities select communities that display a long-term decrease in the numbers of residents who are more likely to resist such projects (farmers and fishermen), and those localities that have experienced a rapid population increase. These two variables signal to state planners that such communities might serve as easy targets for siting attempts because of the citizens’ limited ability to organize effectively. Areas proven vulnerable (or cooperative) in initial siting attempts are likely to have not one, but multiple, public bads in their backyard.

Once authorities have decided where to locate NIMBY projects, they must also decide how (if at all) to respond to the almost inevitable opposition from civil society that accompanies even the best-sited facilities. While a majority of the local residents may seem to be in favor of siting a controversial facility, a small yet vocal minority might sabotage the attempt to actually construct the facility. Some governments either completely ignore

community protest or rely on coercive tools like expropriation and police suppression. Other states try to educate the local residents in an attempt to change their opinions, or structure the venue for protest. Research demonstrates that state agencies that encounter widespread opposition and have a longer time horizon are more likely to use preference-altering policy tools. These include programs like educational curricula for local students, visits from scientists who speak of the safety and necessity of such projects, and awards ceremonies for cooperative local officials. Policy instruments that seek to structure the venue and thereby make resistance more difficult include closing licensing procedures to outsiders and restricting access to information about these controversial facilities. Coercion-based tools, which make full use of the state's monopoly on force, include the expropriation of land through procedures of eminent domain and the arrest and surveillance of activists and leaders.

State responses to civil society protests, some have argued, are dictated by cultural norms; different agencies within the same nation would handle similar problems in similar ways. This assumption is false. In Japan, for example, the Ministries of International Trade and Industry (MITI), Construction, and Transportation handle the siting of nuclear power plants, dams, and airports, respectively. These three central government agencies recruit from similar elite universities, provide jobs in related sectors upon retirement from the civil service, and have enormous budgets to carry out their activities. However, the strategies used in handling citizen resistance vary dramatically across ministries.

The Ministry of International Trade and Industry avoided implementation of coercive methods in its management of anti-nuclear plant opposition. Although it was legally empowered to confiscate privately-held lands from citizens, MITI never exercised this right. Rather, it created and improved a broad array of preference-altering tools. For example, farmers and fishermen expressed concerns about the possibility of not being able to sell their goods in markets because consumers would think that their crops and fish were contaminated. The Ministry responded by sponsoring an annual exposition in which these groups could sell their goods to more than 100,000 consumers in the Tokyo metropolitan area. In contrast to the perceived fear of "nuclear blight," the government guaranteed these local citizens a market where they could sell their goods for profit. Similarly, when local mayors and governors rescinded their initial agreements to site nuclear power plants, the state flew them to Tokyo for training in the field of nuclear power. The state provided not only technical details about nuclear reactor operations but also a chance for local politi-

cians in "failed" siting attempts to explain what had gone wrong, suggesting new tactics for the future.

The Ministry of Transportation took a different tack in handling anti-airport opposition; it regularly relied on expropriation and police suppression to handle the occasionally acute, but often short-lived, protests from local citizens. (For example, the infamous Narita Airport siting case featured thousands of anti-riot police engaged in a melee with thousands of anti-airport protestors.) Bureaucrats within the Ministry of Construction who encountered an enduring opposition to a dam siting also used expropriation but added tactics of subsidies and grants to induce cooperation in local communities slated for dams.

The manner in which state agencies handle conflict over public bads is linked to the larger issue of the co-evolution of state and civil society. Many social scientists describe the state as a static monolith that engages in "holding patterns" against more agile and adaptive citizens' movements and contentious political groups. My research demonstrates that under certain circumstances state agencies are flexible and adaptive. When citizens employ new strategies and tactics—such as filing lawsuits to delay the siting process—a responsive state will develop counterstrategies such as the shutting of licensing procedures to "outsiders" to keep the lawsuits from being effective. Or, when disruptive civil protests occur, the state might avoid the use of force to deny the protestors any media coverage. Rather than imagining democracies as fixed constellations of unchanging institutions, we should begin to imagine state agencies as flexible and adaptable, able to change not only their policies but also their institutional structures to keep up with citizen challengers.

Democratic theorists and political scientists that subscribe to the pluralist camp believe that citizen preferences—that is, the interests and needs of people within the society—compel governments to create programs that serve their needs. Much of the literature on welfare states illuminates how wars, which create new populations of wounded veterans, widows, and orphans, are often triggers for new welfare policies that provide medical benefits and insurance coverage to these new demographic groups. I have concluded that citizen preferences do alter state plans, as seen in the actions of state bureaucracies that avoid communities with certain political characteristics



Members of the Canadian Coalition for Nuclear Responsibility and Greenpeace took to Parliament Hill in Ottawa to protest the air transport of plutonium fuel from Russia to Canada. (CP PHOTO/Jonathan Hayward, 2000.)



Continued page 11

SETTLING ACCOUNTS?

by **Kimberly Theidon**

Kimberly Theidon is an assistant professor in Harvard's Department of Anthropology and a faculty associate of the Weatherhead Center for International Affairs. A medical anthropologist focusing on Latin America, her research interests include political violence, forms and theories of subjectivity, transitional justice, and human rights. Most recently she directed a research project on community mental health, reparations, and the micropolitics of reconciliation with the Ayacucho Office of the Peruvian Truth and Reconciliation Commission. She is currently conducting research in Colombia and Ecuador on two interrelated themes. The first focuses on the causes and consequences of populations in displacement, refuge and return, with a particular interest in the role of humanitarian organizations in zones of armed conflict. The second topic is local level peace initiatives in Colombia. She is the director of Praxis: An Institute for Social Justice.

Truth, Justice, and Redress in Post-Conflict Societies

The Weatherhead Center hosted an international conference entitled “Settling Accounts? Truth, Justice, and Redress in Post-Conflict Societies” on November 1-3, 2004. Also sponsored by the David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies and the Department of Anthropology at Harvard University, the conference convened an interdisciplinary group of nineteen scholars engaged in research on political violence, transitional justice, and the politics of memory and processes of reconciliation in diverse regions of the world.

The conference participants engaged in a number of debates that are central to our understanding of transitional truth, justice, reconciliation, and reparations. The conference was conceptualized thematically rather than regionally, reflecting the globalized context in which any debate regarding these themes must take place. All of the panelists have conducted extensive research in diverse settings of conflict and conflict transformation and drew upon their comparative research to explore the role of truth commissions in transitional processes, and to examine how individuals, communities, and states work toward accountability and justice following lengthy periods of political violence.

Theme 1: Justice in Transition

We live in an historic époque in which memory has increasingly become the medium for political action and rights claims. One manifestation of the role of memory in international affairs is the rise of truth and truth-and-reconciliation commissions. Truth commissions are now standard post-conflict structures and have emerged as the reigning model for nation building after sustained periods of state violence. As institutional expressions of the globalization of human rights, they have taken on a transnational validity as one of the main mechanisms for announcing a new democratic order. Conference participants analyzed the genealogy of transitional justice, locating truth commission within a broader set of transitional justice mechanisms such as lustration, prosecutions, apologies, and reparations.

Our discussion enabled us to explore what truth commissions can and cannot achieve. They can be effective in terms of historical clarification and the establishment of certain truths that limit societal

ignorance and official denial of past human rights violations. There was agreement that the commission process itself may be as important as the final report in terms of changing political cultures and generating a sense of citizenship among formerly marginalized sectors of the population. Additionally, these commissions can be an important component in determining the fate of the disappeared and providing their surviving family members with some sense of symbolic closure.

However, conference participants agreed that commissions do not replace criminal proceedings or prosecutions, nor do they prevent further conflict. There was also agreement that both restorative and retributive forms of justice are optimal, particularly in terms of ending impunity and providing victims with a sense that justice has been served.

Theme 2: Reconciling What and With Whom?

While the literature on truth commissions is abundant, to date there has been scant ethnographic or comparative research that allows us to move beyond the transcendent moral philosophy of human rights, truth, and justice to a rigorous examination of the history and social life of these concepts as they are put into practice. Somehow these commissions and the equation that drives them — more memory = more truth = more justice = more reconciliation — has become an article of “religious faith,” and the literature to date on these commissions has been overwhelmingly celebratory.

Our conference participants were interested in juxtaposing these rituals of the state with the subaltern forms of punishment, pardon, and reconciliation, which they have studied in diverse social contexts. The discussion focused on the points of conjuncture and disjuncture between national reconciliation and the micropolitics of reconciliation practiced at the communal and intercommunal levels. We found that retribution has a strong moral hold on people, and that an excessively theological interpretation of “reconciliation” may obscure the place of punishment in contributing to the possibility of coexistence following political violence. There was agreement that states do not have a monopoly on transitional justice and that local-level processes of administering both retributive and restorative

2005 Thomas T. Hoopes Prize Winners



NOTE

These Harvard College seniors and undergraduate associates of the Weatherhead Center are winners of the 2005 Thomas T. Hoopes Prizes—along with their academic supervisors—in recognition of their outstanding scholarly work as reflected by the success of their senior theses:

Shalini Ananthanarayanan, for her submission entitled “Access to Abortion for Victims of Rape in Mexico City: A Case Study of Policy Implementation,” with Professor Jorge I. Domínguez.

Jody Kelman, for her submission entitled “The Broken Promise: Why Liberal Democracies Shut Their Doors to Asylum Seekers,” with Professor Michael Hiscox.

Peter McMurray, for his submission entitled “The Singer’ After 70 Years: A Dialogic Restudy of Parry, Lord, and the Family Mededovic,” with Mr. David Elmer.

Aaron Mihaly, for his submission entitled “The Dynamics

of an Ouster: Explaining the October 2003 Forced Resignation of Bolivian President Gonzalo Sánchez de Lozada,” with Professor Jorge I. Domínguez.

Swati Mylavarapu, for her submission entitled “Voices Against Violence: Hindu-Muslim Riots and Civil Society in Hyderabad, India,” with Dr. Theodore Macdonald, Jr.

Sabeel Rahman, for his submission entitled “Development, Empowerment, and Political Space: The Depoliticization of the NAO Sector in Bangladesh,” with Professor Ajantha Subramanian.

The Weatherhead Center congratulates these fine young scholars and their advisors.

Ethno-racism ...

(such as liberal rights, anti-Americanism, Islamic fundamentalism, and the Black Power movement) on local de-stigmatization strategies; and 4) the “thickness” with which out-groups perceive members of in-groups (i.e., whether they provide a simple or more complex view of the cultural world inhabited by “them”).

This research is part of a larger initiative on “Successful Societies,” which I co-direct with Peter A. Hall of Harvard’s Department of Government with the support of the Canadian Institute for Advanced Research. For the last three years, an interdisciplinary team of Canadian and American social scientists and epidemiologists has been developing a framework to study the cultural and institutional factors that explain differences in determinants of health outcomes. (See www.ciar.ca, research program on Successful Societies.) This team is concerned particularly with larger social processes that complement the psycho-social processes studied in the vast literature on population health. Brought together by the Canadian Institute for Advanced Research (CIAR) to analyze conditions generating “successful societies” (defined in terms of health outcomes, such as low infant mortality and morbidity, high life expectancy, and high development indicators), this team is examining a range of questions: Why have some African societies developed particularly robust institutions that have been more effective in managing the

AIDS crisis? What role does public policy play in sustaining the conditions commonly associated with well-being, such as strong social networks? How do societies’ collective myths (or conceptions of “we-ness”) contribute to self-empowerment? It is in this context that I have developed a framework for studying the conditions under which societies are more inclusive and come to develop weaker social (structural) and symbolic boundaries. The project on de-stigmatization strategies is a terrain for the empirical study of such conditions.

The January workshop held at the Weatherhead Center brought together for the first time the four teams of researchers involved in the project—each team involves senior researchers on site as well as graduate students from Harvard University and local institutions—as well as some of the Successful Societies project affiliates who are associated with this project. The workshop provided an occasion to further specify and elaborate our theoretical foci and research design. We also benefited from feedback from a dozen specialists whose research speaks to different aspects of the project. From these experts, we learned about social processes of equalization, group boundaries and the comparative study of ethnic conflicts, and social identity. (See <http://www.wcfia.harvard.edu/conferences/ethnoracism>.) We also heard from experts on ethnic conflicts in each of the cases that concern us. All in all, this workshop provided a unique occasion to add specificity and analytical complexity to a challenging interdisciplinary international project.

❖ Research shows that racism and perceived discrimination have negative effects on a range of health outcomes.



Measuring Identity

as a Variable

By Rose McDermott

Rose McDermott is an associate professor of political science at the University of California, Santa Barbara. Her main area of research revolves around political psychology in international relations. She is the author of Risk Taking in International Relations: Prospect Theory in American Foreign Policy (University of Michigan Press, 1998), and Political Psychology in International Relations (University of Michigan Press, 2004). Professor McDermott has held fellowships at the Weatherhead Center's John M. Olin Institute for Strategic Studies and the Women and Public Policy Program at Harvard University. She is a member of the "Identity as a Variable" research team.

Identity constitutes a central part of collective character. Collective and national identities can encompass a broad range of values, beliefs, and characteristics. Indeed, integrating such forces often proves challenging for states with heterogeneous populations of whatever sort. Our project on "Identity as a Variable, Measuring the Content and Contestation of Identity," a Weatherhead Initiative, seeks to investigate the role of identity, whether defined in national, ethnic, religious, or other terms, and to examine its impact on domestic and international politics.

Lately, the concept of identity has taken an increasingly prominent place in the social sciences. Analysis of the development of social identities themselves has become an important focus of scholarly research. Scholars using social identities as the building blocks of social, political, and economic life have attempted to account for a number of discrete outcomes by treating identities as independent variables. The dominant implication of the vast literature on identity is that social identities are among the most important social facts of the world in which we live.

After taking stock of what has been learned—and re-learned—from a generation of identity scholarship, we have identified two sets of problems with social identity scholarship: conceptual issues, and coordination gaps. The conceptual problems



Photo Martha Stewart

Harvard Identity Project conference, December 2004. Left to right: Richard Rose, director of the Centre for the Study of Public Policy at the University of Strathclyde (Glasgow), Ulrich Krotz, assistant professor of political science at Brown University, and Rawi Abdelal, associate professor of business administration at the Harvard Business School and member of the "Identity as a Variable" research team.

include how to compare and differentiate types of identities as well as the issue of how to take advantage of theoretical advancements in operationalizing identity as a variable. A second important weakness in identity scholarship concerns "coordination" problems. These include a lack of consistency and clarity in defining and measuring identities, a lack of cross-disciplinary and cross-subfield coordination of identity research, and missed opportunities to take advantage of possible methodological options. In this project, we build upon the brush clearing that has already been done by other scholars to develop an analytic framework that addresses these problems.

We define a collective identity as a social category that varies along two dimensions: content and contestation. Content describes the meaning of a collective identity. The content of social identities may take the form of four, non-mutually exclusive types: constitutive norms, which are the general rules of thumb that define what makes up a particular identity; social purposes, which incorporates the goals of certain identities; relational comparisons with other social categories or groups, such as how groups with various identities relate to one another; and cognitive models, including the relevant thoughts and beliefs that go hand in hand



Photo Martha Stewart

A. Iain Johnston is a member of the "Identity as a Variable" research team and the Governor James Noe and Linda Noe Laine Professor of China in World Affairs, Department of Government, at Harvard University.

Continued page 11


Harvard Academy

Alumni Conference

Since its founding in 1986 by Henry Rosovsky, the Harvard Academy for International and Area Studies has supported 83 social scientists through its fellowship program for Academy Scholars. On March 10-12, 2005, more than 50 Academy Scholars, from the past and the present, assembled for the Harvard Academy's first alumni conference. Traveling from such places as Singapore, South Korea, Japan, Israel, and Russia, the interdisciplinary group of Academy Scholars met at the American Academy of Arts and Sciences for a series of thematic panel discussions highlighting nearly twenty years of research at the intersection of area studies and the social sciences. Over the course of the conference, Academy Scholars who were in residence at Harvard during all of the years of the Academy's history learned about each other's scholarship, renewed old friendships, or became acquainted with each other for the first time.

The conference consisted mainly of panels organized in relation to five particular themes, all of them showcasing the interdisciplinary breadth and geographical diversity of the Academy Scholar cohort. Presentations on the "Identity" panel, for example, ranged from Christopher Boyer's research on peasant mobilization in twentieth century Mexico to Oleg Kharkhordin's discussion of identity and symbolism in the medieval Russian city of Novgorod. Kanchan Chandra spoke on behalf of a research group—including fellow Academy Scholars Dan Posner, Macartan Humphreys, and Steven Wilkinson—that is exploring constructivist approaches to identity in a number of different world regions. Anthropologist William Sax discussed his ethnographic field research on an emerging national identity in a small Himalayan "divine kingdom." Another panel, on institutional change, brought together Academy Scholars examining that phenomenon in Africa (Catherine Boone and Joshua Forrest), Latin America (Edward Gibson), and Russia (Pauline Jones Luong and Steven Solnick).

Other panels featured the themes of violence, and the wave of political, economic, and social transitions at the end of the twentieth century. In a panel on "Violence and Conflict," historians, anthropologists, and political scientists presented their research. Timothy Snyder offered insights into the Soviet and Nazi occupation of Eastern Europe. Mariane Ferme and Rebecca Hardin presented findings from their fieldwork in West Africa and sub-Saharan Africa, respectively. Steven Wilkinson discussed his broad comparative research on the




relationship between European colonial occupation and eventual ethnic conflict in developing countries. Political scientists, economists, and sociologists on two different panels tackled the subject of transition. China's rapidly changing economy was the subject of presentations by Kellee Tsai, who examined China's emerging entrepreneurs, and John Giles, who reported on a large survey of that country's urban labor market. Lucan Way, Keith Darden, and Veljko Vujacic discussed aspects of the fundamental changes in Eastern Europe. Carrie Rosefsky Wickham offered her insights into the prospect for change in the Middle East, while Michael Kevane analyzed the volatile situation in Sudan.

The accompanying chart shows the remarkably balanced distribution of regions studied by Academy Scholars since the Academy's founding.


A highlight of the conference was a dinner event at the Fogg Art Museum for conference participants and other members of the Academy community. Henry Rosovsky, the Academy's first chairman, was the speaker for the evening. Rosovsky described his own experiences in academia, and he recalled the lack of training available to members of his academic generation in the languages and cultures of non-Western regions. Recognition of this state of affairs helped to inspire his vision for the Harvard Academy as a place where social scientists would be supported in their efforts to seek a broader kind of cultural exposure and training. Rosovsky also paid tribute to the pivotal role of Ira Kukin, the founding benefactor of the Academy, and Samuel Huntington, who succeeded Rosovsky as chairman and sponsored numerous conferences and book projects while developing a number of new research programs during his tenure. Jorge I. Domínguez, the current Academy chairman, served as host for the evening and presented his predecessors with gifts of thanks for their distinguished service.

*Academy Scholars
by Region Studied,
1986-2005*



**Imperial Reckoning:
The Untold Story of
Britain's Gulag in
Kenya**

by



**Europe Without Illu-
sions:
The Paul-Henri Spaak
Lectures, 1994-1999**

by
**Andrew Moravcsik
(editor)**

As part of the Allied forces, thousands of Kenyans fought alongside the British in World War II. But just a few years after the defeat of Hitler, the British colonial government detained nearly the entire population of Kenya's largest ethnic minority, the Kikuyu—some one and a half million people. The compelling story of the system of prisons and work camps where thousands met their deaths has remained largely untold—the victim of a determined effort by the British to destroy all official records of their attempts to stop the Mau Mau uprising, the Kikuyu people's ultimately successful bid for Kenyan independence. Caroline Elkins, an assistant professor of history at Harvard University, spent a decade in London, Nairobi, and the Kenyan countryside interviewing hundreds of Kikuyu men and women who survived the British camps, as well as the British and African loyalists who detained them. The result is an unforgettable account of the unraveling of the British colonial empire in Kenya—a pivotal moment in twentieth-century history with chilling parallels to America's own imperial project.

Caroline Elkins is a faculty associate of the Weatherhead Center for International Affairs.

Co-published with the Weatherhead Center for International Affairs, this book offers a critical assessment of European Union developments since 1994. It combines the texts of the five Paul-Henri Spaak lectures given at Harvard University in the 1994-2000 period, and a cogent analysis of the successes and failures of the EU by Professor Andrew Moravcsik, entitled "Europe without Illusions." The European Union is the most successful voluntary international organization in world history. Europe without Illusions explores the paradox that the EU has just completed probably the most successful decade of integration in its history, yet it continues to be widely perceived as unstable and undemocratic.

Contributors: Jorge I. Domínguez, Frank Boas, Andrew Moravcsik, Right Honorable Lord Roy Jenkins, Ambassador Renato Ruggiero, Ralf Dahrendorf, Uffe Ellemann-Jensen, George Papandreou.

Andrew Moravcsik, professor of politics and director of the European Union Program at Princeton University, is a former faculty associate of the Weatherhead Center for International Affairs.

NEW

This section presents recent publications by Weatherhead Center affiliates.

Settling accounts ...

justice are central in staying the hand of vengeance and facilitating the rehabilitation of perpetrators.

Additionally, conference participants explored the role of religious actors and practices in both the militarization and demilitarization of daily life. Our comparative research indicated the context-dependent role of religious belief; religious groups that at one juncture may elaborate a theology of armed violence may subsequently develop a theology of reconciliation. There is no simple equation between the roles of religion and violence, nor between religion and peace building. However, one striking comparative feature was the role of religious conversion to various forms of evangelical Christianity among perpetrators in diverse cultural contexts. This is a phenomenon that warrants further comparative research.

Theme 3: Aftermaths

One of the least-studied aspects of transitional justice is what happens *after* truth commissions publish their reports and close their doors. Volumes have been written about the aftermath of political violence, but virtually nothing has been published about the aftermath of commissions and the impact of their recommendations. Thus our conference included a final panel addressing this theme, laying out an agenda for further research.

One theme we identified concerns memory, forgetting, and remembering to forget. Although

much emphasis has been placed upon memory as a deterrent to further atrocity, less attention has been paid to the centrality of forgetting in local-level postwar processes. Conference participants were struck by the salience of ritual forgetting in our diverse research settings and agreed that this is a key issue to develop in our work.

Another key issue is redistributive justice following conflict. While participants agreed that forms of retribution such as criminal proceedings are important to pursue when possible, there needs to be more emphasis on redistributive justice in postwar contexts. When we move beyond the fuzzy dichotomy of victim and perpetrator to include a third category — beneficiaries — then the centrality of redistributive forms of justice indicates that settling accounts is more than a mere figure of speech.

Finally, participants advocated following the debates and implementation of reparations programs. Reparations include both material and symbolic forms of redress, and there has been no sustained study of this topic.

Following the public conference, panelists participated in a one-day authors' workshop to discuss their papers and determine the structure and content of the edited volume that will be the final product of this conference. Final chapters will be circulated in the summer, and we plan to submit the manuscript for publication by the end

Measuring identity ...

with particular identities. Contestation refers to the degree of agreement within a group over the content of the shared category. Collective identities, in this conceptualization, vary in the agreement and disagreement about their meanings.

We argue that there is always some level of contestation over the content of identity, implying that social identities vary in agreement and disagreement about their norms, boundaries, worldviews, analytics, and meanings. We hope that our framework will provide greater theoretical commensurability among conceptions of identity in political science and the other social sciences, while still recognizing and valorizing a diversity of approaches. Our goal is not to “discipline” identity, or to impose a new, narrow semantic straightjacket on scholars who seek to treat identity as a variable. Rather, by categorizing identity scholarship and its methods in a synthetic framework and highlighting complementarities among conceptualizations and methods, we aim to encourage more coordination and explicit comparison among scholars working on identity.

In this project, we have brought together scholars from a variety of disciplines and sub-disciplines in order to consider the conceptual and methodological issues associated with treating identity as a variable. In this way, we have explicitly sought to solve some of the coordination problems that have thus far impeded progress in identity scholarship.

We have done this through two specific mechanisms. First, we have held two conferences that have brought together diverse groups of identity scholars representing a range of substantive interests from different subfields of political science and other fields across a range of methodological approaches. The first conference explored the potential for more rigorous conceptualization and empirical measurement of identity. The second conference examined a variety of empirical cases, using different methods. These methods included discourse analysis, surveys, and content analysis, as well as some promising newer methods, including experiments, agent-based modeling, and cognitive mapping. The papers from this conference examined identity within the context

of a wide range of substantive topics, including work on ethnic identity in areas of the former Soviet Republic, the Sino-Soviet split, Israeli-Palestinian relations and the measurement and definition of race within the American context.

Second, as a result of these conferences and our own work, we have developed our own analytic framework for measuring and using identity as a variable. We have surveyed a wide range of methods for measuring and operationalizing identity. We have written an article on this topic, which, together with an edited volume based on the papers from the second conference, we hope, will serve to further disseminate our research and spark further work in the area by other scholars. In addition, we have developed undergraduate and graduate courses on this topic, and developed a content analysis software program, dubbed the Yoshicoder, which allows for computer-aided quantitative content analysis in non-English languages, including Russian and Chinese. Together we hope that our analytic framework and the discussion of methodological options will provide a roadmap for further integrated progress in identity scholarship.

In outlining a definition of identity and tools for measurement we aim to encourage creativity in thinking about identity. We think any definition of identity must address the issues of content and contestation, and we believe that there are a variety of research methods that are amenable to identity research. We think a commitment to empirical research requires both attention to rigorous methods and the open-mindedness that allows a researcher to adapt to the specific demands of a particular research question. Attention to measurement helps complete the story of how a social identity came to be what it was at a particular historical moment, as well as how it might be changing, or in a process of re-formation. The result of greater attention to common conceptualizations and research methods will support more rigorous and replicable studies of identity and help scholars to understand the wide

Not in my backyard ...

(i.e., those demonstrating stronger resistance). However, states also seek to alter citizen preferences. States do not create programs based on citizen preferences; rather, governments consider these preferences to be malleable, and they attempt to capture the “hearts and minds” of local citizens. Rather than sway with public opinion, the state attempts to dictate it.

Controversial facility siting will expand and

become more divisive in the future as demands for energy, water, and transportation infrastructure increase and populations swell and converge on urban areas. Systematic research on how various nations manage contentious civil society will provide some understanding with which to begin creating programs and incentives that take into account those who shoulder the heaviest burdens of these externalities.

E-mail correspondence regarding the Centerpiece or other matters may be directed to:

Jim Cooney

Executive Director jcooney@wcfia.harvard.edu

Steven Bloomfield

Editor
Associate Director
sbloomfield@wcfia.harvard.edu

Amanda Pearson

Director of Publications
publications@wcfia.harvard.edu

The Center's Web address is:
<http://www.wcfia.harvard.edu>

Weatherhead Center Relocates

In August 2005 the Weatherhead Center is moving to Harvard's new Center for Government and International Studies (CGIS). The main buildings of the complex are designed by Harry Cobb of Pei Cobb Freed and Partners, and the north building is named after Sidney R. Knafel, the former chairman of the WCFIA Visiting Committee who made the major gift that allowed Harvard to begin this project. The buildings are near Harvard Yard and the heart of Harvard University, and they house the Department of Government and many of Harvard's research centers on international studies. The Weatherhead Center is the largest of these centers, and our programs and projects will be located in the north building, at 1737 Cambridge Street, in the historic wooden house at 1727 Cambridge Street, and in the red brick house at 61 Kirkland Street.

An array of facilities for major conferences, workshops, and small planning groups will make a major contribution to the intellectual and community life of the Weatherhead Center. The new library, state-of-the-art information technology services, and expanded dining facilities will also contribute greatly to the Center. This new building complex will enhance for years to come the Weatherhead Center's mission to support scholarly multidisciplinary research and teaching on international affairs within the unique setting of Harvard University.



The Weatherhead Center is poised for an exciting year ahead. With its move to a new home, it is also an ideal time for us to establish a new logo that provides a fresh approach and graphic identity to the Center and its print and Web publications.



1033 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02138

Nonprofit Organization
U.S. Postage
PAID
Boston, MA
Permit No. 1636