WELCOME TO THE NEW	CARNEGIE REPORTER

In 2000, Carnegie Corporation of New York published the first issue of the Reporter. It was meant to be “a magazine simply about ideas…a hub for foundation ideas in the United States and abroad.” Today’s Reporter has a brand-new look—it’s bigger, with more room for colorful illustrations and striking photographs—and more readable, with generous white space and a seamless flow from story to story. Yet its intention is the same as on day one—the sharing of important ideas.

Our cover story takes you to the Arab world, to learn how courageous social scientists are conducting groundbreaking research in a tumultuous time. Fifty years after the signing of the Voting Rights Act we assess the impact of Shelby v. Holder and see what the Corporation’s grantees are doing to make voting easier and less restrictive. Our education story shows how more effective math courses are helping community college students get ahead. There’s a dramatic photo essay on Russia; and the latest issue of Carnegie Results, bound into this issue, tells the story of a successful workshop series aimed at advancing Jewish-Muslim engagement.

A letter from Vartan Gregorian, President of Carnegie Corporation, is featured in every Reporter. In this issue he writes about the negative impact of data overload on knowledge acquisition. Fifteen years ago, introducing the magazine, he wrote, “We hope it will help you understand Carnegie Corporation and its philosophies on education, democracy, international peace…the areas in which we currently concentrate our grantmaking. We also want this publication to be a hub for the work of other foundations, an avenue for important ideas.” These are still the goals for the Carnegie Reporter, and for our website—also redesigned and launching as this magazine is published. Read all about it in “End Note,” on the last two pages of this issue, then visit Carnegie.org.
Carnegie Corporation of New York is a philanthropic foundation created by Andrew Carnegie in 1911 to promote the advancement and diffusion of knowledge and understanding among the people of the United States. Subsequently, its charter was amended to permit the use of funds for the same purposes in certain countries that are or have been members of the British Overseas Commonwealth. The goal of the Carnegie Reporter is to be a hub of ideas and a forum for dialogue about the work of foundations.
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Real-World Alchemy: Turning Knowledge into Public Policy

It may seem paradoxical that in the current era of global connectivity and instant communication, our society shows signs of being starved for knowledge. I would argue that this is exactly the situation in which we find ourselves. While the modern world is overwhelmed with data and information, it is “underwhelmed” with real understanding and clear vision about how to address the challenges that confront us. Television’s talking heads speak to us in a barrage of sound bites and the Internet presents us with billions of lines of text, millions of videos, images, and more “content” than any one human being—or ten, or a thousand, for that matter—could ever attempt to process. And all across the globe, men, women, and children are either plugged into or casting their eyes toward the screens of various electronics that speak, sing, whisper, and shout at us 24 hours a day, seven days a week. The constant chatter of the world seems both addictive and unavoidable.

While this explosion of information seems unlikely to slow down—indeed, we are told that the total amount of collected information will double in less than two years—recent estimates indicate that we are unable to use 90 to 95 percent of the information that is currently available. It is hardly surprising, therefore, that not only are we distracted and overwhelmed by the flood of images, news, rumor, gossip, data, information, and knowledge that bombard us every day, we also face dangerous levels of fragmentation of knowledge, dictated by the need for specialization and the need to find some way to catalog and manage all the learning that human beings have accumulated over the millennia.

Perhaps nowhere is this breakdown in the unity of knowledge more apparent than in our universities, which were largely influenced by the principles of such philosophers as Wilhelm von Humboldt (1767–1835), who believed that a university comprised a whole community of scholars and students engaged in a common search for truth. Truth may still be the objective, but the road leading to that goal now has more byways than even Google maps can chart. After all, universities are no different than any other institution—or our own homes, for that matter—where the daunting arrival of information in the form of books and journals has been compounded by an accelerating electronic torrent of information and opinion, some of it true, much of it false, and a great deal of it falling somewhere on the spectrum of “maybe so but then again, maybe not.”

This situation has resulted, among other outcomes, in a broad decline of support for the time-tested idea of a general education, once considered necessary for an educated citizenry and the strength of our democracy, which has for
all practical purposes become little more than a nostalgic memory. Indeed, because the body of requisite knowledge has become so vast, no one can hope to master more than a small segment of it.

Faced with an impossible undertaking, most universities today have entangled themselves in a smorgasbord of specialties and subspecialties, disciplines and subdisciplines, within which further specialization continues apace. Indeed, the scope and intensity of specialization is such that scholars, scientists, and many others have great difficulty keeping up with the important developments in their own subspecialties, not to mention their fields in general. What this means is that the university, which was conceived of as embodying the unity of knowledge, has become an intellectual “multiversity,” drifting in the direction of becoming a “Home Depot” of educational offerings, without blueprints. At the present time, for example, many major research universities offer countless undergraduate courses, an approach to education in which all too often there is no differentiation between consumption and digestion, no differentiation between acquiring information and learning, and often without accompanying reflection or questioning about what it means nowadays to be an educated person.

As early as the 1930s, José Ortega y Gasset, in his Revolt of the Masses, noted this phenomenon and decried the “barbarism of specialization.” Today we have more scientists, scholars, and professional men and women than ever before, he observed, but fewer cultivated ones. To put the dilemma in twenty-first-century terms, I might describe this as everybody doing their own thing, but nobody really understanding what anybody else’s thing really is.

And therein lies what may be an even greater problem facing us today. It’s something we all experience every time we watch the news on TV, or visit a website to find a fact, or ask our new friend Siri to answer a question, or try to do research about which new car to buy, or figure out what the ingredients in a can of soup we’re about to open really are—or embark on any of a thousand other tasks and activities that need to be carried out in any given day. Each time we do anything like this, we are depending on whatever source of information we’re consulting to provide not only relevant and useful information, but also some context in which to consider how to apply the knowledge we’ve just gained. In other words, what we need is a way to make a connection between disparate bits and bytes of information and their practical application. Otherwise, we may find ourselves wondering, as did T.S. Eliot, “Where is the wisdom we have lost in knowledge? Where is the knowledge we have lost in information?”

Paradoxically, in the midst of a technological revolution, one would assume science would prevail. Unfortunately, it does not. We love technology and we consume it, but we don’t realize how much science is behind our inventions. It is not the age of science but the age of technology. We are more interested in how to get information rather than how to use the information we get. This is the tension between means and ends: the tension of the liberal arts. On a larger scale, the need for some real-world alchemy that will help us transmute raw information into wise practice has long been the concern of fields such as law. In that regard, one is reminded that St. Thomas Aquinas said, “Law is an ordinance of reason for the common good...” The field of medicine, as well, is oriented toward the practical application of even the most theoretical areas of research. Unfortunately, the same cannot be said of the social sciences, for instance, where applied research is all too often looked down upon as being of only temporary or fleeting value and use. Yet today, in addition to science and technology, we must look to the humanities and social sciences. It is exactly in this area where we as a society, a nation, and a global community, need real-time answers to questions that have critical and far-reaching implications for the future. That is not to say that solutions to the problems we face can be patched together with some kind of intellectual quick fixes; not at all. But neither can we watch civilization’s clock tick away its many dangerous hours while thinkers and doers decline to engage one another in useful dialogue.

International peace and security; immigration; the relationship of religion to secularism and science; the advancement of national and global economies; progress in education; the levying and collection of taxes; and countless other issues of great complexity require both the attention of scholars and the involvement of policymakers in order for all of us to find our way towards a more peaceful, equitable world. In this endeavor we rely on scholars, who have the unique ability to reintegrate and reconnect the disparate, ever-multiplying strands of knowledge, to bring meaning to information and forge wisdom upon the
policymakers who must implement the lessons that can be gleaned from the efforts of scholars; policies created without the backing of deep knowledge and framed by wisdom are likely to fail. We have had too many of these failures already, too many adventures in policymaking rooted in shallow understanding that have left both our nation and people across the globe in need of new ideas, new remedies, and new ways forward.

It is in the service of these goals that Carnegie Corporation has devoted significant resources to “bridging the gap” between scholars and policymakers, which in recent years only seems to have gotten wider. Perhaps this is understandable, given that the policy community must often react to global crises with little time or opportunity to reflect on the wider implications of international events while the increasingly specialized academic community all too often remains preoccupied with theoretical matters. Nevertheless, backed by the belief that academic rigor is not incompatible with policy relevance, the Corporation has embarked on a number of major projects aimed at closing that yawning distance between scholars and policymakers. One of our recent efforts involved sending out a request for proposals to the 22 American-based members of the Association of Professional Schools of International Affairs (APSIA). The request called for uniquely practical, on-the-ground, policy-focused programs, and offered to award two-year grants of up to $1 million each for projects with a strong chance of success, especially from institutions willing to rethink tenure rules so that academics are free to pursue policy work and challenge convention and merge ideas across international and disciplinary lines. Experts in the international relations field, chosen for their understanding of the policymaking process in Washington, D.C., as well as awareness of the administrative challenges of universities, reviewed 17 submissions from APSIA members. The following five were chosen: Columbia University, Syracuse University, Tufts University, the University of Denver, and the University of Washington. Their proposals include fresh ideas such as rapid response funds to make academics available on short notice to join counterparts at the State Department as soon as an international crisis breaks, and incorporating nontraditional outlets for research, from new forms of online publishing and social media to documentary videos and TED-style talks.

Further, building on the Corporation’s long-standing commitment to supporting individual scholars of exemplary promise, we recently inaugurated the Andrew Carnegie Fellows program, a major annual undertaking that will provide support for scholars in the social sciences and humanities. Recipients will receive up to $200,000 each, which will enable them to devote between one and two years to research and writing. The first class of 31 fellowship recipients, announced this spring, is an exceptional group of established and emerging scholars, journalists, and authors whose work distills knowledge, enriches our culture, and equips leaders in the realms of science, law, business, the arts, and, of course, public policy. The fellowships aim to provide new perspectives on the program’s overarching theme for 2015: Current and Future Challenges to U.S. Democracy and International Order. Winning proposals address issues including policing and race, big data and privacy, the impact of an aging population, the safety of generic drugs, and how attitudes are formed among voters. The Corporation will award a total of $6.2 million to the inaugural class.

These might be regarded as big programs for one foundation, but we also recognize that they are small steps towards developing an understanding of how we have arrived at this moment in time. Then, perhaps, as problems and issues evolve, we can invoke the lessons of history, apply intellectual rigor, look to humanitarian concerns, and start to open some new doors to the future that all of mankind can pass through not just without harm, but with real hope. At least, that is our aspiration as we follow the mandate of our founder, Andrew Carnegie, who urged us all to “set a goal that commands your thoughts, liberates your energy, and inspires your hopes.” Our work continues on in that spirit and we look forward with great excitement to what we will learn in the years ahead.

Vartan Gregorian
President, Carnegie Corporation of New York
A workshop on writing revolutionary history drew professional historians and amateurs to an island in the Nile for a new approach to social science research.
ven in the early days of Syria’s uprising, it was nearly impossible to do independent research. From early on in the rule of President Bashar al-Assad, which began in 2000, very little leeway was allowed for any work that might challenge the regime. Academics, journalists, political activists, even humanitarian workers were subject to harsh measures of control. The situation worsened after peaceful protests erupted across the country in 2011. Nonviolent activists were imprisoned, exiled, or killed, and armed insurgents took their place. From the start, the conflict restricted movement around the country. Even worse, authorities on the government side and later among rebels wanted to manipulate any research or reporting from their tenuous zones of control. Analysts began to call Syria a “black box,” an unruly place off-limits to credible researchers.

Into this confusion stepped two Syrian-born academics: Omar Dahi, an economist at Hampshire College, and Yasser Munif, a sociologist at Emerson College. They practiced traditional disciplines at reputable research institutions, but they wanted to conduct unconventional research. How were Syrians adapting to the transformation of their society and the disintegration of an old order? Dahi and Munif wanted to bring systematic rigor to studying the experiences of the thousands, eventually millions, of Syrians who were building new modes of self-governance, beyond Assad’s control, or who were adapting to new lives and identities in the maelstrom of exile. They believed they could conduct meaningful social science in the “black box.”
“Most of the research about Syria revolved around geopolitical conflict and strategies, interested in a top-down perspective,” Munif said. “I was interested in the other way around. I wanted to understand participatory democracy, the different ways people were conducting politics after the collapse of the state.”

Like other radical developments that accompanied the Arab uprisings and government backlash, Syria’s crisis demanded sustained scholarly attention. And research in a rapidly evolving war zone, in turn, required support from a flexible and imaginative institution. Dahi and Munif found their backer in the Arab Council for the Social Sciences, a quietly transformative venture that’s been midwifing a network of Arab scholars to more confidently practice a new brand of social science that rises directly from the concerns of a region in turmoil.

Dahi and Munif applied in the fall of 2012 for the first batch of funding offered by the grantmaking organization, known by its acronym, the ACSS. Dahi wanted to study the survival strategies of refugees. By the time his grant had been approved and he began research, the number of refugees had swollen from a few hundred thousand to nearly two million. He partnered with researchers and activists in the region who were devoting much of their time to the urgent needs of resettling refugees and defending their rights. Munif wanted to study the way local people took charge of their own lives and governed themselves. He chose a provincial city called Manbij, in northeastern Syria. By the time he began his field research, government troops had been driven from the city, leaving it in the hands of local civil society groups and rebels.

By 2014, Munif had to interrupt his own work prematurely when Islamic State rebels conquered Manbij. “Without the ACSS, I wouldn’t have been able to do this type of work. They funded the entire project from A to Z,” Munif said. “The ACSS is willing to experiment with new types of research, new methodology. With the Arab revolts they are funding some interesting projects that would not get funding from traditional sources.”

Arab Social Science

It’s worth pausing for a minute to look at the research that came out of Munif and Dahi’s loose collaboration, because it conveys a sense of what a different kind of social science looks like—in the terms of the ACSS, a “new paradigm” that addresses questions of concern to people who live in the Middle East and North Africa.

In his work among Syrian refugees in Lebanon, Turkey, and Jordan, Dahi identified ways that humanitarian aid manipulated the politics of the refugees, in some cases fostering deeper sectarian division, and in others strengthening a more inclusive kind of citizenship. At the same time, Dahi helped to build an online portal that will serve as a data resource for other scholars. He found many willing collaborators within the active community of regional researchers, advocates, and activists. Munif has already published extensively on the local governance and decision-making structures he discovered in Manbij, and he’s currently working on a book that counters “the dominant narrative about Syria,” which in his view “reduces the Syrian uprising to violence, chaos, and nihilism.”

This project is but one of dozens supported by the ACSS since it set up shop in 2010 with a tiny staff but grand ambitions to foment change in intellectual life in the Arab world. Formally, the Arab Council incorporated in October 2010 but only hired staff and began operations from its Beirut headquarters in August 2012. The experiment is still young, but after two major conferences to present research, two business meetings of its general assembly, and the third cycle of grants underway, the ACSS is moving from its organizational infancy into adolescence.

Still, some might see its mission as exceedingly quixotic: to foster a standing network of engaged activist intellectuals who set a critical agenda and use the best tools of social science to address burning contemporary questions. And all this ambition comes against the backdrop of a region governed by despots for whom academic freedom is in the best cases a low priority, and in the worst, anathema. “We’re enabling conversations that hadn’t taken place,” said Seteney Shami, the founding director of the ACSS. “It’s too soon to say how we’ve affected social science production, but we have created new spaces. I think we have made a difference.”

The method is as straightforward as the idea is bold. Solicit proposals, especially from researchers who aren’t already part of well-funded and established networks, or who are working on different questions than the mainstream Western academy, which still dominates the research landscape. Invite researchers (ACSS-funded or not) from the region to join the ACSS as voting members who ultimately control its policies and agenda. See what happens.

Since doling out its first grants in 2013, the ACSS has awarded $1.162 million to 108 people. Its annual budget has grown from $800,000 in 2012 to close to $3 million in 2015. The first round of research has been completed, and voting members of the Council’s general assembly this year elected a new board of trustees. (There are 58 voting members out of a total of 137 in the general assembly, according to Shami.) It’s been a dizzying journey for a small organization that supports a type of research criminalized throughout much of the region.

The founders and original funders were determined to promote regional scholarship. Carnegie Corporation in particular has aimed much of its funding in the region toward local scholars, with the intention of stimulating and enabling local knowledge production. The Arab Council complements a number of other efforts in the region to strengthen research and social science. New universities, think tanks, and research centers are emerging in the Arabian Peninsula. Arab and Western academics have formed partnerships, sometimes individually and sometimes at the
level of academic departments or entire universities. The magnitude of the ACSS’s impact will only become clear in the context of a wide web of related ventures—all of them taking shape at a time of enormous change and pressure. All across the Middle East and North Africa, academic researchers face daunting obstacles. There are bright spots, like the active intellectual communities in the universities in Morocco and Algeria. But some of the oldest intellectual centers, like Egypt, struggle under aggressive security and police forces as well as university leaders whose top concern is to ferret out political dissent. War has disrupted intellectual life in places like Syria and Iraq. Government money has poured into the education sector in Qatar and the United Arab Emirates, but the lack of academic freedom has dulled its luster.

“The Council was conceived at a time when repression was high but the red lines were clear,” Shami said, referring to the years before the uprisings, when the ACSS was in its planning phase. The current logistical challenges underscore the difficulty of the changing conditions for researchers in the Arab region. An organization dedicated to free inquiry, the ACSS chose to incorporate in Lebanon, where it could operate without governmental restrictions and draw on a vibrant local academic community. Even that location is an imperfect choice.

Members from Egypt, for example, now face new restrictions when they want to visit Lebanon. So far it’s not impossible for Arab scholars to travel around the region, but it’s getting harder. Lebanon’s excessive red tape has thrown up numerous hurdles. For example, the ACSS is currently seeking special permission from the government of Lebanon to allow its international members to vote online on internal policy questions. Equally important, according to Shami, is that work permits for non-Lebanese people are becoming more difficult to obtain, which makes it challenging for the ACSS to hire staff from different parts of the region.

Many resources other regions take for granted don’t exist in the Arab region, where governments restrict access to even the most mundane archives. Data about everything from the economy to food production to the population is treated as a state secret. Until the ACSS compiled one, there wasn’t even a comprehensive list of the existing universities in the region.

Many resources other regions take for granted don’t exist in the Arab region, where governments restrict access to even the most mundane archives. Data about everything from the economy to food production to the population is treated as a state secret. Until the ACSS compiled one, there wasn’t even a comprehensive list of the existing universities in the region. It was these challenges that the founders of the ACSS had in mind, but by the time the ground had begun to shift. Tunisia’s popular uprising in December 2010 began years of political upheaval across the region. The horizons of possibility briefly opened up, until the old repressive regimes returned in full force almost everywhere except Tunisia.

“We started off at a moment of heightened expectations about the role social sciences could play in the public sphere,” Shami said. “Now we’re in a situation that is far worse in every possible way. These are all big shocks for a young institution. But so far, so good. People are saying it’s impossible to work, but the evidence is that they’re still producing.”
**Everything All at Once**

The ACSS put a lot of balls into the air from the start. Its founders wanted to create a standing network for scholars from the region and who work in the region. Their goal was to empower new voices, connect them with established academics, and nurture the relationships over a long term. That way, even scholars at out-of-the-way institutions, or smaller countries traditionally ignored by the global academic elite, might get a hearing. The Council also wanted to integrate Balkanized research communities, bringing together scholars who often published and collaborated exclusively in Arabic, English, or French.

Other long-term goals factor into the project’s design. Some of the grant categories, like the working groups and research grants, explicitly aim to change the discourse in academic social science. Others, like the “new paradigms factory,” intend to bring activists and public intellectuals into conversation with academics. The ACSS is a membership organization; each grantee can choose to become a permanent member with voting privileges—a sort of institutional democracy and accountability in action that the Council hopes will filter into other institutions in the region.

Finally, this summer (2015) the Council will publish its first in-house work, the Arab Social Science Report, a comprehensive survey of the existing institutions teaching and doing research in the social sciences in the region. The ACSS has established the *Arab Social Science Monitor* as a permanent observatory of research and training in the region and hopes to produce a new report on a different theme every two years, in keeping with its role as a custodian as well as mentor of the Arab social science community.

The inaugural survey demanded an unexpected amount of sleuthing, said **Mohammed A. Bamyeh**, the University of Pittsburgh sociologist who was the lead author on the report and helped oversee the team that produced it. In some cases it was impossible to obtain basic data such as the number of faculty at a university or their salaries. “If you call them, they will never tell you,” Bamyeh said. “For some reason, it’s a secret.”

In the end, however, a year’s worth of legwork produced a surprisingly thorough snapshot of social science in the region. Researchers identified many more academics and other researchers than they expected, and a wider range of periodicals and institutions. Freedom of research turned out to be a better predictor of quality than funding did, Bamyeh said. The quality varied widely, but Bamyeh said social science in the region is “mushrooming.” We may not have appreciated this growth because we don’t have an Arab social science community,” he said. “We have a lot of individuals doing individual research but they are not connected to each other.”

**Sari Hanafi**, a sociologist at the American University of Beirut, has studied knowledge production in the Arab world and is intimately familiar with the paucity of quality peer-reviewed journals, professional associations, and the unseen scaffolding that supports top-notch research. He was one of the founding members of the ACSS and currently sits on its board, but he is pointed about the bitter challenges impeding research in the region.

“Social science in the Arab world is in crisis,” Hanafi said. “Social sciences are totally delegitimized in the Arab world.” Repressive states wanted only intellectuals they could control, he maintains, so they starved institutions that could produce the large-scale research teams required for any serious, sustained research. The problem has been compounded, Hanafi said, by ideologues and clerics who want to fulfill the role that social science should rightfully play: providing data, assessing policy options, and generating dissent and criticism.

Quality research anywhere in the world depends on money, intellectual resources, and the support of society and the state, according to Hanafi. “In the Arab world, this pact is still very fragile,” he said. “You don’t have a strong trust in the virtue of science.” He hopes that the ACSS can play a part in a wider revival, in which social scientists reclaim their influence and beat back the encroachment from clerics and authoritarian states. “The mission and vocation of social science in this region is to connect itself to society and to decision makers,” Hanafi said. He believes the Arab world needs stronger institutions of its own, including independent universities, governments sincerely committed to funding independent research, and professional associations for researchers. Efforts like the Arab Council can help pave the way.

Participants at ACSS conferences are encouraged to present and publish in Arabic. The Council also emphasizes the value of its members as a collective network. Pascale Ghazaleh, a historian at the American University of Cairo, said it was “mindblowing” to meet scholars she’d never heard from around the region at the ACSS annual meeting in Beirut in March 2015. She said she was moved to hear her colleagues discussing their work in their own language. “It was the first time that I’d been surrounded by people who were unselfconsciously using social science terminology in Arabic,” Ghazaleh said. “It’s something to be proud of.”

The language is part of an intentional long-term strategy to anchor the Council and its social science agenda in the region. Although many of its founders have at least one foot in a Western institution, Shami said that “we see ourselves as fully homegrown and firmly based in the region but interacting with the diaspora as well.” The majority of the trustees, for instance, are based in Arab countries.

“It is an ongoing conversation as to who decides the main questions of research for social sciences,” Bamyeh said. “Can there be something like an indigenous social science that has its own methods? It is essential for social sciences in the Arab world to develop a strong sense of their own identity.” As an example he cites an Egyptian sociologist in the 1960s who discovered at the post office a bag of...
unaddressed letters, most of them containing prayers and pleas for help from the poor written to a popular folk saint. A clerk was about to throw them away. The sociologist took them home and produced a seminal study of Egyptian attitudes and mentality.

That’s the sort of approach that Bamyeh said he hoped to see employed after the Arab revolts. Instead, he was disappointed to find many American sociologists trying to apply existing Western models to the cases of Egypt and Tunisia. “It was an opportunity to acquire new knowledge,” Bamyeh said. “We need an independent Arab social science that feels its own right to ask questions, questions not asked by the European and American academy. It’s not nationalistic, although it might sound that way. It’s really a question of a scientific approach that comes out of a local embeddedness.”

**Activist Research**

The architects of the ACSS have embraced that quest, encouraging research that springs from local problems, and supporting work from outsiders and nonacademics. In Beirut, the ACSS supported an atypical multidisciplinary research team that explored the misuse of public space and the confiscation of people’s homes. As a result of that research project, Abir Saksouk, an architect and urban planner without an institutional home of her own, launched an ongoing public campaign to save the last major tract of undeveloped coastline in Beirut.

Today she is spearheading one of the most dynamic and visible grassroots social initiatives in Lebanon: the Civil Campaign to Protect the Dalieh of Raouche. The Dalieh is the name of the grassy spit of rock that flanks Beirut’s iconic pigeon rocks. Cliff divers used to perform death-defying Acapulco-style style leaps from the Dalieh’s cliffs until last year, when developers suddenly fenced off the last publicly accessible green open space in Beirut. The campaign that Saksouk helped initiate wants to stop the Dalieh from being transformed into a high-end entertainment and residential complex.

“The ACSS was a huge push forward,” Saksouk said. It wasn’t the money, she said, so much as the people with whom it connected her. She was mentored by academics, given a platform to publish in Arabic, and introduced to other people thinking about ways to engage with their city. “My activism on the ground informed what I wanted to focus on in my research, and the paper I wrote for the ACSS informed my activism,” Saksouk said.

The Civil Campaign has started a contest, soliciting alternative, public-minded proposals for the Dalieh peninsula. The point, Saksouk said, is to energize a social movement and change the way Beirutis think about their city’s public space. Her research collaborator, Nadine Bekdache, studied the history of evictions, and together the pair explored the concepts of public space and private property. These are theoretical concepts with explosive implications, especially in a place like Beirut where a few powerful families dominate the government as well as the economy.

“A lot of people are sympathetic but don’t think they can change anything,” Saksouk said. “We’re accumulating experiences and knowledge. All this will lead to change.”
“The act of creating a network across multiple countries is in and of itself a major feat, given the realities of the region,” Deana Arsenian said. “While it’s a work in progress and many aspects of the association have to be worked out, the interest among the members in making it succeed seems very strong.”

**Egypt: In the Shadows of a Police State**

In contrast, the clock has turned backward on the prospects for reform and innovation in Egypt, long considered a center of gravity for Arab intellectual life. Egypt has some of the region’s oldest and biggest universities, and historically has generated some of the most important thinking and research in the Arab world. But Egypt’s academy has suffered a long, slow decline as successive dictatorships suppressed academic life, fearing it would breed political dissent.

In the two-year period of openness that began after Hosni Mubarak was toppled in 2011, university faculty members won the right to elect their own deans and expel secret police from their position of dominance inside research institutions. Creative research projects proliferated. The ACSS was just one of many players during what turned out to be a short renaissance. A May 2015 U.S. State Department report on Egypt’s political situation found “a series of executive initiatives, new laws, and judicial actions severely restrict freedom of expression and the press, freedom of association, freedom of peaceful assembly, and due process.”

At least one well-known ACSS grant winner, the public intellectual and blogging pioneer Alaa Abdel Fattah, languishes in jail; he was detained before he could complete the paperwork to start his research. Officials even took away his access to pen, paper, and books after his prison letters won a wide following.

Universities have seen a severe decline in academic freedom and some researchers have stopped working or have fled. Outspoken academics like Khaled Fahmy, a historian who has been a critic of military rule and also a spokesman for freer archival access, are waiting out the current turmoil abroad. Political scientist Emad Shahin (who left Egypt and now teaches at Georgetown University) was sentenced to death along with more than a hundred others in May 2015 in a show trial. Some Egypt-based researchers have left since 2013, many grantees remain. The ACSS continues to receive applications from Egypt, and has become all the more vital to that country’s scholars.

Cairo native and historian Alia Mossallam used her research grant to hold an open workshop about writing revolutionary history. As protests roiled the capital, Mossallam quietly organized a workshop that drew 20 people, some from the academic world, some activists, and some professionals and workers who were intrigued by her proposal to study the historiography of “people who are written out of histories of social movements and revolutions.”

Tucked away on an island in the Nile in Upper Egypt, Mossallam’s workshop brought professional historians together with amateur participants. They studied the history of Egyptian folk music and architecture, they looked at archives and newspaper clippings, and then the students used their new skills to produce historical research of their own. Mossallam carefully avoided politics in her open call for workshop participants, but any inquiry into the history of revolution and social movements at Egypt’s present juncture is by nature risky.

Contemporary politics might be a third rail, but in her workshop the Egyptian participants could talk openly about past events like the uprising and burning of Cairo in 1952, or the displacement of Nubians to build the Aswan High Dam. At a time when political speech has been banned, history offers a safer way to talk about revolution. “These workshops are a search for a new language to describe the past as well as the present,” Mossallam said.
“Watch out for how you’re being narrated. A lot of the things the participants wrote engaged with that fear, the struggle to maintain a critical consciousness of a revolution while it’s happening.”

Her project wouldn’t have been possible without the Arab Council’s forbearance. The Council encouraged her to find creative ways to engage as wide an audience as possible and gave her extra time to recalibrate her project as conditions in Egypt changed. No other Arab body gives comparable support to Arab scholars, Mossallam said. “They ask, are we asking questions that really matter?” she said. “Are we trying to reach a wider public?”

**Can It Last?**

Sustainability remains an open question. Although the ACSS is registered as a foreign, regional association under Lebanese law and considers itself a regional entity, the organization currently depends on four funders from outside the Arab world for its budget: Carnegie Corporation of New York, the Ford Foundation, the International Development Research Centre of Canada, and the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency. If at some point in the future those funders turn their attention elsewhere, the ACSS, for all its promise, could quickly reach a dead end. According to Shami, “It’s as sustainable as any other NGO that depends on grants.”

While it’s politically tricky for an Arab institution to take Western money, funds from various regional sources can come with strings attached. Ideally, Shami said, the ACSS would like to find acceptable funding sources from within the region.

The Arab Council’s accelerated launch has attracted wide interest, creating new challenges as the organization matures. “We’ve built up a lot of expectations. People think we have unlimited resources,” Shami said. “We might be coming up against hard times. We might be starting to disappoint people.” Just as important as money is the political structure of the region. Lebanon, Tunisia, and Morocco remain the only relatively free operating environments for intellectual work in the region, and that freedom is always under threat from militant movements, authoritarian parties, and regional wars.

Deana Arsenian, Carnegie’s vice president for international programs, attended the March 2015 meeting and was impressed by the enthusiasm of the several hundred participants, whose optimism for research far exceeded their expectations for their region’s political future. “The act of creating a network across multiple countries is in and of itself a major feat, given the realities of the region,” Arsenian said. “While it’s a work in progress and many aspects of the association have to be worked out, the interest among the members in making it succeed seems very strong.”

The ACSS came at a moment of great change and opening in the Middle East, and was rooted in a region that needs to be heard from. From the beginning the ACSS has intentionally included all those who reside in the Arab region regardless of ethnic or linguistic origins, as well as those in the diaspora. As it moves past the startup phase, the Arab Council’s scholars will have to decide whether their aim is to increase the visibility in the wider world of scholars of the region, or whether it’s to create a parallel universe. It will also have to grapple with its definition: what is an “Arab” council? Shami herself is of Circassian origin, and there are plenty of other non-Arab ethnicities and language groups in the region: Kurds, Berbers, and so on. Many of the early success stories in the ACSS are geographical hybrids, trained by or based at Western institutions, which she points out reflects the global hierarchies of knowledge production.

The Council might also have to refine the scope of work it supports. So far, in the interest of transparency and interdisciplinary research, the ACSS has been very flexible and open to all communities of scholars, knowing that as a result the work of its grantees will be uneven. Another question is whether, once the novelty wears off, the ACSS conference will become a genuine source of scholarly prestige for social scientists. Its second annual conference, in March of this year, attracted four applicants for every presentation slot. Almost nobody who was invited to present dropped out.

Arab Council has already identified a greater breadth of existing scholarship in the region than its founders expected. Over time, it will gauge the quality and rigor of that work. “It’s too early to see the dividends or the fruits, because these fruits depend on how social science is professionalized or institutionalized,” Hanafi said.

Dahi, the economist from Hampshire College who researched Syrian refugees, has stayed involved with the ACSS, helping to organize its second conference this year. Regional research has grown harder, he said, because of the “climate of fear” in places like Egypt and the impossibility of doing any research at all today in most of Syria, Iraq, and Libya. “The carpet is shifting under our feet in ways that academics don’t like,” Dahi said. “Academics like a stable subject to study.”

He believes the Council will face a major test over the next years as it shifts from dispersing grants to pursuing its own research agenda, like other research councils around the world. “The key challenge will be this next step, because you need to create this tradition of quality production of knowledge,” Dahi said. “I’m optimistic. Supply creates its own demand. I don’t believe that in economics, but I do believe it in knowledge production.”

Thanassis Cambanis, a fellow at the Century Foundation, is the author of Once Upon a Revolution: An Egyptian Story. He blogs at thanassiscambanis.com and tweets @tcambanis.
Not Left, Not but Forward!
Right,

50 Years On, Advancing U.S. Voting Rights for All

by Abigail Deutsch
Daniel Menchaca, who lives in El Paso, Texas, has voted in nearly every election for the last 30 years. But in November 2014, he confronted a problem at the polls: due to a new law, he needed to show his driver’s license to cast a ballot, and he had left his license at home. Poll workers refused to accept his voter ID card or a federally issued ID for his job at a military base; instead, they told him to fill out a provisional ballot. Three weeks later, he learned that—due to missing documentation he hadn’t known was necessary—his provisional ballot wouldn’t count.

Menchaca says the experience made him feel “upset” and “unworthy”—and it didn’t seem to make much sense. The poll workers, who live in his neighborhood, knew who he was. It was harder to get his federal ID (which includes his address, a photo, and a computer chip) than his driver’s license. Situations like this explain why he finds voting so crucial in the first place: “They try to take your rights away.”

In recent years, the United States has seen a rush of restrictive voting policies. The number of new difficulties citizens face—including voter ID laws, cutbacks in early voting, closures of polling places, limitations to same-day registration, and other discouraging measures—is “unprecedented in the last several decades,” according to a report from New York University’s Brennan Center for Justice, a nonpartisan law and policy institute. Until 2013, the Voting Rights Act (VRA) required areas with histories of discrimination to clear proposed voting law changes with the federal government, a hurdle that prevented the passage of countless restrictive laws. In 2012, for instance, the VRA stopped Texas from enacting the very policy that would preclude Menchaca from voting two years later. But the Supreme Court dismantled the Act in 2013 with their Shelby County v. Holder decision, which lifted protections from the regions that need them most.

Harsh voting laws disproportionately affect people of color, youth and the poor, as well as other disadvantaged groups, and the protests that recently rocked cities such as Ferguson and Baltimore have given the matter new urgency. Matt Singer, executive director of the Bus Federation Civic Fund—a nonprofit that supports youth engagement and enfranchisement, and that, like the other organizations mentioned in this piece, receives funding from Carnegie Corporation of New York—sees a link between voting rights and issues that have gripped the American public over the last several months.

“I don’t think that protecting voting rights will on its own lead to an end to police violence, to poverty, to systemic racism,” he says. “But it’s very clear that there are common themes here, with a set of incredibly powerful people in this country—policymakers, judges, and police—whose actions indicate that black people’s lives don’t matter, that their voices and votes don’t matter.”

To Singer, it’s evident that if we hope to solve pressing national problems, we need to empower all Americans to join the conversation—“especially,” he says, “the people most affected by systemic injustice.” For his organization and like-minded partners, it’s a question of advancing equal rights for all Americans regardless of life circumstances or political party: not left, not right, but forward.

A Blow to Injustice

Fifty years ago this August, when President Lyndon B. Johnson signed the Voting Rights Act, systemic injustice was rampant. A variety of obstacles hindered would-be voters, from confusingly worded “literacy tests” to poll taxes, especially in the South. At the whim of local registrars, certain voters might be asked to prove their knowledge of the Constitution, or might get disqualified for abbreviating words on their applications. Such tactics had been disenfranchising minority citizens since the late nineteenth century. The result was that, in 1962, less than seven percent of black Mississippi residents could vote. A year later, in Selma, Alabama, a mere 156 of the city’s 15,000 eligible black voters were registered.

This widespread discrimination gave rise to historic protests, including Martin Luther King, Jr.’s march on the Edmund Pettus Bridge near Selma, Alabama. The violence that his marchers suffered at the hands of state troopers, combined with years’ worth of earlier protests, inspired President Johnson to appear before Congress on March 15, 1965, to make his case for a voting rights law. Comparing the Selma events to battles of the American Revolution and the Civil War, Johnson asserted that the issue of voting rights was critical to American identity itself. “Rarely are we met with a challenge...to the values and the purposes and the meaning of our beloved Nation,” he said. “The issue of equal rights for American Negroes is such an issue”—and should Americans fail to respond to it, “we will have failed as a people and as a nation.” The question of Black voting rights, he suggested, implicated everyone, and was for everyone to answer: “There is no Negro problem. There is no Southern problem. There is no Northern problem. There is only an American problem,” he stated.

The Voting Rights Act, which Johnson signed into law five months later, went a long way toward solving this problem. The brilliance of the law—often seen as the most effective civil rights law ever adopted by Congress—lay in both its geographic particularity and its preventive approach. The VRA contained a formula for identifying states and jurisdictions with low turnout or with histories of discriminatory voting practices, and required those regions to obtain approval from the federal government before modifying their voting laws. The formula relied on two factors: whether an area was using a discriminatory “test or device” (such as a literacy test) that impeded citizens from registering and voting, and whether its registration or presidential turnout rates lingered below 50 percent. In addition to approving a law, the federal government could take actions such as sending federal examiners to evaluate
people registering to vote, removing biased registrars from the equation, and sending federal observers to keep an eye on polling activities. In 1965, these strictures applied to Alabama, Louisiana, Georgia, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Virginia, along with swaths of North Carolina and a single county in Arizona. Over the years, that list would evolve as certain jurisdictions proved themselves innocent of discrimination, and obtained relief from coverage, and as others were found newly guilty of bias.

The law’s effects were immediate. By the end of 1965, 250,000 African Americans had become registered voters. By 1968, voter turnout among African Americans in Mississippi had risen to 59 percent from about seven percent in March 1965. These trends would continue. According to a 2015 report by the Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies, more black than white Southerners cast ballots in one third of U.S. presidential elections since 1965. Nationally, black turnout exceeded white in the 2012 presidential election.

More Minority Representation

The VRA affected not only who voted, but also who got elected. In 1972, the first black southern politicians since Reconstruction won seats in Congress. By 1990, 495 African Americans served as elected officials in Georgia, up from three before the passage of the VRA. As of March 2015, Alabamans had elected 757 black officials—a steep rise from 86 in 1970—and more than 17,000 members of minority groups held office across the nation, up from fewer than 1,000 in 1965. While minorities remain underrepresented in elected offices, these figures nonetheless indicate substantial progress in civic engagement and political influence.

Yet progress has hardly been consistent. Since 2010 in particular, the United States has suffered a vast number of efforts to curtail voting rights. “It seems like every time I wake up there’s something new coming out,” says Anita Johnson, a Wisconsin-based community organizer and a plaintiff in a voting rights-related case for the Advance- ment Project, a civil rights organization that provides legal, communications, and organizing support to grassroots movements across the nation. She points out that weekend voting has been taken away and residency requirements for voting have been changed. “Now, when Wisconsinites move, they must live in their new homes for 28 days before being able to vote nearby. ...I’m embarrassed that legislators think they can take us back to 1950 when it comes to these voting laws.”

Why this regression? Wendy Weiser, director of the Democracy Program at the Brennan Center, sees the problem as a response to President Obama’s election and anxiety over demographic change. As she explains the connection, “The places that saw the greatest increase in voter suppression bills were the places that saw the greatest increase in African American voting turnout, and also the states that saw the greatest increases in Latino population growth in the last decade.”

According to a Brennan Center report, supporters of these laws claim they save money, ease the administrative process, and prevent voter fraud. Numerous studies have shown voter fraud, often used as a defense for voter ID laws, to be a red herring; the student journalism initiative News21 found in 2012 that an “infinitesimal” number of cases had occurred since 2000. Opponents point out that the restrictions often disproportionately affect students, the elderly, and the disabled, in addition to the poor and people of color.

Anita Johnson has spoken with many such people, who, she says, often have pressing priorities beyond casting a ballot. She recalls urging an African American man to get a new ID card—a requirement for voting in Wisconsin, which passed a tough voter ID law in 2011—only to learn that the man couldn’t afford the fee; that money had to go to food for his child.

Former felons are another group confronting fresh difficulties in certain states. Richard Straight hasn’t voted since 2004, when he was arrested, because of a 2011 policy requiring former felons in Iowa to apply to the Governor’s office to get their voting rights back. A retired truck driver who served in the military, Straight lives off Social Security and can’t afford the $500 lawyer’s fee required to file the application. “It’s like you’re no longer an American citizen,” he says. “It feels like I’m still being punished for what I did years ago, to this day.” If he could, he would not only vote but also run for city council; he’s passionate about issues like street repairs and the cost of city maintenance. But he’s not hopeful about either goal. “I don’t see how I can ever vote again,” he says.

Shelby County Turns Back the Clock

The single most damaging legal shift in recent years—one that has permitted many others to occur—is the 2013 Shelby County Supreme Court decision. After an Alabama jurisdiction challenged the constitutionality of two sections of the VRA, the Supreme Court declared one outdated: Section 4, which included the formula that determined the geographic areas subject to federal preclearance. With that, preclearance ended. Efforts to update Section 4 are ongoing, but—in a time when partisan gridlock makes voters wish for President Johnson’s productivity—it’s unclear when new legislation will pass.

The Shelby decision yielded swift backlash. President Obama voiced his disappointment, and Supreme Court Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg delivered a scathing dissent. “Hubris is a fit word for today’s demolition of the VRA,” she wrote, adding that the act should not be destroyed on account of its success: “Throwing out preclearance when it has worked and is continuing to work to stop discriminatory changes is like throwing away your umbrella in a rainstorm because you are not getting wet.”
Immediately after the announcement of the Shelby decision, voters got wet. The Texas voter ID law that the VRA had blocked in 2012—the same law that would later prevent Menchaca from voting—went into effect. A month later, North Carolina passed what the Nation deemed “the most sweeping voting restrictions in the country.” The state cut early voting, ended same-day registration, and introduced strict voter ID requirements, among other measures. “It’s been a deluge,” says Katherine Culliton-González, director of the Voter Protection for Advancement Project. “A complete and total deluge.”

Like Weiser, she points to backlash against voters of color—a trend she connects to the fact that America is on its way to becoming a majority nonwhite country. For instance, Latino, Asian, and Pacific Islander voters are confronting burdensome proof-of-citizenship requirements. She also emphasizes the protean nature of discriminatory practices. Once voters figure out how to address any given problem, others arise: a jurisdiction changes a form, or starts to ask for ID, or doesn’t let people get assistance. “It’s a lesson that everyone should have learned from 1965,” Culliton-González says. “There’s not any one thing we can litigate against and be done, because discrimination will then rear its head in other ways. That’s why we need preclearance.”

In addition to mandating preclearance, the VRA had required states to publicize proposed voting law changes and let citizens weigh in on any potential alterations. Now, it’s much harder simply to figure out if and how laws are changing, Culliton-González says. The tasks of identifying, publicizing, and litigating against restrictive voting laws have fallen to local communities, public interest attorneys, and the nonprofit sector. Organizations like Advancement Project, the Brennan Center, and the Shelby Response Fund (which coordinates funding for a number of litigating groups) share in this demanding and expensive work. In a time of low voter turnout—only 36.4 percent of eligible Americans voted in the 2014 midterm elections—all of these efforts divert needed resources from registering voters and getting out the vote, notes Karen Narasaki, manager of the Shelby Response Fund, which is housed in NEO Philanthropy’s state infrastructure fund.

Narasaki emphasizes the importance of catching violations on the local level, which is where most discriminatory tactics occur. “Things are happening in small communities everywhere, and you may not know about them in time to do anything about them,” she says. “All those changes are less exciting and harder to find, but as a practical matter they’re very important.”

That’s why, in the absence of federal oversight, the Fund’s grantees train and organize volunteers to monitor local elections; the Advancement Project engages in similar efforts. Monitoring elections can both prevent problems and provide a means to “spring into action” if a law does change, Narasaki says. It’s also yielded a surprising benefit: new and productive relationships between voting advocates and election officials, “many of whom really want the system to work.” In some cases, officials have started asking local volunteers to help with outreach and other needs.

Yet these benefits can feel small in comparison with the damage that the Shelby decision inflicted. “It keeps hitting me, how much we’ve lost,” Culliton-González says. “It’s still hitting me a couple of years later.”

**Why We Don’t Vote**

Restrictive laws are far from the only problems hindering American voters today. The laws intersect with a variety of other factors, from misinformation about polling places to the difficulties of registering that keep voter turnout low. According to Helena Huang, director of Philanthropy and Communications for State Voices, all of these barriers contribute to a widespread sense of disenchantment that leaves people uninterested in voting: they feel unmotivated to fix problems, including systematic disenfranchisement itself. Huang, whose organization is a nonpartisan network that coordinates social-justice groups within and across many states, says, “It’s one of the cruel ironies. At precisely the moment where we need people to be making sure the government is working for them, they feel so disenfranchised and alienated that they no longer want to participate.”

Matt Singer, of the youth-oriented Bus Federation, echoes this concern about people’s disgust with the system. He cites the negativity of the political process, the “drumbeat of Super PACs and attack ads and partisanship, which is not what anyone wants, but especially not what young people want.” This atmosphere can keep voters—particularly young ones—away from the ballot box, he stresses, yet it inspires his hope for recasting the mood of the democratic process: “How can we make democracy engaging and approachable and exciting enough that people want to vote?” (One answer, for his organization, lies in their choice of transportation: volunteers move around on the Federation’s four buses, not in cars, simply because being together on the buses is more fun.)

Singer believes other factors contribute to youth disengagement. “The political system doesn’t take young people very seriously, because young people don’t vote, and because the political system thinks young people don’t vote,” he says. Political campaigns tend to send information to people who have voted before. “When people say young people are too poorly informed to vote—well, young people are not getting that information.”

Lack of information doesn’t create problems just for youth. According to Singer, six million people did not vote in the 2008 election because they missed a deadline or didn’t know how to register. That statistic inspired his organization to start National Voter Registration Day, which spreads the gospel of voter registration over traditional and social media, in addition to sending activists and celebrities onto the streets to motivate people to register to vote. The
federation also runs voter registration and turnout drives and teaches young people how to cast ballots. Hundreds of national and local organizations partner in promoting National Voter Registration Day, which will take place on September 22, 2015.

New immigrants also face particular challenges to voting, Huang says—partly because many come from countries with different attitudes toward government. “For some Asian communities, not only is the concept of democracy a new one, but in some societies, political participation was cause for severe punishment. So we have a huge cultural barrier there.” As part of State Voices’ work welcoming new immigrants into American society, its New American Voters program in Oregon sends representatives to citizenship ceremonies, where they register new citizens to vote. That program has a 90 percent success rate, and has been picked up by colleagues in Georgia.

The efforts of advocates and sympathetic lawmakers are unquestionably easing certain voting rights problems. Take voter registration: it is widely considered the largest barrier to voting, and in many states, it remains paper based and error prone. Yet more and more states are recognizing this issue and adopting online registration; over half may offer it in time for the 2016 presidential election.

In a similar vein, the Electronic Registration Information Center, created by Pew Charitable Trusts and run by the states, uses up-to-the-minute technology to allow states to identify people who have died or moved, which helps in updating voter rolls and registering new voters.

Citizens often lack information about the voting process, including polling site locations; Pew’s Voting Information Project, which offers multiple online tools and apps in partnership with Google, Facebook, and other organizations, lets voters see their ballots, and access turn-by-turn directions to polling places, once they enter their addresses. Oregon’s new Motor Voter law, adopted in March, marks another significant improvement: it automatically registers people to vote when they conduct a transaction at the Department of Motor Vehicles. This program is expected to enfranchise an estimated 300,000 people. (California has already expressed interest in adopting a similar law.)

David Becker, who directs election initiatives at Pew, feels optimistic about the prospect of increasing access through modernization. “We’ve seen a shift over the last six or seven years,” he says. “It’s not a question of do you upgrade technology; it’s a question of when.” On this issue, he emphasizes, Democrats and Republicans often agree.

It’s Not All Bad News
Cooperative bipartisan action is at the heart of the Presidential Commission on Election Administration established by Executive Order in March 2013. Cochaired by Robert F. Bauer, who served President Obama as White House counsel, and Ben Ginsberg, who served as national counsel to the Romney for President campaigns, the Commission’s ten members include election administrators and customer service–oriented business people whose private and public sector experience help identify best election practices.

The Commission conducted a six-month study of problems that have plagued voting in the past and that will confront the American voter in the future. After hearing testimony from around the country and evaluating the results of a survey of thousands of election administrators, the Commission concluded unanimously that the “problems that hinder the efficient administration of elections are both identifiable and solvable.” Their report plus online tools and recommendations can be found at the Commission’s website (www.supportthevoter.gov) and on the site of the Corporation-supported Caltech-MIT Voting Technology Project.

Indeed, the story of voting in America can’t be reduced to partisan battles over restrictive laws: “There are advances both on the good side and the bad side, and sometimes even in the same places,” the Brennan Center’s Weiser says. Virginia has passed a voter ID law, but it also started offering online voter registration and designated minimum numbers of voting machines and workers at polling places to cut down on long lines on election day. Florida has introduced an online registration system even as it limited voter registration drives, curbed early voting, and effectively disenfranchised people with criminal convictions. According to the Brennan Center, between the January start of the 2015 legislative session and mid-May, 113 restrictive measures were introduced or passed in state legislatures—and so were 464 bills that could improve access to registration and voting.

Yet owing both to the ongoing push for restrictive laws, and to what Weiser describes as a “systematic underinvestment in our elections,” voting rights advocates can never rest. “We repeatedly come up against cliffs where all the voting machines are about to expire, or we haven’t registered anyone to vote, or our voter rolls are a mess, or no one can find their polling places. We’re going to sound the alarm and there will be advocacy and it will get solved, and then a new crisis will come.” The next crisis, she says, concerns antiquated voting machines: “We need to be getting on that quickly or we’ll end up with election meltdowns.”

Now, advocates are waging a two-pronged attack. “We need to both improve the voting system for everybody, and cut off opportunities for voter suppression,” Weiser says. “I’m confident on the system side, but we’ll have to see for how long we’ll need to continue fighting voter suppression battles.” For Richard Straight, Daniel Menchaca, and the countless other Americans prevented from voting in recent years, those battles can’t be won quickly enough.

Abigail Deutsch is a writer based in New York. Her work appears in the Wall Street Journal, Poetry magazine, The Times Literary Supplement, and other publications.
Taylor Rountree took a year and a half to snag a spot in Yevgeniy Milman’s alternative developmental, or remedial, math class at New York City’s Borough of Manhattan Community College (BMCC). The 21-year-old had already withdrawn from the regular developmental education course—twice—because she was failing and decided she’d rather get out than get an “F” on her transcript.
Rountree found Milman on Rate My Professors, an independent website where students grade their professors on helpfulness, clarity, and easiness. “He was the top-rated math professor in our school, so I hunted him down like a hound to have him,” joked Rountree. “Finally, this semester I got lucky.” The waiting paid off. Standing outside room S741 on the main campus, which stretches along the Hudson River just blocks from City Hall and Ground Zero, Rountree smiled modestly and said she is not just passing the class; for the first time, she feels smart.

It’s easy to see why there’s a waiting list for Milman’s class. He’s calm, patient, and has a quirky sense of humor. He started the class with a warning—“Algebra coming in!”—followed by reassurance: “It’s not necessarily going to be anything bad because algebra is not a bad word; it’s just something that can be useful in certain situations.” Ignoring the moaning, Milman explained that for the next problem they would be figuring out how long someone who has had a few drinks should wait before legally and safely getting behind the wheel of a car. The students perked up.

“This they could relate to.

“The legal limit is this much in three gallons of blood,” Milman told his class, holding his thumb and forefinger about an inch apart to illustrate the tiny amount. A smattering of shocked murmurs erupted from around the classroom; it was much less alcohol than the students expected. Milman is attentive as he moves from group to group answering questions and trying to make sure every student understands the problem and what they’re being asked to do. When someone is struggling, he pulls up a chair and works one-on-one. When he senses broad confusion or misunderstanding, Milman stops everyone, goes to the blackboard, and reviews the lesson, then continues his rounds.

“I like that he thoroughly explains everything in real-world terms,” said 19-year-old Ciara Gipson, wearing jeans, a green T-shirt, and a serious expression. “It’s not just math and formulas and stuff, we have the opportunity to work it out on our own first before the professor explains it to us. Then we work it out together as a class and figure out what we did right and what we did wrong, instead of the professor just giving us the answers right off the bat.” Gipson said math was a difficult subject for her in high school and that’s how she wound up taking a remedial course. But after nearly a year in Milman’s class, she has experienced that “click,” when everything starts to make sense. That was remarkably clear when Milman asked Gipson to share the process she used to get a correct answer.

The program that boosted Gipson’s confidence and restored Rountree’s self-worth is part of the nationwide Community College Pathways initiative—two revamped remedial math courses created with Carnegie Corporation support and with liberal arts majors in mind. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (CFAT) developed the two courses, Statway (focused on statistics) and Quantway (focused on quantitative reasoning), which aim to move students more quickly into college-level math through an innovative approach that includes building lessons around real-life situations and having students work together in groups to figure out the answers.

What students learn will have “relevance, value, and purpose,” explained CFAT President Anthony Bryk, applicable to all sorts of daily decisions and current events, from calculating how long it takes for alcohol to dissipate, to making sense of political polls, to shopping for a mortgage. CFAT published a workbook for Quantway filled with everyday scenarios to keep students engaged in problem solving. A section on linear models, which can be used to chart the rate of change or to compare rates, uses cell phone plans as an illustration. Students are given prices for a two-year, flat-rate contract and a price-per-minute plan, and have to figure out which is the better deal, then graph their answer. M&M’s candy is the sweet spot in a Statway lesson on distribution of sample proportions. Each student receives a random sample of 25 M&M’s and plots the proportion of blue candies. Using everybody’s results, they have to figure out the best estimate for the proportion of all M&M’s everywhere that are blue.

The Heart of the Problem

Math problems based on real-world experience can make that subject less intimidating. But fear of math isn’t the only obstacle keeping community college students from reaching their goals. Simply transforming the content and structure of remedial courses won’t counteract years of negative messages many students received about their value, abilities, and future potential. At the heart of the problem are years spent in inadequate schools in impoverished neighborhoods that take their toll on student potential. Lawsuits such as Williams v. California, a seminal court case settled in 2004, rendered vivid images of low-income students stuck in elementary and secondary schools with crumbling plaster, broken bathrooms, insufficient textbooks, and a revolving door of substitute teachers.

Even students tenacious enough to overcome those inequities and attend college face other hurdles. On average, 60 percent of entering community college students will be referred to developmental math because they don’t score high enough on the college’s placement exam. Of those, only 20 percent will advance to college-level math, which is the ticket to transfer to a four-year college or to earn an associate’s degree. No wonder students feel like interlopers who aren’t worthy enough or, as in Taylor Rountree’s case,
smart enough to have a seat at the higher education table. Being told they have to take remedial math, even if it’s new and improved, risks reinforcing those beliefs.

“These are students who traditionally have not done well in math,” said Bryk. “They don’t see the relevance and purpose. They’ve come to think about themselves as not good at this. And if we’re actually going to figure out a way to sustain their active engagement in this work, we have to address these issues about motivation, given everything that the educational system prior to this point has signaled to them.”

The Pathways team at CFAT spent a lot of time reading and talking and thinking about how to address this challenge. They immersed themselves in research around social and psychological connections to learning, focusing on the work of renowned Stanford University psychology professor Carol Dweck, best known for studying growth mindset. Dweck and her team conducted a series of experiments with elementary school students and found that those who believed they weren’t smart and would never improve—described as having a fixed mindset—could change that self-perception by learning study skills, being told that they had the ability to succeed, and getting encouragement to keep trying and pushing ahead even if they failed now and again.

CFAT staff and Pathways faculty expanded Dweck’s idea into what they call “productive persistence”: essentially a set of skills, strategies, and mindsets that disadvantaged children and teenagers can use to improve their study habits, motivation, self-regulation, and tenacity. These motivational tools and habits of mind were embedded into the teaching, training, and structure of Statway and Quantway.

At American River College in Sacramento, California, Statway Professor Michelle Brock starts every class with a request intended to create a growth-mindset culture. Right after walking in the door and saying “hello,” before she’s pulled out the class materials from her rolling backpack, Brock glances at the handful of empty chairs and asks her students to get on their cell phones. “If you look around and see that somebody is not here, can you text them real quick to find out where they are?”

Brock’s class meets 3 hours a day, four days a week. Missing even one session could be hard to make up. But that’s not the only reason for the calls. “That’s reminding them they’re important here; you’re an important part of this class,” said Brock later that morning in her office. “One of the things researchers found that can affect a student’s success in a class can be whether or not they feel that they belong in college.”

Another critical piece of the process is group work. After reviewing their homework, the 26 students break into the same groups they’ve been in all semester, scooch their desks into clusters, and turn on their graphing calculators. The group model works on multiple levels. “There’s a little bit of a family thing, a little bit of the banter that goes on between students,” observed Brock. “They’re comfortable with each and with the faculty.” Sometimes too comfortable.

“Mrs. B!” called out student James Dorris. She looked over but didn’t respond. Dorris tried again.

“She’s ignoring me now. I’ve used up my two Mrs. B’s,” he said to no one in particular, chuckling.

His assessment isn’t too far off base. After class, Brock explains that she intentionally doesn’t step in right away because the Statway method isn’t about handing out equations and having students fill in the blanks. It’s designed for students to work through the problems individually, share their answers within their groups, and work together to help classmates having difficulty. The bottom line is that they should try to work through the problems themselves before giving up and asking for the answer, and Dorris gave up too soon.

**Triple the Success in Half the Time**

At BMCC, nearly 80 percent of all first-time freshmen place into developmental math, and less than 30 percent pass the traditional version of the course, according to a 2014 report to the regional accreditation commission. But for students enrolled in Quantway, results are almost flipped—about 60 percent of them pass. Some community colleges have two, three, even four levels of remedial classes that don’t count toward graduation, could take two years to complete in the best of circumstances, require expensive books, and cost the same as any other class. The Community College Research Center (CCRC), located in Teachers College at Columbia University, found that just 10 percent of students who place three semesters below college math make it to the next remedial level. Typically, they run out of time, money, and motivation.

“Math kept me here two years longer than I should have been,” grumbled Debbie Huffman, who hopes to graduate this year from American River College and then transfer to nearby Sacramento State University. She was accepted into the anthropology department, pending a passing grade in this class. Huffman is 57 years old and impatient to finally earn a degree now that she’s in college. But everything she learned in high school algebra was long gone by the time she got here. “I was completely stumped, I could not do it,” recalled Huffman of her two failed attempts at pre-algebra.

Then she heard about Statway. The two-semester course combines three redesigned math classes—two remedial and one college-level statistics. She passed the first semester, but the second half is giving her trouble. “This semester is a real struggle for me,” conceded Huffman. She had just given her eraser a workout on a task that called for determining confidence intervals and calculating margins of error; in this case, determining the accuracy of a measurement, such as a political poll. For Huffman and other students who find themselves on shaky ground, Statway
and Quantway are undergirded with supports. Tutoring is available and professors hold and keep office hours.

When CFAT started digging into problems at community colleges back in 2008, they found that high failure rates in developmental education were the “single biggest impediment” to student success, said Bryk. “They can complete everything else, but if they don’t get through that, all opportunities are blocked. They can’t transfer to four-year institutions and they can’t qualify for a number of different technical and occupational certification programs,” said Bryk. “This was a real high-leverage problem to solve.”

It’s not only struggling students who suffer the consequences. By 2020, just five years from now, 65 percent of all new job openings will require some postsecondary education. But the United States is looking at a shortfall of five million qualified workers. That gap can’t be closed without improving the odds for the 7.5 million students enrolled in degree or certificate programs at the nation’s more than 1,100 community colleges. They make up 42 percent of all undergraduates attending public and private nonprofit colleges, according to the latest figures from the National Center for Education Statistics.

Community colleges are also pivotal to advancing social and economic mobility. Forty-four percent of high school students with family incomes below $25,000 choose to attend community colleges after graduation. These institutions are also the top college choice for more than half of all Native American, Hispanic, and Black students. “This is really a central institution in our educational system,” said Bryk. “Yet community colleges are perceived as a lower tier of the [higher education] system in the United States.”

CFAT decided to take on this problem, and started the Pathways initiative as a pilot program. They invited the 26 community colleges within its national network to participate, assembling a team of math faculty from those campuses to take the lead. When American River’s Brock received the email, she was elated. “I went to the dean and said, ‘this is what I need to be doing.’” She had been discouraged by the high failure rate in remedial classes and the lack of any effort to address the problem. “We really did need to do something different; we couldn’t keep doing the same thing and expecting different results,” said Brock, referencing the definition of insanity.

She became a charter member of CFAT’s Pathways team. They spent the first year reviewing research, meeting with experts, designing the courses, writing curriculum, testing out lessons on their students, and tweaking them before the actual launch. Four years into the program, 80 percent of Statway students at American River College are completing the full yearlong course, compared to about 15 percent in the traditional course, said Brock. An analysis of all 18 community colleges in the initial Statway pilot found that 51 percent of the 1,077 students enrolled in the course in 2011 (the first year it was offered) completed it and earned college credit in one year, compared to 15 percent of students in the regular sequence earning college credit after two years.

At latest count, 49 colleges in 14 states are participating in Statway or Quantway, enrolling nearly 18,000 students since the Pathways initiative began. “Our tagline for Statway is ‘triple the success in half the time,’” remarked Heather Hough, an analyst at CFAT. “And it’s been true every single year even as we’ve added more colleges.” As a proven success, CFAT’s Pathways program has broad support in the field and is scaling up the program—which will again be funded by Carnegie Corporation.

### One Size Won’t Fit All

While Pathways has been extremely successful for these students, up until now it did not deliver all the necessary algebra and precalculus content to enable students to take math courses in STEM majors or other programs requiring similar math preparation. But faculty from six colleges have been working together to build bridge courseware to take students from Statway and Quantway to precalculus. During 2014-15 the faculty developed a complete set of materials and pilot tested elements of them in their existing classes. The resulting curricula have now been shared network wide. Colleges can now make Statway and Quantway available to significantly more students, as the bridge option has expanded the number of majors for which the Pathways programs are appropriate.

The campaign to reinvent remedial math doesn’t end with Statway and Quantway. A two-year-old program also supported by Carnegie Corporation, the New Mathways Project at the University of Texas’s Charles A. Dana Center (a joint enterprise with the Texas Association of Community Colleges), offers a wide selection of alternative developmental education courses, each one fine-tuned to align more closely with a different major. Philip Uri Treisman, founder and executive director of the Dana Center, was part of the CFAT team that shaped the Pathways initiative. Groundbreaking research he conducted as a graduate student at the University of California, Berkeley, in the mid-1970s had given Treisman a valuable perspective on what it takes for students to succeed. That insight found its way into both programs.

As a student of math and education, he was interested in the factors that support high achievement among minority students in mathematics. In particular, he wanted to understand why African American students who were at the top of their high school classes did so much worse in freshman calculus at Berkeley than their Chinese American classmates. Treisman found that, beginning on the first day of class, the Chinese American students organized academically focused social groups.

By contrast, the African American students, accustomed to being among a small elite band of high achievers in high school, isolated themselves academically and kept their social lives and school lives separate. These observations led Treisman to establish the Mathematics Workshop Program, small science and math working groups for Black and Latino students.
Treisman’s early research found its way into the New Mathways Project currently being implemented in community colleges throughout Texas, especially in its use of approaches that help students develop skills as learners. Mathways students take a semester-long, for-credit course designed to help them develop the strategies and persistence necessary to succeed in college (particularly in mathematics courses) and in their careers and life. Mathways offers multiple course options with mathematics content aligned to specific fields of study. Acceleration allows students to complete a college-level math course quickly; and curriculum design and pedagogy are based on proven practice.

Recognizing that no one or two models can work for all students, CFAT is also exploring new alternatives. American River College student Kia Elliott fears that the Statway class she’s enrolled in is her last chance, but she’s not thriving here any more than she was in the college-level Algebra II. Elliott said the problem with Statway is that she’s not good at teaching herself and needs more direct instruction from the professor. “I think the teacher needs to teach more. A lot of students who come to this class, it’s the last resort that we have and a lot of us can’t teach ourselves,” said Elliott.

The widely varying needs of their students have led community colleges to try many different models of developmental education over the past decade with differing degrees of success. Through its NextDev Challenge project, the Denver-based Education Commission of the States has been following the trends and outcomes. One example, the GetREAL program at Berkshire Community College in Massachusetts, boosted pass rates in math from 39 percent to nearly 67 percent by working closely with students to make sure they take advantage of all the academic resources available to them and by helping them to manage the personal and social demands that can be distracting for first-year students. Virginia and North Carolina are leading the way in using instructional modules, which break out the individual competencies, such as fractions, into shorter one-credit units.

CCRC at Teachers College has received a number of grants to study reforms in developmental education, but most of the programs are still too new to generate the type of results needed to consider broad expansions. “It’s likely that certain approaches may work better for certain students, depending on their developmental need or their intended program of study,” said Nicole Edgecombe, senior research associate at CCRC. Still, she added, the early returns on Statway and Quantway show “some very promising short-term outcomes.”

For now, the biggest challenge with expanding Pathways even more is “getting math people interested in doing this,” suggested Michael George, a mathematics professor who teaches along with Milman at BMCC, and who has been part of the Pathways program from the beginning. For starters, he said, it requires a very different teaching style than most mathematicians are comfortable with. “There’s an inherently more informal relationship that develops between the students and the faculty in these Quantway classes,” explained George. Most traditional math teachers are used to being treated with great deference and respect, he said, but Quantway requires more of a coach than a professor, which is one of the reasons it’s hard to recruit faculty to teach in this program.

The preparation is more time consuming, said Brock from American River, and it needs a different kind of energy. Sometimes it’s hard to convince faculty members to take that on. Brock and the other early adopters have shifted their roles from developers and testers to mentors for colleagues across the country who are new to the program.

An ongoing organizational barrier that receives a lot of attention is the lack of alignment between public colleges and universities, even those in the same state. A student may earn an “A” in Statway, but that’s moot if the local four-year state university won’t accept the credits. Sometimes it’s a bureaucratic tangle, but more often it’s a philosophical debate over how much and what kind of math college students should be required to know. One side contends that students who aren’t majoring in a field that requires algebra or calculus should be allowed to take a math class that will be useful in their liberal arts career. Critics of that perspective maintain that without an agreed upon set of universal requirements, the value of a college degree is diminished. As Bryk pointed out, Statway and Quantway were designed as a deliberate challenge to that point of view.

The good news is, the mathematics community is increasingly recognizing and advocating for the need for differentiated courses for students based on their major and, relatedly, a need for greater emphasis on quantitative reasoning and statistics skills. Recently the University of California granted permanent transfer approval for Statway, another significant indicator. This is evidence of an ongoing evolution over the five years of Statway’s development. Although challenges remain, the hope is that the California State University system will also grant permanent transfer approval as will the University of Washington, both of which are up for consideration in the coming months and years.

Those who, like Professor George of BMCC, consider the Pathways approach to be the best way forward, contend that the old standards don’t meet the real needs of today’s community college students. In contrast, Pathways can help large numbers of students in multiple contexts gain essential mathematics skills to not only achieve their academic goals but to solve problems and improve their lives—all with the aid of clear quantitative and mathematical thinking. Consequently, “For me,” George says emphatically, “there’s no going back.”

Kathryn Baron is a California-based reporter. She has been writing about education for more than 20 years in newspapers and magazines, online, and for public radio.
Devyatkino
Moments of Passage and Peace

by Alison Graham
Wind fills the tunnel at Ploshad Vostanniya, one of Saint Petersburg’s central metro stops, and crowds of businesspeople, babushkas, and teenage couples edge closer to the tracks, ready to squeeze onto the approaching train before its unforgiving doors slam shut. Inside, shoulders are wedged among shoulders and bodies breathe the same sticky air, but eyes make no contact. People look either up or down, riveted by a map or a spot on the floor. The only voice is that of the automated announcement system, regular and smooth in contrast with the rough vibration of the train.

At each stop the car unloads more people than it takes on. Shoulders are again free to slump and tired legs welcome an open space on the bench. By the seventh or eighth stop, it is clear who will be riding the train to the end of the line. Most carry backpacks or suitcases—several shopping bags, at least. At the ninth stop, the train empties. A guard sweeps each car for stragglers.

The doors of the train station burst open into a misty wind. Travelers adjust their scarves and pull their suitcases around puddles. They have come only nine stops from Ploshad Uprising Square, Vostanniya, considered the gates of St. Petersburg and half an hour from the city center. But this place called Devyatkin is much colder. The northernmost stop of the Saint Petersburg Metro system—and formerly, of the world—it is the only Metro station located beyond the city limits.

On the outskirts, Devyatkin is a place of transfer. Where the metro ends, passengers proceed to the commuter rail, the bus station, or one of many lingering taxis. Women click by on high heels, en route to a business meeting or perhaps home in one of Devyatkin’s nearby suburbs; older couples wait for a bus to their dachas in the countryside.

The crowds that gather here are not the homogenous white population that dominates the city center. Mansur, a Saudi, sells his pirozhki in a café where everything but the coffee is fried. At the farmer’s market, Babushka Ola, from Latvia, sits and waits for someone to buy a rose or two on the way home. Hovering wherever the crowds come, a group of women in bright, ornate gowns circle the sidewalk with their palms outstretched, asking for money to get home, miles south of the city near the Georgian border.

Beyond the buses and trains, Devyatkin becomes a quiet bedroom community. After work or errands in the city, a commuter’s walk is just five minutes from train to apartment—the crumbling brown Soviet-style block or the massive blue and orange concrete development next door. One long, muddy road rolls away from the area, with only the occasional car repair shop or convenience store surrounded by overgrown grass to be seen. Outside one of these shops, two teenaged brothers sit in folding chairs while their mother and father stand under a rotting wood roof a few feet away. They seem to be conversing, but everyone faces the road and watches the traffic. Like every establishment in the area, they advertise “24 ЧАСА” service. Travelers, loggers, and truck drivers, tired and hungry, pass through at all times of day. Like the taxis and the subway train, Devyatkin business is always ready.

Back at the station, evening rush hour begins. The cool air thickens and so does the crowd, everyone fidgeting to find a spot under the awning as a few heavy raindrops fall. A child stretches out a hand from under her mother’s umbrella to let the rain water a bunch of flowers she’s holding. A gloomy couple slides past; the woman holds a newspaper-wrapped bundle close, as if to warm her cheek. The first wave of buses arrives. The rain comes quicker now and passengers take their seats, disappearing behind the foggy windows.

About This Photo Essay

In spring 2014, the Program for Narrative and Documentary Practice at Tufts University took 11 students, including Alison Graham, who created this photo essay, to St. Petersburg, Russia to explore that country up-close. The stories and photographs they brought home focused on the cultural — the resurgence of iconographers, the role of chess, and the evolution of dance; the social — the current punk scene, homelessness, and access for the physically disabled; and the sense of place — Nevsky Prospekt and the ring neighborhoods of Soviet housing.

The workshop was led by award-winning photographer Samuel James, an alumnus of the Institute for Global Leadership and an instructor in the Program. An educational initiative of the Institute for Global Leadership and supported by Carnegie Corporation of New York, the Program for Narrative and Documentary Practice teaches students to shape important global issues into penetrating, multimedia narratives. Its mission is to promote narrative documentary work that cultivates progressive change by amplifying relevant voices, breaking down barriers to understanding, advancing human dignity, and highlighting social injustices.

For more photo essays from St. Petersburg 2104, visit Carnegie.org.
CARNegie RESULTS
Conversation among faith communities is in my experience a great gift. Given the dangers facing the world today, it is also a religious imperative.

Arnold M. Eisen, chancellor, Jewish Theological Seminary; Preface, The Muslim World

Judaism and Islam in America

A Game Plan for Growing Interfaith Connections

by Karen Theroux
H

ow can faith communities survive in a twen-
ty-first-century western world? Modernity
offers many benefits to people of all religions
and cultures, yet the openness of American
life with its seemingly limitless options has
dramatically changed religious experience. In short, it is
harder than ever for a community of faith to take its future
for granted.

Twenty-first-century challenges affect American Jews
and Muslims alike. When it comes to following scripture
and maintaining traditions and religious identity in a large-
ly secular society, the two groups have a lot in common.
But despite the over 1,000-year history of close relation-
ship and religious dialogue, opportunities to conduct open
conversations and share their learning are rare, especially
given the atmosphere of mistrust and misunderstanding
casted by world events. What to do?

From 2010 to 2014, the Jewish Theological Seminary
(JTS) in New York City and two project partners, the
Islamic Society of North America (ISNA) and Hartford
Seminary, found a way to advance Jewish-Muslim
engagement and dialogue nationwide. Their joint project,
Judaism and Islam in America, began with a series of
workshops that fostered interfaith discussions and ex-
changes between scholars and religious leaders, and
ended with other Jewish-Muslim projects that
meaningfully expanded on the conversation: two
groundbreaking publications and four Jewish-Muslim pilot
engagement projects.

Burton L. Visotzky, a professor at JTS, recalls the
germination of the idea: “There was a new chancellor at
the seminary, Arnold Eisen, who encouraged me to push
forward in interreligious dialogue work,” Visotzky says. “I
had been making inroads in the Muslim community, but
wanted to go further.” Visotzky got in touch with a friend,
Mohamed Elsanousi, director of ISNA, whose mission is to
foster the development of the Muslim community, inter-
faith relations, civic engagement, and better understanding
of Islam. They held a meeting where Visotzky raised the
idea of an interfaith program, and ISNA’s director general
responded, “What took you so long?” As Visotzky puts it,
“He fired the starter pistol.”

“This was a time when a program was needed, par-
cularly between Jewish and Muslim communities in the Unit-
ed States,” Elsanousi says. “It was very clear our communi-
ties needed to choose from two options: either strengthen
our relationship and increase trust here at home by trying
to have Muslims learn Judaism from their neighbors and
the reverse; or watch what’s happening in the Middle East
and bring that tension here. We chose the first option, and
the “Judaism and Islam in America” project was born.”

The former president of ISNA, Ingrid Mattson, was
also in favor of the program. She was then the director of
the MacDonald Center for the Study of Islam and Chris-
tian-Muslim Relations at Hartford Seminary in Hartford,
Connecticut. An academic unit within the country’s oldest
nondenominational Christian seminary, it supports the
premise that through intensive study and academically
guided dialogue, interreligious respect and cooperation can
develop. Mattson brought the Hartford institution in as a
second Muslim partner with JTS.

Recognizing that there were too few opportunities for
Jewish and Muslim scholars and religious leaders to
gather and exchange their learning and insight in a secure,
open environment, the program leaders set a goal for the
series of academic conferences to “spill over into places
where Judaism and Islam have similar arcs, as well as into
advocacy and congregational alliance,” Visotzky says. “We
wanted not just to talk, but also to do good in communities
and interfaith relations.” A survey was sent out to Conserva-
tive congregations to assess interest in interfaith activity
(Reform congregations had already participated in a
similar program), and to seed the message of helping Islam
in America to normalize as Judaism had done in order to
become a more regular part of the American fabric.

Finding Common Ground

In 2010 the religious leaders launched their first workshop
for Jewish and Muslim scholars from universities around
the country at JTS in New York City, focusing on what the
two groups have in common as members of minority reli-
gions in America. The objective was to share experiences,
make connections, and readjust their view of the “other.”
Carnegie Corporation of New York and several Jewish
and Muslim cultural foundations provided funding for the
event, hosted jointly by JTS, Hartford Seminary, and ISNA.

Visotzky says there are some significant obstacles
to communication in everyday life between Jews and
Muslims. “First and foremost, the Muslim community is
primarily a series of immigrant communities: Bangladesh,
Indonesian, Middle Eastern, Arab, Persian, and more,” he
explains. “Each community lives in its own silo, with its
own mosque, and not much interaction with other Mus-
lins. ISNA is helping, and wants to bring together this
diverse population to speak in one voice—American Islam.
We are trying to help get Islamic leadership trained here,
PhDs, chaplains, etc., and to have an Islamic seminary here
to ordain imams. Now they are all are born and trained
abroad, which means they’re getting a perspective of local
issues where they are trained rather than here where they
live.”

At the workshop, two dozen scholars discussed the
issues both groups had experienced in adapting to the
traditions of twenty-first-century mainstream America.
This first exchange established that there is ample com-
mon ground between the Muslim- and Jewish-American
communities. Based on the success of this workshop, the
participants decided to continue with a second meeting,
this time at the Hartford Seminary, focusing on their
work in scriptural interpretation and law. The intent was
to fortify connections from the first gathering, plan for
continued collaboration, and reach out to an expanded group of participants.

Rabbi Daniel Nevins, dean of JTS’s Division of Religious Leadership, took part in both gatherings, first in New York and then in Connecticut. “It was thrilling to meet a new set of colleagues who shared similar academic and communal concerns while inhabiting very different cultures,” he says. “At the first session in New York, I recall discussing the respective arcs of historical experience for Jews and Muslims in America. We also spoke about sacred scriptures and began the process of comparison which always challenges us to reconsider our own assets and present them with a new perspective. This experience reminded me that our identity is always contextual—we curate an exhibition of ourselves from our many self-images, some of which have long been buried in storage.”

At the Hartford meeting, where Nevins found the focus closer to his own research interests, he was pleased to make a presentation on Jewish law (halakhah), which was followed by a Muslim scholar speaking about Islamic law (fiqh). Other participants spoke about Midrash and tafsir, the respective traditions of literary interpretation. “I also enjoyed praying beside one another, and the festive dinner that brought community members to the conversation,” he says. “Because this encounter involved not only Jews and Muslims but also Christian scholars, it was a constant experience of comparison.”

Like many of the participants, Nevins became aware that Jews and Muslims are quite similar to one another in the legal focus of their religious cultures and in the intensive study of language. But it was also clear that these relatively liberal Muslims did not come from a reformed tradition, and had some characteristics that he found more similar to Orthodox Jews. “It seemed that we Conservative Jews had much more in common with our Christian colleagues, including the Catholics.”

Also present at the second meeting was Heidi Hadsell, president of Hartford Seminary. She joined the Judaism and Islam project through Mattson, who had left the seminary after the first round of workshops. “I became her substitute,” Hadsell explains, “and had the privilege of being a fly on the wall, listening to the conversation, and getting to know all the people. I learned a lot from hearing the two traditions encounter each other.” Why Hartford? Hadsell describes it as an unusual place with a unique mission that’s relevant for religious leadership all over the world. “You can’t be a good religious leader unless you know people of other religions,” she says. “Hartford Seminary’s interfaith work goes back more than a hundred years. Already in the late nineteenth century there was interest in Islam.”

Hadsell explains that the seminary’s purpose at that time was mainly to train Protestant missionaries for work in the Middle East. Eventually the seminary developed a large library and a faculty centered on Islam, and, in the 1950s, decided to stop conversion and take all the faculty and the library and open a center for the study of Islam. “Today we have this center that attracts students from Christian and Muslim communities all around the world,” she says, “and a thriving Islamic chaplaincy program started 18 years ago at the request of the armed services.”

The genius of the Judaism and Islam project was “that it did what interfaith academics do, which is talk in small groups and at a relatively high level of abstraction as they were finding things in common between the faiths in terms of scripture and its uses,” Hadsell says. The two groups were most alike in taking scripture seriously, and to a very high degree, but with very different methodologies, she adds. “There can be deep differences, but participants felt free to be individual. And there was always good will. The first time you meet there’s the joy of encounter and crossing boundaries; the second time it’s a consolidation of that, and meeting old friends.”

Zainab Alwani, a professor of Islamic Studies from Howard University, also joined the second group for what she describes as a very academic discussion among the...
scholars about scripture and Sharia law, and about “how to practice our beliefs and laws all within the American society. We also talked about the role of Jewish and Islamic scholars within the American academy: ‘How do you teach about your theology?’ I still remember many of the discussions and dialogues,” she says. “I think the main critical point was to be honest. Share what you honestly feel, how you think. From the beginning this was well established by scholars from both faiths— honesty about what you know and what you practice.”

Because the focus was on a community of faith and beliefs, there was nothing about politics, according to Alwani. “The secret of the success of the meeting was that its focus was the well-being of people, communities, and societies,” she says. “When there’s politics, most of the time it’s complicated and has its own agendas or interests that take away the purity of intention. As religious scholars or a faithful community, the intention is to build a righteous community of families and individuals, while you discuss practical aspects of daily life: how to live, pray, deal with school, children, in-laws. It was two different groups working very hard to advance the well-being of their communities...to feel that you are one human family. At the end, that was my feeling.”

**Spreading the Word**

The first two dialogues were so successful for establishing common ground and sharing interpretations of law and scripture that the network of scholars and leaders resolved to broaden the impact of the series through community outreach. The third and final workshop, “From Classroom to Congregation,” included Muslim and Jewish congregational leaders in addition to academics. It took place in Washington, D.C. and ended with a tour of the White House and a briefing with the community engagement staff there.

Experiences from the earlier workshops shaped the format for the last. The daylong closed sessions allowed for frank and open discussion that would not have been possible in a public forum. Hospitality was critical in building trust and the creation of networks to continue the conversations that began at the workshop. A well-attended and favorably received public forum was held during which gleanings from the workshop sessions and the larger context of the need for dialogue were shared.

In this final round, the public presentation was more accessible than the closed convenings, Hadsell says. “There was also the discernment to create, *Sharing the Well: A Resource Guide for Jewish-Muslim Engagement*, that could be put in the hands of Jewish congregations, mosques, maybe churches, too,” she adds. “It would be aimed at lay people who are in the communities, so the fruit of the project wasn’t just academic papers and relationships, but was much more widely spread.” Hadsell got a big supply of the publication and sent it to many leaders of congregations, where it was widely and enthusiastically received. “At the beginning there was some trepidation, she recalls. “Are the communities involved going to support their own people getting involved? In the end, it was extremely well thought out and collegial.”

*Sharing the Well* was the culmination of almost five years of creating bridges of understanding and partnership between American Muslim and Jewish leaders. It was created to answer the question at the heart of the third workshop: Would it be possible to bring the same level of relationship-building to the broader Jewish and Muslim communities in America? The publication’s goal was to highlight what Muslims and Jews in America today share, and to use this as a starting point for deeper learning and dialogue. It contains:

1. Guidelines from experts in the field on how to begin and sustain open and productive interreligious dialogue.

2. Essays by religious, academic, and communal leaders from both religions, centered on values and traditions that Jews and Muslims share, which serve as content for interreligious learning and engagement. These essays cover nine subjects that Muslim and Jewish authors explore independently, and they include discussion questions to help spark conversation.

3. Twenty-four diverse examples of Jewish-Muslim engagement programs from around the country—inspiration for readers to create and expand such programs in their communities.

The book is divided into three sections: “Caring for Others,” “Family and Heritage,” and “Religious Life.” It also contains chapters on “Guidelines for Interreligious Dialogue” and “Shared Learning and Discussion,” and a glossary.

The book’s editors deliberately chose to omit discussion of the Israel-Palestine dispute, realizing that it casts its shadow over every Muslim-Jewish dialogue and inhibits the mutual understanding and trust needed for friendly conversation around sensitive issues. Kim Zeitman Kaplan, who edited *Sharing the Well* along with Elsanousi, remembers the discussion surrounding this topic, including a Muslim scholar’s remark that “you must walk before you can run.” As she explained, “If you want people with little background to see each other as people, bringing up a divisive issue is not helpful. We want to create relationships and understanding, so people aren’t talking to the enemy but to their friend. When you meet someone for the first time, you ask the easy questions—not politics. Once you’re friends you can listen to each other’s opinion. We do acknowledge other approaches in the book; it’s all a matter of how you handle it.”

Creating the publication was more complex and time consuming than Kaplan had been prepared for, but she
society is nearly identical for Jews and Muslims. As Alwani writes in the introduction, “In addressing the daunting social challenges confronting the community of all faith groups, perhaps a collective effort by the interreligious community would introduce a new chapter in interfaith relations.”

**Reaching Out**

The workshops helped to set the groundwork for dialogue-based pilot projects between the Muslim and Jewish communities in Northern Virginia, Washington, D.C., and suburban Maryland. Held in –2013–2014, these projects forged genuine bonds between the two communities, and participants have pledged to do similar programs in the future. The general premise of Judaism and Islam in America—to take the alliances formed among the academics and bring them into the wider community—came to fruition in four pilot projects:

- Adas Israel Congregation and Masjid Muhammad, Washington, D.C.: The two congregations gathered for an evening exploring the role of the Jewish- and Muslim-American communities in the American Civil Rights Movement.

- Georgetown University Jewish and Muslim Student Organizations: These student groups met in the Jewish gathering space on campus, Makóm, to share dinner, dialogue, and a screening of the critically acclaimed documentary, *Little Town of Bethlehem*.

- Beth Shalom Congregation of Columbia County, Maryland, and Howard County Muslim Council: The congregations developed a program with a series on Talking about Israel.

- Temple Rodef Shalom and McLean Islamic Center in Virginia: A dinner and movie event (*Enemy of the Reich: A Muslim Woman Defies the Nazis in WWII Paris*) was held at Temple Rodef Shalom.

“We didn’t know how successful we could be on the community level,” Visotzky says, “but for both Muslims and Jews it was a marvelous outcome.” Elsanousi sees a need for such a program “not only here at home but globally. There is a need to find ways to communicate this kind of work,” he says. “The larger society needs to know *Sharing the Well*, and we need to find a way to do that.” According to Alwani, “You come out of this kind of discussion—wow! We really need to know how to approach each other and get to know each other in a positive way. And to try even for a short time to leave your biases and judgments away from this kind of conversation, and see what the result will be.”

Karen Theraux is an editor and writer at Carnegie Corporation of New York.
St Andrews Celebration

The Duke and Duchess of Cambridge were guests of honor at the St Andrews Gala Benefit, held at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York City on December 9, 2014. The event celebrated the 600th anniversary of the University of St Andrews, from which the Duke and Duchess graduated in 2005. Of the several million dollars raised at the event, a large portion was earmarked for scholarships supporting students who would otherwise be unable to attend university.

Andrew Carnegie, founder of Carnegie Corporation of New York and a native of Scotland, was a rector of St Andrews, the oldest university in Scotland and now one of Europe’s preeminent higher education and research institutions. Louise Richardson, principal and vice-chancellor of the University of Oxford, is a member of the Corporation’s Board of Trustees. A native of Ireland, Professor Richardson is a political scientist by training and has specialized in international security with an emphasis on terrorist movements.

Summit on African Higher Education

Five hundred representatives of the education, private, and public sectors convened in Dakar, Senegal in March 2015 to debate the future of higher education in Africa. The African Higher Education Summit was organized by the pan-African educational organization TrustAfrica with support from Carnegie Corporation of New York, the African Development Bank, the World Bank, and the MasterCard Foundation, among others. The conference aimed to institutionalize continental dialogue around Africa’s higher education challenges, highlight and sustain exemplary initiatives and innovation, and build a constituency for transformation and investment in the field.

Today, as Africa’s economies continue to grow at an unprecedented rate, the demand for an educated workforce is rising at an increasing pace. African universities, however, are not producing enough employable graduates to meet demand. According to organizers, a consensus is beginning to emerge among governments, the business community, scholars, and pan-African development agencies regarding the critical importance of the role higher education can play in the building of democratic societies, fostering of citizenship, empowerment of citizens, and the
facilitating of development and regional integration. Summit participants created a road map for the future aimed at building a constituency for transformation and investment in Africa’s higher education while overcoming such significant challenges as inadequate infrastructures, outdated pedagogies, and low levels of funding. The President of Senegal presented this action plan at the African Union summit in June.

Carnegie Corporation was represented at the higher education summit by Deana Arsenian, vice president, International Program and Program Director, Russia and Eurasia; Claudia Frittelli, program officer, Higher Education and Libraries in Africa; and Judge Anne Claire Williams, member of the Board of Trustees.

New Presidents Meet and Greet

Carnegie Corporation Board Chairman Thomas H. Kean and President Vartan Gregorian hosted a reception in March welcoming the new leaders of three of the Corporation’s sister organizations:

William J. Burns, president of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, retired from the U.S. Foreign Service in 2014 after a 33-year diplomatic career. The recipient of numerous distinguished service awards, he holds the highest rank in the Foreign Service, Career Ambassador, and is the second serving career diplomat in history to become Deputy Secretary of State.

Matthew Scott, president of the Carnegie Institution for Science, was formerly professor of developmental biology, genetics, bioengineering, and biology at the Stanford University School of Medicine. His research has focused on genes that control development, and his lab group discovered the genetic basis of the most common human cancer, basal cell carcinoma, and of the most common childhood malignant brain tumor, medulloblastoma.

Subra Suresh, president of Carnegie Mellon University, was formerly director of the National Science Foundation, the only government science agency charged with advancing all fields of fundamental science and engineering research and related education. A distinguished engineer and scientist, Dr. Suresh’s experimental and modeling work has shaped new fields in the fertile intersections of traditional disciplines.
Wake-up Call for Pakistan

Foreign policy experts—American, Pakistani, and international—have spent two years working on a powerful new report, *Jago Pakistan/Wake Up, Pakistan*, published this May by the Century Foundation and supported by Carnegie Corporation of New York. Time is running out for the critical reforms needed in Pakistan to avoid disaster and move ahead, say the experts of The Century Foundation International Working Group on Pakistan, chaired by Thomas R. Pickering, former U.S. Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs and former Carnegie Corporation trustee.

As the United States draws down its troop levels in Afghanistan and the world’s attention turns to newer challenges, Pakistan is disappearing from the list of priorities for the international community, despite horrific, headline-grabbing violence. The year 2015 offers opportunities to implement a strong course correction, the report argues, opportunities that may not be available in the future. Pakistan’s people, particularly its elites and leaders, need to seize the multiple opportunities to meet challenges in three vital areas—security, economy, and governance—and take their first crucial steps in a new direction.

Partners in Peacebuilding Convene

A group of grantees supported jointly by Carnegie Corporation and Canada’s International Development Research Centre (IDRC) got together in May 2015, midway through their peacebuilding projects. The two funders each support distinct but related clusters of grantees, some based in the United States and some in Africa, through a 2012 joint RFP on peacebuilding and statebuilding. Grantees were joined by the Advisory Group on the Review of the UN Peacebuilding Architecture. The two-day meeting had several purposes:

- to provide an opportunity for researchers working on peacebuilding and statebuilding to share findings and mutually assess the work being undertaken;
- to encourage creative thinking about activities that would elevate and give visibility to the knowledge being produced; and
- to inform, and be informed by, the UN Advisory Group.

Among the 27 attendees were researchers from Uganda, Côte d’Ivoire, Nigeria, Kenya, South Africa, and Benin.
Thirty-One Outstanding Scholars Are Part of a New $6 Million Program Supporting Social Sciences and Humanities

The inaugural class of Carnegie Corporation’s annual fellowship program will receive up to $200,000 each to devote between one and two years to research and writing. An exceptional group of established and emerging scholars, journalists, and authors, the fellows are expected to provide new perspectives on the program’s overarching theme for 2015: Current and Future Challenges to U.S. Democracy and International Order.

The Corporation sought nominations from nearly 700 leaders from a range of universities, think tanks, publishers, independent scholars, and nonprofit organizations nationwide, who collectively nominated more than 300 candidates. The jurors, including the heads of some of the nation’s preeminent institutions dedicated to the advancement of knowledge, considered the merits of each proposal based on originality, promise, and potential impact on a particular field of scholarship.

SELECTION JURY
Chair: Susan Hockfield, president emerita, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Ralph Cicerone, president, National Academy of Sciences
Jared Cohon, president emeritus, Carnegie Mellon University
Mary Sue Coleman, president emerita, University of Michigan
John DeGioia, president, Georgetown University
Robbert Dijkgraaf, director and Leon Levy Professor, Institute for Advanced Study
Jonathan Fanton, president, American Academy of Arts & Sciences
Amy Gutmann, president, University of Pennsylvania
Ira Katznelson, president, Social Science Research Council
Earl Lewis, president, The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation
Don Randel, chair of the board, American Academy of Arts & Sciences
Pauline Yu, president, American Council of Learned Societies
Rapporteur: Arthur Levine, president, Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation

2015 FELLOWS

Alessandro Acquisti
Carnegie Mellon University

Larry M. Bartels
Vanderbilt University

Shahzad Bashir
Stanford University

David E. Bloom
Harvard University

Kevin Gerard Boyle
Northwestern University

Fotini Christia
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

John D. Ciocciari
University of Michigan

Gregory T. Cushman
University of Kansas

Katherine Eban
Journalist

Caleb Everett
University of Miami

Masha Gessen
Journalist

Mala Htun
University of New Mexico

Valerie M. Hudson
Texas A&M University

Maria Ivanova
University of Massachusetts, Boston

Keir A. Lieber
Georgetown University

Arthur Lupia
University of Michigan

Sarah Mathew
Arizona State University

Ian Morris
Stanford University

Leith Mullings
The Graduate Center, City University of New York

Laurence Ralph
Harvard University

Louise I. Shelley
George Mason University

Timothy David Snyder
Yale University

Thomas J. Sugrue
New York University

Patricia L. Sullivan
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Philip E. Tetlock
University of Pennsylvania

Elizabeth F. Thompson
University of Virginia

Daniel J. Tichenor
University of Oregon

Zeynep Tufekci
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Lynn Vavreck
University of California, Los Angeles

Max Weiss
Princeton University

Elizabeth J. Wilson
University of Minnesota
Introducing the New Carnegie.org

Carnegie Corporation of New York is proud to introduce our redesigned Carnegie.org website to you, our valued Carnegie Reporter and Carnegie Results community.

The new Carnegie.org uses exciting design and content curation tools of today in service of our founder Andrew Carnegie’s vision of a foundation that would “promote the advancement and diffusion of knowledge and understanding.” More than 100 years later, this mission could not be better suited to exciting advancements in digital technology, the dissemination of information, and the building of community.

We invite you to explore Carnegie.org—a new take on the traditional Carnegie forum, bringing together leading scholars and innovators working on longstanding critical issues. Program areas—Education, Democracy, International Peace and Security, and Higher Education and Research in Africa—are now showcased front and center on our homepage in rollover pull-outs designed as spines of books in, appropriately, a library.
Each program area also now exists as its own subdomain or hub, allowing readers to delve more deeply into areas of particular interest. Like the Corporation, Carnegie.org aims to serve as a convener for grantees and audiences within our fields, inspiring and building on the research and activities of leading nonprofit institutions working towards related outcomes.

In our hub dedicated to Democracy, for example, you can learn about the program’s focus areas, staff, news, and grantees. Scroll down for Your Voice—Your Vote, special multimedia and interactive features on voting rights. There’s an aggregated Twitter feed of voting resources hosted by Carnegie Corporation in partnership with NationalVoterRegistrationDay.org plus the ability, through a partnership with the platform Genius, to annotate the 1965 Voting Rights Act in the context of today, and more.

As a convening site, we are committed to robust and evolving use of social platforms. As such, our program hubs now serve as one place where you can see the collected social feeds of related grantees. Moving forward, we will be developing conversation and commenting tools expanding the reach and impact of our communities and their knowledge. Producing content, as we know, is just the beginning. How we engage and exchange with each other, is what leads to the knowledge and understanding valued by Andrew Carnegie.

The Corporation is especially proud of our role as stewards of our founder’s legacy, which you can learn about through quotes on program pages, and through a “Fable” of Carnegie’s life and philanthropy—including the 26 cultural and education organizations he established. Students and others can embed and share individual elements of the interactive biography.

We hope that you, our vested audience, will become part of the development of this site by providing ongoing feedback as we continue to roll out various features. Please share your feedback at externalaffairs@carnegie.org. And don’t forget to try us on a range of devices, as the new Carnegie.org is responsive. Check back frequently; we’ll be tweaking and adding much, much more.

Deanna Lee
Chief Communications and Digital Strategies Officer
This October, some of the most charitable and visionary philanthropists in America will receive the Carnegie Medal of Philanthropy. These eight outstanding individuals and families embody the spirit of giving demonstrated by Andrew Carnegie, each having made significant and lasting impacts on a particular field, nation, or the international community. Their generosity has had tremendous influence on a wide range of fields, including education, the environment, cancer research, culture, the arts, science, citizenship, healthcare, and technology.

The 2015 Medal Recipients are:

- Microsoft cofounder and philanthropist Paul G. Allen
- Atlantic Philanthropies founder Charles F. Feeney
- Leading environmental philanthropists Jeremy and Hanne Grantham
- Longtime Pennsylvania philanthropists the Haas Family
- Utah philanthropist and Huntsman Cancer Institute founder Jon M. Huntsman, Sr.
- Prominent San Diego philanthropists Irwin and Joan Jacobs
- Two steadfast New York philanthropists, brothers Robert B. Menschel and Richard L. Menschel
- Celebrated culture and education philanthropist David M. Rubenstein

The Carnegie Medal of Philanthropy was established in 2001 to mark the centennial of Andrew Carnegie’s retirement from business and the start of his career as a philanthropist, with the stated goal of doing “real and permanent good in this world.” Medalists are nominated by the more than 20 Carnegie organizations throughout the United States and Europe, and selected by a committee comprised of representatives from seven of those institutions.