Integration: Are We There Yet?

Beinart vs. Dershowitz on Zionism in Crisis | Janet Gornick on Inequality
INTEGRATION: ARE WE THERE YET?

No, we’re not, but we are getting closer. Interactive maps, created by the CUNY Mapping Service at the GC’s Center for Urban Research, show how urban America changed during the first decade of the twenty-first century. Drawing on census data, the maps display the racial and ethnic composition, block by block, for many major metropolitan areas, revealing a pattern of black neighborhoods becoming less intensely black and white neighborhoods becoming less intensely white. What is surprising are population shifts that few urban sociologists would have previously predicted were possible.

INEQUALITY: IT MATTERS

Professor Janet Gornick, who addressed the question of inequality in her commencement address last spring, pursues the issue further in her interview with Folio. As director of LIS, an international data archive and research center, she works to provide data that researchers throughout the world use to assess income inequality. Her own research, on twenty-five of the world’s richest nations, indicates that the United States has the most unequal distribution of income, more low-wage earners, and fewer worker rights and benefits than nearly all affluent nations.

IS ZIONISM IN CRISIS?

The debate between Harvard Law School’s Professor Alan Dershowitz and the Graduate Center’s Associate Professor Peter Beinart, whose book The Crisis of Zionism has raised tempers and tantrums within the American Jewish community, found the two disputants of much the same mind about Israel’s future. They clashed, however, over Beinart’s call for a boycott of Israel’s West Bank settlements, which Dershowitz contends “plays into the hands” of Israel’s enemies, and over when to support a military response to Iran’s nuclear threat.
The current issue of Folio highlights what might be called “the third mission” of the Graduate Center. We are firmly established as a leading seat of graduate education, with a growing reputation for academic excellence, and we are among the largest of the nation’s doctorate-granting institutions in the humanities and social sciences. We are also—with the inauguration of the Advanced Research Collaborative (ARC) this fall—the hub of an international, interdisciplinary research network. This network embraces the GC research centers and institutes, brings together the wealth of research activities taking place throughout the City University’s colleges, and reaches across the world for new concepts and approaches to those urgent global issues on which ARC scholarship is focused.

No less significant than teaching and research is our role as a forum where our faculty members engage in public discussion of the daunting challenges of our times. This issue of Folio captures the broad thrust of this third mission, with feature articles on inequality, integration, and the crisis in the Middle East.

The cover article, “Integration: Are We There Yet?” examines the changing demographics of urban America, highlighting the views of Distinguished Professors John Mollenkopf and Richard Alba of the Center for Urban Research, and featuring the work of that Center’s Mapping Service and its director Steven Romalewski.

In an interview with Folio for “Inequality: It Matters,” Professor Janet Gornick follows up her commencement address on the subject with a detailed and thoughtful analysis of the growth of inequality in America. The interview notes the work of British social epidemiologist Richard G. Wilkinson on the social and health consequences of inequality. As ARC’s first Distinguished Visitor in Inequality Studies, Dr. Wilkinson lectured at the Graduate Center in November and met in seminars with faculty and students engaged in ARC’s inequality initiative.

Also featured here is the clash of high-profile public intellectuals at Proshansky Auditorium in October, when Associate Professor Peter Beinart, senior political writer for the Daily Beast, met in debate with Harvard law professor Alan Dershowitz. At issue was Beinart’s call for a boycott of Israel’s West Bank settlements and his disagreement with Dershowitz about the threat presented by Iran’s nuclear program.

The topics covered on the following pages are integrated matters; equity, human rights, and global security are all pressing issues at this difficult moment. Integrated as well is our approach to these concerns, for the scholarship our faculty brings to these matters derives from their teaching and research. It is the strength of a robust academic base that enables the Graduate Center to enlighten public discourse.

William P. Kelly
President
The Graduate Center
The Extraordinary Life of Francine du Plessix Gray

“Predictability in writing is like saltpeter in sex,” said Francine du Plessix Gray, in a lively exchange with Graduate Center President Bill Kelly at the October 10 program of his Extraordinary Lives series. These hour-long conversations celebrate “thinkers, artists, and visionaries who have indelibly impacted the fields in which they work.” On this occasion, Kelly artfully guided the slender, well-spoken woman of letters through musings about her upbringing, her life as a writer, and the art and craft of writing.

“I know of no contemporary writer who has written so many beautiful sentences,” said Kelly in his introduction. Her “dazzling essays” have appeared in the New Yorker, the New York Times, the New York Review of Books, Vogue, and Vanity Fair. She has produced “compelling novels,” including October Blood, Lovers and Tyrants, and most recently The Queen’s Lover; “remarkable biographies” on such subjects as Madame de Staël, the Marquis de Sade, Simone Weil, and Flaubert’s muse Louise Colet; and her “magnificent memoir” Them, which won the 2006 National Book Critics Circle Award.

Gray spoke of how the “very magisterial” and “dictatorial” Charles Olsen changed her life at Black Mountain College’s summer session in 1951. He inspired her writing career, encouraging her to keep a journal, which she does to this day, although “in one’s advancing age one leads a less tumultuous life,” she said drolly.

A heritage of European culture was her birthright, the ballet, opera, and painting that were the world of her parents, Vicomte Bertrand Jochaud du Plessix, a French diplomat in Warsaw, Poland, at her birth in 1930, and Tatiana, a sophisticated White Russian émigré and a muse to poet Vladimir Mayakovsky. Then, from age ten, after the death of her father in World War II, hers was a privileged if immigrant life among the cultural elite of New York, where her stepfather Alexander Liberman was editorial director of Condé Nast.

But a history of hardship and adversity was also part of her heritage, and she told how her mother, reduced to poverty in Russia during the 1917 revolution and the 1920–21 famine, “stood on street corners and recited poetry to Soviet soldiers in exchange for pieces of bread.” In her own case, Gray explained that, despite the governess, Latin tutor, debutante ball, and upper-class salons, she considered herself to have endured an upbringing of “privileged neglect,” which forced her to become both creative and self-reliant.

Kelly remarked on her fascination with themes of displacement and exile, of “one world coming into another,” such as the disintegration of Rome at the time of St. Augustine, the French Revolution, the Russian Revolution, the post–World War II period, and the 1960’s cultural revolution. Gray agreed, noting her particular enthrallment with the eighteenth century as a transformative time, which saw the birth of modernism and democracy.

Other topics Kelly probed in their wide-ranging exchange included the diverse styles of reporting for radio and fashion magazines and finding a different voice for fiction and nonfiction. When asked how she could write about cruelty and describe dreadful things with dispassion, such as the actions of Klaus Barbie, the “Butcher of Lyon,” Gray commented: “Detachment is essential as a critical faculty in writing. It’s no fun to read somebody who’s having a tantrum, unless you’re reading William Burroughs.”

This self-described transnational writer credited her attraction to female subjects to a feeling of sisterhood and intense friendship with women, something she began to discover in her twenties. “Mothers are often the love of one’s life, even if you think you hate them. My mother was the love of my life, even though I cherish my father and my husband.”

Gray, an octogenarian, still finds plenty of surprise in her life, in good books, performances, or reading papers written by her grandchildren. And the greatest surprise is still ahead, she said, “I have no idea how long I’m going to live. Three years? Thirteen or fourteen? That’s the biggest surprise of all, to look forward peacefully to the fact that you will never know until it comes.” Thus, she demonstrated the resilience, strength, and candor that have held her in such good stead throughout her life and career.

—JEH

In “Crossing Boundaries” Three Gifted Singers Blend Genres, Styles, and Ethnic Musical Traditions

“Are you in Haiti now?” Emeline Michel asked the audience, laughing. “In Haiti, we cross boundaries every day!” Michel was one of three spirited performers who headlined in “Crossing Boundaries,” the season’s first concert of the Live@365 World Music Series on September 20. Their venue was the intimate Elebash Recital Hall, whose rich acoustics rival the best concert halls in the city.

Bulgarian Vlada Tomova, often called a “vocal sorceress,” and oud player Harvey Valdes, along with percussionist Mathias Kunzli, started off the evening, bringing traditional and contemporary Slavic music to life in a whirlwind of trilling vocals, staccato drums, and haunting melodies. Tomova sang stories of love, life, and loss on the shores of the Black Sea.

Martha Redbone

Vlada Tomova

Emeline Michel

Acclaimed Haitian musician Emeline Michel followed in an unapologetically joyful performance, dancing elegantly as she sang, and bantering with her band—Patrick “Andy” Andriantsialonina on bass, Jean-Guy Rene on conga, and Dominic
James on guitar. Michel reflects Joni Mitchell’s poetic folksiness but also echoes soulful altos such as Joan Armatrading and Cesária Évora. Her songs are, in the words of La Presse de Montréal, “sacred and profound rhythms” in both English and Creole.

The final performer of the evening was singer-songwriter Martha Redbone, whose impressive and eclectic music blends the traditional music of her Shawnee, Chocotaw, and African-American roots with R&B, soul, funk, gospel, blues, and Appalachian folk music. Remarkably, this amalgam perfectly expresses the cultural melting pot in today’s America. Redbone was accompanied by Aaron Whitby on piano and Teddy Kumpel on guitar and banjo.

In the last song of the “Crossing Boundaries” concert, the Bulgarian and Haitian performers joined Redbone on stage to perform a song drawn from Redbone’s Garden of Love album, wherein she sets the two-hundred-year-old poems of William Blake (1757–1827) to Appalachian and gospel music. This exemplified how these magnificent musicians from three different countries blur the traditional boundaries of music, blend genres and styles, the ancient and the modern, folk, traditional, and acoustic instruments, to reflect today’s growing transcultural world.

Spring concerts in the Live@365 World Music Series will explore the Persian naqqal storytelling tradition; the music of Hungarian gypsy cabarets; and the Chinese jaw harp. See www.gc.cuny.edu/publicprograms.

—Amelia Edelman

Edith Wharton: She Kept a Sharp Eye from Abroad on an Ever-Changing New York

Edith Wharton’s protagonist in The House of Mirth, Lily Bart, can’t imagine herself “anywhere but in a drawing-room, diffusing elegance”; and according to the New York Times obituary, Wharton herself was “mostly a chronicler of Fifth Avenue.” But in a September 12 illustrated lecture celebrating Wharton’s 150th birthday, doctoral faculty member Hildegard Hoeller, a professor of English and the author of From Gift to Commodity: Capitalism and Sacrifice in Nineteenth-Century American Fiction (University of New Hampshire Press, 2012), made a strong case for Wharton as an advocate for improved low-income housing and racial integration who was well aware of the city’s mutability.

Hoeller sees Wharton as a product of self-exile who constantly confronts in her writing her own anxieties about race, place, class, and womanhood. A native New Yorker and the first woman to win a Pulitzer Prize, Wharton spent many years in France and produced her stories there, Hoeller explained, but, notably, they were stories about a hometown that faced constant demolition and renewal.

This theme of the new replacing—or displacing—the old runs through Wharton’s work. In The House of Mirth (1905), the action begins in the old Grand Central Station—a landmark that would be torn down before the novel’s publication. As Hoeller showed, Wharton draws a connection, “almost a foreshadowing,” between the old station and the book’s main character, Lily Bart, “a refreshing sight, a specialized product, and a testing ground for what can survive in the real New York.” However, “Lily too will be torn down and replaced,” said Hoeller; “she dies when she finds life no longer worth living due to circumstances.” In The Age of Innocence (1920), a pivotal scene is set in the Academy of Music, soon to be demolished and replaced by the Metropolitan Opera, to the dismay of the old guard. The academy, Hoeller declared, citing the book, was cherished for being “shabby, small, and inconvenient, and thus keeping out the ‘new people’ whom New York was beginning to dread and yet be drawn to.”

In her first published short story, “Mrs. Manstey’s View” (1891), in which a powerful bond links Mrs. Manstey to her dwelling, Hoeller described how Wharton made clear her strong feelings about the overcrowding of Manhattan’s Lower East Side tenements. And in her final tale, The Old Maid, which was serialized in 1922, Wharton focuses on social change, drawing attention to the beginnings of racial integration in New York society. “For the first time,” said Hoeller, “[Wharton] turned her eye on whiteness as something that must be escaped.”

As the writer Vivian Gornick, who introduced Hoeller, astutely pointed out, there exists an acceptance of change throughout Wharton’s tales—buildings go up while others come down, mirroring a similar rise and fall in the power dynamics of the city’s inhabitants. For Wharton, Gornick declared, change is both a universal phenomenon and a quintessential aspect of New York in particular.

The event was sponsored by the Gotham Center History Forum.

—AE

Robert Massie: Bringing Immediacy, Relevance, and Suspense to Biography

“I am a storyteller,” began author, historian, and biographer Robert Massie in his Leon Levy Biography Lecture on September 24 in Proshansky Auditorium. And telling stories of the past is hugely important, he explained, “to all of us who are trying to understand who we are and where we came from.”

In his lecture Massie, who grew up during World War II, wove together personal anecdotes of his youth with details of the great historical events then happening across the globe. He described crossing battleships images off a map of the war zones and the sense of immediacy it gave him to follow the war so closely. Even as a small boy in Kentucky he felt he "knew what war was like.”

That sense of immediacy comes through strongly in Massie’s writing. It is one of three key elements he believes every writer needs in writing about history. To immediacy, he adds relevance—how past events affect us today—and suspense, so important in maintaining the reader’s interest in a familiar historical story. “After all,” he laughed, “a president wasn’t born at the beginning of the book—a little baby was!”

Following his three-key-elements formula, Massie has produced a string of fascinating, detailed, and
wildly successful biographies, from his best-selling Nicholas and Alexandra in 1967 to Catherine the Great in 2011. In addition to a Pulitzer Prize for his Peter the Great: His Life and World, Massie has received both the Andrew Carnegie Medal for Excellence in Nonfiction and the PEN/Jacqueline Bograd Weld Award for Excellence in Biography for Catherine the Great.

Taking on two big names of the writing trade, Massie's talk playfully challenged William Butler Yeats's assertion that "all knowledge is biography" and Ralph Waldo Emerson's conviction that "there is no history, only biography." Massie doesn't see biography as the be-all and end-all of knowledge and understanding. He sees it as a specific kind of depiction. "By reading history," he explained, "we better know our own time. So, by reading biography, we can better understand ourselves."

—AE

Segal Theatre Center’s Prelude.12: At the Forefront of the Performing Arts

Bringing the latest contemporary dance, music, and theatre performances to the Graduate Center October 3–5 was the Segal Theatre Center’s popular annual “Prelude,” which more than 2,500 attended. The festival featured more than fifty presentations, including excerpts from Black Wizard/Blue Wizard and War Lesbian, and a performance of The Problem with Dancing.

Black Wizard/Blue Wizard, a musical fantasia, with (top, l. to r.) Eliza Bent and Nikki Calonge, was created by Bent and composer Dave Malloy and depicts an epic duel between two wizards of competing philosophies in a "modern and mundane age." The performance explores the effects of technology’s pervasive influence on the human soul.

Kristine Haruna Lee’s War Lesbian, with (center, l. to r.) Andrew Butler, Jeanna Phillips, Stevo Arnoczky, and Haruna Lee, is about family, lesbianism, and the challenges of sexual identity and violence. Inspired by the queer deities from Inuit mythology, the play attempts to unravel the word “lesbian” in a post-“lesbian” world and all that it signifies.

Miguel Gutierrez and the Powerful People brought The Problem with Dancing to the festival, performed by music and dance artist Gutierrez (bottom, on screen) and Andrew Champlin (foreground). Created in 2007, the piece was adapted for the “Manifestos 2012” theme of the festival, which featured eleven contemporary New York theatre groups presenting in theatrical form their artistic platforms about the meaning and direction of today’s theatre.

—Rachel Ramírez
It was the summer of 2010—almost two years after Barack Obama took office. In the news were constitutional challenges to the recently passed Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, and the repercussions of BP’s disastrous oil spill. Also making headlines were the many Tea Party candidates on the ballot in that autumn’s pivotal midterm elections, and the passage of Arizona’s much-contested anti-illegal immigration bill (SB 1070), also known as the Support Our Law Enforcement and Safe Neighborhoods Act.

With so many hot topics bombarding the airwaves, the summer of 2010 was also one of mass meetings and protests. Among these was Glenn Beck’s Restoring Honor rally, held on August 28 at the Lincoln Memorial in Washington, DC. Russian-born photographer Lena Herzog, wife of German filmmaker Werner Herzog, was there, using only her camera’s portrait lens to snap pictures like this one. A wide-angle lens, she explains, would have distorted her subjects.

On a similar mission that day was Herzog’s fellow photographer Marc Valesella. A native of France, he was in Phoenix, Arizona, photographing the protests surrounding SB 1070. “I grew up in post-World War II Europe,” says Valesella. “For many like me, America had always been a beacon of democracy and human rights. The arrival of the law SB 1070 seemed in direct conflict with this beacon.”

The exhibit “America: A Reverie” was the result of Herzog and Valesella’s combined efforts to document the rallies that have defined the social and political climate since the historic election of this nation’s first black president. It was on view in the Exhibition Hallway at the Graduate Center, City University of New York, through December 21, reflecting what the exhibitors called “a disturbing trip into the dark side of the American Dream.”

—Jackie Glasthal
Integration: Are we there yet?

How the Graduate Center's CUNY Mapping Service Shows the Changing Face of Urban America
The first decade of the twenty-first century saw some intriguing changes in America's cities as color lines softened and ethnic divisions blurred.

The new look of urban America becomes dramatically clear in the interactive maps created by the CUNY Mapping Service, a highly visible arm of the GC’s Center for Urban Research.

Displaying U.S. Census data at the individual block level, the Mapping Service’s “Visualizing a Changing Region” project shows the racial and ethnic composition of neighborhoods in New York and its suburbs as they were in 2000 and how they had changed by 2010. The maps color-code the predominant group in each block (blue for white, green for Hispanic, and so on). A block’s color changes when the predominant group changes, and the intensity of the color reflects the comparative size of the predominant group within the block’s overall population.

The New York City maps reveal that Manhattan’s posh Upper East Side (the historic “silk stocking district”) is no longer as monochromatically white; Central Harlem is no longer so intensely black; and Brooklyn’s historically black Bedford-Stuyvesant neighborhood has also seen an influx of white residents.

New York is not unique. Similar changes have occurred throughout the country, and interactive maps of the Mapping Service show just how different key neighborhoods in fourteen other cities became—or appear to have become—during the century’s first decade.

The CUNY Mapping Service, a division of the GC’s Center for Urban Research, brings complex social, political, and ecological data to life with interactive maps that allow viewers to navigate across broad stretches of landscape, zoom in for close-up looks, and track changes in their communities, their society, and the environment. In addition to laying out the demographic shifts of the century’s first decade (a project supported in part by the Hagedorn Foundation and the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation), other online displays of the Mapping Service show:

- Racial and ethnic breakdowns of New York State’s congressional districts and their eligible voters
- The impact of redistricting in the state, with maps comparing old and new legislative and congressional districts
- New York as it was in the 1940s, with neighborhood maps, photos, narratives of the period, and analyses that compare data from the city’s 1940 and 2010 censuses
- Long Island maps that lay out the matrix of Nassau County’s 240 independent taxing authorities, its special service districts for fire, sanitation, water, libraries, parks, parking, police, schools, and sewers
- Local open spaces, with the maps of the New York City OASIS (Open Accessible Space Information System) showing parks, public lands, and recreational sites, as well as the area’s zoning restrictions and transportation systems

Many of these differences seem striking—striking enough to prompt scholars affiliated with the New York–based Manhattan Institute to issue a report this past winter proclaiming “The End of the Segregated Century.” But change can sometimes be more apparent than real, and the Center for Urban Research (CUR) was quick to caution Manhattan Institute colleagues to temper their enthusiasm.

Responding to the institute’s paper, Richard Alba (Dist. Prof., Sociology) of CUR and Steven Romalewski, director of the Mapping Service, issued a more nuanced report, titled “The End of Segregation? Hardly.”

Drawing on data from the “Visualizing” project’s maps, the Alba-Romalewski report spelled out the reality of how our national racial mosaic now “mixes integration with renewed segregation.” While the authors found the end of segregation is plainly “not at hand,” they allowed that integration “continues to advance.” As CUR’s director John Mollenkopf (Dist. Prof., Sociology) puts it, “Segregation has softened a bit, but it would be a dramatically wrong interpretation to say it has gone away or is no longer significant.”

Alba readily acknowledges that there has been “a great deal of
change, much of it positive.” But how one sees that change depends very much upon who is looking and where they look. After all, one person’s integration may be another’s gentrification; one’s ghetto, another’s ethnic enclave; and what is immigration to some may be diaspora to others.

“White urban Americans are seeing lots of integration,” says Alba. “There are few remaining all-white neighborhoods, and the average white American lives in a census tract that is at least one-quarter non-white or Hispanic. So, what the ordinary white person experiences is greater diversity among neighbors.” This is not, however, the average black or Hispanic person’s experience. “The average black or Hispanic person,” according to Alba, “lives in a neighborhood dominated by blacks and Hispanics and doesn’t see very many whites.”

A pivotal issue for Alba is the number of areas that have become “less intensely dominated by a single group but no less segregated.” Among his prime examples are neighborhoods in the South Bronx, which he allows “is not an all-black or all-Hispanic area” but is “far from integrated,” since the presence of a growing Hispanic and heavily immigrant population has created what he calls “a ghetto-like situation—an all-minority, all low-income community, where whites are rarely found.”

A Changing New York
Although New York is indeed changing, it is far from a showcase for racial integration. Neither are most other older cities of the Northeast and Upper Midwest (where housing patterns were established long before the Fair Housing laws of the sixties). A study of one hundred U.S. metropolitan areas released by the Brookings Institution last year ranked New York as the nation’s second most segregated city for African Americans—topped only by Milwaukee.

As Nathan Glazer and Patrick Moynihan pointed out in Beyond the Melting Pot nearly half a century ago, New York is not a “melting pot” nor is it likely to become one. And the prevalent residential pattern in neighborhoods across New York City remains the dominance of one or another of the city’s major racial or ethnic groups—white, black, Asian, or Hispanic. The 2010 census found 85 percent of the city’s census blocks (roughly the size of city blocks) had the same predominant racial or ethnic group that they had in 2000: in 43.8 percent of all blocks it had remained white; in 21 percent black; in 14.8 percent Hispanic, and in 5.1 percent Asian. So, how and where has the city changed?

Crossing East 96th Street
The hard-and-fast line at 96th Street that once separated Harlem from the Upper East Side gave way between 2000 and 2010, mostly, Romalewski speculates, “under real estate pressure” as Manhattan rentals and co-op and condominium prices rose steeply, seemingly impervious to the bursting of the nation’s real estate bubble. During this period the white population of Central Harlem multiplied more than fourfold, from barely 2 percent to close to 10 percent, while the black population shrank by 10 percent. The change, Alba notes, “contradicts an old axiom of segregation literature that whites will not move into areas that are intensely black.” This, he contends, “appears to represent a genuine increase in integration,” for the white popula-

There was a sizable population shift in Central Harlem during the century’s opening decade. Slightly more than nine thousand white residents moved in and somewhat more than ninety-five hundred black residents moved out. Unlike the movement of whites into other black neighborhoods, new arrivals here did not concentrate in a few specific parts of the community. Here, they spread throughout the areas in what looks more like true integration than gentrification.

The Subtle Diversity of the Upper East Side
Although the numbers are modest, the trend is clear. During the decade some 6,500 white residents left the Upper East Side to be replaced by more than 4,000 Asian and close to 2,200 Hispanic residents, raising the minority portion of the population from 16.6 percent to 19 percent. The black population, however, rose from 2.1 percent to 2.3 percent, with the arrival of just 399 additional African American residents.

Population Change in Central Brooklyn
Call it integration or gentrification, but there has been an influx of white residents in Bedford-Stuyvesant, particularly in the Bedford section, and other western parts of central Brooklyn such as Prospect Heights, Fort Greene, and Clinton Hill. “The first thing we noticed in the 2010 census,” said Romalewski, “was the changing concentration in so many traditional black and white areas.” During the decade, Bedford’s white population rose from 2,000 to 18,000, more
INTEGRATION

2010

New York County
Tract 230.00  Block 3001
FIPS: 360610230003001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>-85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>+51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>-150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>+9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source: US Census Bureau, PUMS-15.
Data from 2000 and 2010. Analyzed by Center for Urban Research, CUNY Graduate Center.
than doubling in most blocks. Meanwhile, the black population fell from 40,000 to 34,000. A number of black residents who sold their homes may have been retirees who cashed in and left the city for the South. And, as housing costs rose, there was a pronounced shift of the black population eastward into Canarsie and East Flatbush. The Hispanic population, which also grew during this period, spread more evenly throughout central Brooklyn. But this is an area in transition, and Alba speculates that “it is altogether possible that it will become just as segregated as it was in 2000, as the boundaries separating whites and Asians from blacks and Hispanics move south and east.”

The Bigger Picture
Looking at all fifteen of the mapped cities, Mollenkopf noted that “what we see in New York we also see in most of the other fourteen—black communities that are less intensely black and white communities that are less intensely white.” He credits this, in part, to the aging of the baby boom generation, who are reaching retirement age and may be selling their city homes. Another major factor is the growing suburbanization of the black population, strikingly evident in such areas as New York’s Nassau County as well as Virginia’s Fairfax and Maryland’s Prince George Counties outside the District of Columbia.

The population shift seen in the South Bronx, where traditionally black neighborhoods have become increasingly Hispanic, can be seen elsewhere as well. In California, for example, South Central Los Angeles, once a black stronghold, is now predominantly Latino. This is just one aspect of a larger phenomenon that Mollenkopf says has profound social and political implications.

“The historic black neighborhoods of big cities in the United States are being diminished,” he explains. As a result, African American politicians who have held relatively safe seats, representing long-standing communities, now must run in newly drawn districts with substantially smaller black populations. Beyond the political consequences, he says, “the center of gravity of black populations has definitely shifted away from the old neighborhoods that anchor the black experience, and some very important institutions—such as their prominent Protestant congregations—are now feeling this in one way or another.”

Highly visible in this picture of changing black communities throughout urban America is the movement of white residents into black neighborhoods. Chicago, which has a larger black population in its central city than has New York, has experienced changes similar to ours, and gentrification can be tracked as it moves north and west of the city’s downtown. In the area where the high-rise buildings of Cabrini-Green’s public housing once stood, a new mixed-income community is taking shape, and the Mapping Service display shows today’s residents of this once-black enclave a mixture of population groups in which a strong plurality has yet to emerge.

“We see a lot of this in New York,” Mollenkopf points out, noting the growing white populations of Harlem and Bedford-Stuyvesant, neighborhoods that, he explains, “have good transportation lines and architecturally wonderful late nineteenth-century brownstones, housing that is far less expensive than it would be in white neighborhoods.” Reasonable as this development might seem, he admits, as does Alba, that “it goes against all predictions.”

What the maps show in Central Brooklyn is a substantial population shift between 2000 and 2010. A 13.8 percent increase in white residents throughout the area is clustered in the Bedford section, where the white population of most blocks more than doubled during the period. There was a 2.9 percent decline in the black population, as nearly 20,000 black residents left the area, which saw a significant shift of black residents to the east into Canarsie and East Flatbush. Meanwhile, to the west of Bedford-Stuyvesant, in Clinton Hill and Fort Greene, the influx of white residents can be seen on the maps in several blocks where black pluralities in 2000 had become white pluralities in 2010.

“It has not occasioned racial conflict. We don’t have blacks saying, ‘We don’t want whites moving into our neighborhoods.’ We see whites getting along with their black neighbors. They’re not freaked out by the fact that they are a minority in their new neighborhoods. And this is something urban sociologists would not have predicted was possible.”

There is a hopeful glimpse of the future when Mollenkopf talks of Fort Greene, a well-integrated section of Brooklyn west of Bedford-Stuyvesant, where the population is roughly 60 percent black and 40 percent white. “You can visit the neighborhood and think this is what the sixties was all about trying to achieve. We wanted to have nice neighborhoods where people of all races could occupy the same residential and commercial spaces and all get along with each other.”

He allows that what he sees in Fort Greene “may not be widespread, and it may not be quantitatively large.” But he declares, “I find it heartwarming to sit in one of the cafes on Dekalb Avenue and watch people pass by and see how they interact.” —ISM
Throughout the nation, there is growing awareness of inequality. At the Graduate Center, the issue heads the agenda of our Advanced Research Collaborative (ARC) and was the subject of last spring’s commencement address by Janet Gornick (Prof., Political Science, Sociology). Prof. Gornick is director of LIS (formerly known as the Luxembourg Income Study), an international data archive and research center located in Luxembourg, with a satellite office—the LIS Center—at the Graduate Center. LIS acquires and processes data from nearly fifty of the world’s high- and middle-income countries, creating comparable datasets for cross-national comparisons of income, employment, and wealth. Thousands of researchers and policymakers around the world use the LIS data to assess income inequality, poverty, and other socioeconomic outcomes, across countries and over time. Here, she responds to questions from Folio on the nature and impact of income inequality.
Inability of opportunity, of course, an iconic American value, but equality of outcome—especially with regard to income—hasn't been a central concern, the way that it is in many countries in Europe.

While Europeans have talked for decades about reducing inequality, Americans have focused more on combating poverty, that is, on putting a floor under the poorest Americans. The U.S. enacted antipoverty programs in the 1930s, following the Depression, and again in the 1960s, with the launching of the War on Poverty. It's interesting that the ambitious antipoverty policies of the 1960s weren't sparked by economic downturn; they were launched in an era of prosperity. It was the growing awareness of abject poverty—especially in the rural south and among African Americans—that sparked the War on Poverty. That heightened awareness came about thanks to vivid accounts of American poverty that appeared in articles, photographs, and, of course, books—none more influential than Michael Harrington's The Other America, which was published in 1962.

That was just fifty years ago, and you had some trenchant things to say about today's "Other America" at the anniversary celebration for Harrington's book at the Graduate Center this fall.

Indeed, the face of American poverty has changed since 1962. One of the most dramatic changes relates to age. When The Other America was written, the elderly were much more likely to be poor than were Americans as a whole, and children much less so. Today, that pattern has been reversed. In 2011, 15 percent of Americans were poor, but only 9 percent of the elderly—thanks to expansions in Social Security—compared with a stunning 22 percent of children.

That change goes hand in hand with the feminization of poverty, especially among parents raising children without partners. In 1960, less than one-third of poor families were headed by a single parent; today more than two-thirds are—and, in four out of five of those families, that single parent is a woman. In addition, the face of poverty has become more urban, and less rural; the percentage of people living in extremely poor rural pockets has declined dramatically.

After a precipitous decline in U.S. poverty rates throughout the 1960s—due to the War on Poverty—poverty reduction stalled in the middle 1970s. Since then we've made virtually no long-term progress. On the eve of the current recession, the U.S. poverty rate was exactly what it was in the middle 1970s. Now it's higher than it was at the end of the 1960s.

"While Europeans have talked for decades about reducing inequality, Americans have focused more on combating poverty... on putting a floor under the poorest Americans."

Meanwhile, over the last three decades, while poverty rates have stagnated, income inequality in the U.S. has grown steadily. That is partly because the poor have gotten poorer and partly because of marked income growth at the top—especially at the very top.

"Does income inequality affect society differently from poverty and deprivation?"

We're still learning what the implications of inequality are, as distinct from the implications of deprivation. Poverty and inequality are related, but they're different—especially in the U.S. context.

You can see the distinctive way in which Americans think about inequality when you consider the way that we measure poverty. All countries set a poverty line and consider households with income under that line to be poor. What's interesting is that, in the U.S., we draw an "absolute" poverty line; that tells us how many households face economic deprivation, meaning that their incomes leave them unable to meet their basic needs. Specifically, in fact, we tie that poverty line to the cost of food. When we consider whether a given household is poor by this standard, the economic well-being of other American households isn't relevant.

There's another way to measure poverty, one that's more common in Europe. That approach also sets a poverty line, and considers households with incomes below that line to be poor. But, instead of setting an "absolute" line, they set a "relative" line, meaning one that's related to the median income in the country. Most often, if your household's income is less than 50 percent of your country's median income, then you're said to be poor. That type of poverty—"relative poverty"—is, of course, a form of inequality. It defines poverty with respect to the standard of living in each country. In short, households are poor if their resources place them far below the middle.

"We know what harm deprivation can do to society, that's pretty clear but what about what you call "relative poverty"—what about inequality itself—how does that hurt us?"

One of the great debates in social science today—one that has intensified in the U.S. since the Occupy demonstrations last year—concerns the effects of income inequality. The debate addresses the question: Is income inequality harmful to a society, and, if so, how?

Generally speaking, there are two schools of thought about this. Some focus on what we might call "instrumental" grounds, arguing that inequality is bad because it worsens a range of other outcomes. This argument has been popularized by Richard Wilkinson and Kate Pickett in their book The Spirit Level. Wilkinson and Pickett conclude that large income disparities—within countries—worsen a multitude of outcomes, including physical and mental health, infant mortality and life expectancy, crime and incarceration, and educational performance. Today, many scholars are tackling this...
Among the most consequential causes of rising inequality are cuts in social assistance and tax reforms we associate with the Reagan Revolution and the conservative realignment of the last 30 years.

In your commencement address you make a strong case that American inequality is largely homegrown. We can’t blame it on globalization, free trade, or other outside influences. Well, these factors contribute, of course, but they don’t explain why the U.S. has levels of poverty and income inequality that are rarely seen in the world’s affluent countries. I recently carried out a study of poverty and income inequality in twenty-five of the world’s richest countries—all of which face pressures from capitalism, globalization, and neoliberal reforms. The most recent data available indicate that the U.S. has the highest level of both relative poverty and income inequality.

At the end of the day, income inequality is driven by two factors. One is the degree of inequality based on our market income—what we earn and what our money earns. The other is the extent to which the government adjusts the results of the market through taxes and transfers, that is, how much the government gives us and takes away from us.

Now, inequality in the U.S. is higher than elsewhere—simply put—for two reasons. The first is that the distribution of market income is highly unequal; we have a lot of very low earners and a lot of very high earners. But the main story is about the taxes and transfers, that is, how much the government gives us and takes away from us.

What about the political implications of income disparity this great? What I think is not contested is that high levels of income inequality have a damaging effect on the functioning of a democracy, especially on people’s faith in government and on their attitude toward their own citizenship. Clearly, inequality leads whole swaths of the population to feel excluded—and to be excluded. In his book Unequal Democracy, the political scientist Larry Bartels demonstrates that elected officials in the U.S. respond to the views of affluent constituents much more than to those of poor people. Rich constituents—people and corporations—exercise their economic power in many ways, and none of these is more influential than their capacity to give money to support their favored candidates and causes.

I think that the extreme income inequality that we now see in the U.S. is unacceptable, in no small part because of its corrosive effects on our political system. And, in fact, to come full circle, Stiglitz sees the negative effect of inequality on the macroeconomy, and the harm done to the functioning of our political system, to be inseparable processes.

What your data and everyone else’s show is a dramatic increase in inequality over the past thirty years. It’s now as bad as it was in 1929, just before the Great Depression. How did this come about? The rise in inequality has multiple causes. Among the most consequential are the cuts in social assistance and the tax reforms that we associate with the Reagan Revolution and the conservative realignment that’s unfolded over the last three decades.

It’s also the case that, in recent decades, wage inequality has increased. Economists are debating the roots of that increase and there’s surprisingly little consensus. What is totally clear is that, today, we have a remarkably large low-wage labor market. If we apply the internationally accepted metric that defines “low pay” as less than two-thirds of median earnings, recent data indicate that fully 24 percent...
of Americans hold low-paying jobs. That means that 30 million workers earn less than about eleven dollars an hour—or $22,000 a year if they work full time all year. This would fall well short of the poverty level for a family of four and barely reach the threshold for smaller families. By the same measure, low-wage earners in Germany make up 18 percent of the workforce. That’s 16 percent in Japan, and between 7 and 8 percent in most of Northern Europe.

And we have this comparatively large low-wage labor market for a few reasons. One is that we have one of the lowest minimum wages in the Western world. A second is that our workers have comparatively little bargaining power. That bargaining power is low due to the low unionization rates—only 7 or 8 percent of the private-sector workforce is now unionized—as well as the meager unemployment insurance and the public assistance rules that force people into low-wage work. And, third, we make negligible investments in what are known as “active labor market policies”—the training, reskilling, and other employment services that help workers move out of the low-wage sector.

Look, other rich countries also have lower-skilled jobs. I mean, somebody’s picking up the garbage and emptying the bed pans. But, because of their institutions—higher minimum wages, stronger unions, more generous and less coercive income supports, and more extensive active labor market policies—fewer workers earn low wages, and those who do are more likely to move on to higher-paying jobs than are our workers.

You’ve said that what makes us distinct among the world’s affluent nations is not the prevalence of low-wage jobs so much as our income tax and transfer structure. Is this something that we know because of the surveys that LIS gathers from so many countries?

Yes, it is. All affluent countries administer household income surveys, which include large representative samples of households. These surveys allow us to know, for each household in each country’s sample, a lot about their income in the prior year. Although they vary somewhat across countries, in general, these surveys ask households to report, in great detail, their market income from all sources—mainly from wages and salaries, from self-employment, from returns on capital, from property owned, and from market-based pensions. And then they ask “What else did you get?” So we also have data on what each household received from various government programs, such as retirement, survivor, and disability pensions, unemployment compensation, veterans and military benefits, family allowances, public assistance, and so on. Finally, the surveys record direct taxes paid by each household, especially payroll taxes and income taxes.

What we do in our institute—LIS—is add up all those sources of income and take account of taxes paid. That allows us to look at poverty and income inequality “twice”—once based on market income only, and again based on household income after accounting for the government taxes and transfers.

The two income definitions produce very different stories. What we see when we look at the whole income package is that many other countries are doing far more to reduce the poverty and inequality generated by the market than we are.

Does this mean that most other rich countries have a better safety net than we do?

Well, yes, it does mean that.

But I’d qualify that to stress that it’s not just the size of the social policy system that matters; the way that it’s structured also matters.

In the U.S., we tend to rely heavily on programs targeted on the poor, such as TANF, SSI, Food Stamps, and Medicaid. We even means-test most types of government-supported child care.

In many European countries, social policy provisions have a more universal structure. So the rich, the middle class, and the poor are in the same programs. Rich and poor are enrolled in the same health insurance systems, they send their children to the same public preschools, they receive the same family allowances—and so on. That’s crucial for building political support for these programs, and that widespread support makes them more stable.

Americans, even progressives, often fail to appreciate the importance of universal programs. When people talk about removing the very rich from Social Security—as we hear often in the U.S.—I want to scream. We definitely don’t want to do that, because that would break the universality, and that’s politically risky. I mean, I don’t think that Bill Gates needs a Social Security check, but we need him to be a Social Security recipient.

You go well beyond taxes and transfers when you list all the benefits, mandates, and entitlements that most other rich countries provide and we do not.

Indeed. It’s crucial to point out that there’s a third layer of social protection that has a huge impact on the lives of workers and their families. And, yes, that’s right—most other rich countries provide rights and benefits that we don’t have in the U.S., or at least that we don’t have at the national level. I’m referring to all those programs, like paid maternity and parental leave, that make it much easier to manage daily life, especially for workers who have children.

Isn’t maternity leave a right we have here by law?

The situation with paid maternity leave in the U.S. verges on laughable. When it comes to maternity leave law, most Europeans think...
we’re nuts! In fact, the U.S. is one of only four countries in the world that has no national law requiring paid maternity leave: the others are Lesotho, Swaziland, and Papua New Guinea.

We do have a law, the Family and Medical Leave Act, which provides unpaid leave after birth or adoption, but its coverage is limited to large businesses and it requires a work history; about half of American working women aren’t eligible. Five states provide some disability pay linked to pregnancy but those benefits are meager—and, of course, fathers are not eligible. Two states provide some parental leave, but, all in all, most Americans with young children are left out in the cold.

Our workers have less protection and fewer rights and benefits than just about any in the industrialized world. My recent study of twenty-five of the richest countries in the world revealed that the U.S. is the only one that doesn’t provide universal health insurance, guarantee a minimum number of annual leave days, or have a national program granting employees the right to paid days when they are sick or when their children are sick. Among these twenty-five rich countries, we also invest the least in early childhood education and care, and our university students pay the highest tuition.

It’s true that many high-earning workers in the U.S. are voluntarily granted some of these rights and benefits by their employers, but low-wage workers typically receive none of them. That, sadly, adds a further layer of inequality on top of the already high levels of wage and income inequality.

Clearly, you believe we need to take lessons from abroad, particularly from Europe, at a time when conservative politicians in this country believe what they call the “socialist policies” of European countries are to blame for the sorry economic condition of the European Union.

I feel strongly about the value of looking abroad for policy inspiration. Although there are useful lessons to be learned from countries in many parts of the world, I have spent several years looking to Europe for social policy examples and lessons. I have been around long enough to know that that can be a perilous political path in the U.S., and now more than ever, given the economic crises unfolding in some European countries. Although we don’t know where these crises will lead, what we do know—thanks to a large body of scholarship—is that the kinds of social policies that I have pointed to as models are not the cause.

More to the point, the countries in Europe—mostly in Western and Northern Europe—that have most successfully prevented low wages, high poverty, and high inequality are, overall, all macroeconomically healthy—at least as healthy as economies can be in the middle of a global recession. Many of these countries have lower unemployment rates and lower debt-to-GDP ratios than does the U.S.

Our workers have fewer rights and benefits than any in the industrialized world. Among 25 of the richest countries, we alone provide no universal health insurance and guarantee no annual leave or paid sick days.

Doesn’t asking American politicians to adopt the same policies that limit inequality in Europe, no matter how well they work there, fly in the face of a broad perception of American exceptionalism, one that sees us as an idealized capitalist nation, a land of limitless opportunity, where free market principles prevail and both business and government favor efficiency over equality?

First of all, I must say, I’m always amused—and sort of confused—when I hear the term “American exceptionalism” used to mean American superiority. We heard that language throughout this fall’s campaign season, especially from conservatives. The reason that I’m bewildered is that in my world—the world of comparative social policy scholarship—the term “American exceptionalism” is widely used to refer to the starkly limited nature of U.S. social protections relative to other similar countries. Scholars have pondered, for decades, why the U.S. has enacted so little social policy, especially in the face of such pressing need.

All that said, we should stop to consider that the extreme stinginess of contemporary American social policy is actually somewhat recent. Although earlier generations laid the groundwork, it’s in the last thirty years that U.S. policymakers have failed to enact the social protections that our international counterparts have added and extended in recent decades. In the last thirty years, the U.S. safety net has been ravaged, jeopardizing the economic security of millions of American families. These policy changes have resulted from the sharp political turn to the right that we’ve seen in the U.S. since 1980.

In my view, we should—and we can—resist this turn of events, as well as the misguided notion that today’s American social policy is what it is because of historical precedents engraved in stone centuries ago. That’s simply not good history. We’ve seen progressive social policy reforms in the past—during the Progressive Era, the New Deal, and the Great Society. Sadly, many of the social protections from these earlier times have been eroded, or even eliminated, in recent years. Still, looking forward, we ought to be able to bring about social policy reforms again—reforms that would reduce poverty and inequality, and ease hardship for so many U.S. workers and their families.

And how do we do that?

By and large, we know which social policies would sharply reduce poverty and income inequality, and make life easier for so many Americans. We have the intellectual technology, and, as we’ve learned from some of our neighbors across the Atlantic, it’s not rocket science.

We can bring about the necessary reforms in the U.S. What it will take, as Michael Harrington told us so poignantly in The Other America, is political will—and a measure of collective anger and shame.

—ISM
A leading artist of the post-Impressionist period, Henri de Toulouse-Lautrec (Henri Marie Raymond de Toulouse-Lautrec-Monfa, 1864–1901) was an innovative illustrator and lithographer as well as painter, whose lithograph (above) is part of the Graduate Center’s permanent collection. Prized for his large-scale posters, Lautrec produced whimsical and brightly colored illustrations, which brought to light the private lives of Parisians. His work was widely published in the avant-garde art and literature journal La Revue Blanche, founded by the Natanson brothers in 1891. This illustration, which appeared on the magazine’s cover, features Misia Natanson, the wife of publisher Thadée Natanson. Lautrec’s image captures her as she ice skates. The lithograph was part of a generous gift of works of art from Sol Biderman, who also donated funds to the Graduate Center to purchase additional works. Several of these are displayed in the Foundation Lounge on the first floor.

Henri de Toulouse-Lautrec
La Revue Blanche, 1895
Lithograph
Gift of Sol Biderman
Those who came to Proshansky Auditorium on October 15, anticipating a bare knuckles brawl between two heavyweight public intellectuals set to debate “Is Zionism in Crisis?” may well have been puzzled by the opening round. Here was the Graduate Center’s own Peter Beinart (Assoc. Prof., Journalism, Political Science) taking on Alan Dershowitz, Harvard’s Felix Frankfurter Professor of Law, and it was hard to tell just what the two had to argue about.

They agreed that Israel was a “blessing” for the Jewish people; they agreed it was an “imperfect state” at best. Both believed strongly in the “two-state” solution, with the Israeli and Palestinian states divided—after negotiated adjustments—roughly along the lines of Israel’s 1967 border. Both regard bitterly the global campaign of Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions (the BDS movement)—with its call for a boycott of all Israeli products—mounted by the Palestinians and their supporters.

Both believe the Israeli settlements on the West Bank pose a serious, if not fatal, threat to the two-state solution—that, by encouraging further development of the settlements, the current Israeli government has made productive negotiation with the Palestinian Authority highly unlikely if not impossible.

And there is where accord ended.

Beinart, a senior fellow at the New American Foundation and senior political writer for The Daily Beast, has proposed, in his book The Crisis of Zionism, a boycott of the West Bank settlements and argued in the New York Times that American Jews should “lobby to exclude settler-produced goods from America’s free-trade deal with Israel” and “push to end IRS policies that allow Americans to make tax-deductible gifts to settler charities.”

Dershowitz disagrees with Beinart’s call for boycotting the settlements, as does much of America’s Jewish community. The author of twenty-seven books and hundreds of articles, he is a passionate defender of Israel. “Not of every Israeli policy or action,” he has written, “but of its right to exist, to protect its citizens from terrorism, and defend its borders.”

Here (lightly edited) are key points each participant raised addressing major issues covered by the debate.
**Beinart states his case**

Democracy is not the whole of the Zionist dream, but it is necessary to the Zionist dream. For me, that democratic vision is crucial to the miracle that is the Jewish return to sovereignty in the land of Israel. But that miracle is today imperiled by Israel’s control of the West Bank, where in flagrant violation of the principles of its declaration of independence, Jews carry identity cards with blue covers that give them citizenship, the right to due process, the right to vote, and the right to be waived through checkpoints; West Bank Palestinians, by contrast, carry identity cards with green or orange colors that deny them citizenship in any state, deny them the right to vote, and deny the right to travel to East Jerusalem. Those cards place them under the jurisdiction of military courts, where evidence is largely secret, where people are routinely held months or years without trial and where—according to a recent report—more than 99 percent of those tried in 2010 were convicted.

The problem is not that Jews live in the West Bank. It’s that today on the West Bank citizenship is ethnically based. Jews and Palestinians live under different laws. And as David Ben-Gurion warned, if Israel makes permanent its occupation of the West Bank, it will eventually be forced to choose between its Jewish and democratic characters. It will invite Palestinians into a one-state struggle that Israel cannot win because its efforts to maintain itself as a nondemocratic Jewish state will make it a pariah in the world.

This Israeli government has reversed its predecessor and made much of the West Bank a national priority zone, making settlements there eligible for special government subsidies. . . . By supporting settlement growth, they are pushing Palestinians in exactly the direction we don’t want them to go. Every time Israel subsidizes more Israelis to move to the West Bank, we make those Palestinian leaders who will reluctantly accept Israel’s right to exist and fight terrorism . . . we make them look like fools.

**Dershowitz responds**

I think Peter is right that we agree about a great deal. We agree on the civilian settlements. And I’ve been in favor of the two-state solution since 1970, when I first debated Noam Chomsky, who favored the one-state solution . . . a one-state secular binational state based on the models of Lebanon and Yugoslavia . . . . And I responded by talking about India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, and the paradigmatic one-state solution of the time, the Soviet Union.

I also agree that Israel should do more to start the negotiations. But I disagree fundamentally with Peter about using divestments or boycotts as a method of bringing about that result.

We agree with the hypocrisy of many of Israel’s critics, and I urge you, when you read his book, to read where Peter tells how critics of Israel talk about Israel as the worst human rights offender, and he says, “It’s far from clear that, under similar circumstances, any of the democracies criticizing Israel’s human rights record would have done better.” In fact, I think no country in the world faced with threats comparable to those faced by Israel has had a better human rights record.

So here we come to the disagreements. Fundamentally, what’s not in Peter’s book is Iran. It’s mentioned twice, as far as I can tell.

**Here, Dershowitz tells what he allows was “a name-dropping story” of a call from President Obama when Dershowitz was in Israel.**

He asked what are the three things Israelis are discussing mostly, and
I said, “Let me give you an answer in the order they’re discussing them: Iran, Iran, Iran—if you want four and five it’s Iran, and Iran.” Now that, of course, plays a little bit into Peter’s argument because the Israelis are not thinking hard today about the Palestinian situation, about the West Bank—they’re obsessed with what’s going on in Iran. . . . So we disagree about that enormous omission in the analysis that Peter gives of the problems that Israel faces.

We disagree about divestment, and I think it’s important as Peter indicated that Amos Oz and other great Israelis will not purchase goods that are made in the West Bank. But there is an enormous difference between Israelis not buying goods made in the West Bank, and non-Israelis—people from Sweden, from Denmark, from Norway, from Berkeley—singing out Israel for boycott and divestment. That sends a message different from the message Peter would like to send.

Peter wants to send a message about the legitimization of Israel within the 1967 borders, and delegitimization of Israel outside of those borders. But if you look at Google and the websites, at who is citing Peter—and how he’s being cited—you’ll see that’s not the way it’s being interpreted. . . . Israel’s enemies have picked up the fact that Peter, a Zionist who loves Israel, favors divestment and boycott, and they’ve made him part of the Palestinians’ BDS movement.

It sends the wrong message. It says that this is the issue the left should be most concerned with in the world today—that Israel’s treatment of the Palestinians is worse than the way the Kurds are being treated, worse than the way Tibetans are being treated . . . that it’s among the worst human rights violations in the world. It’s a terrible and wrong message. It also gives the world an excuse to ignore all the other human rights problems. And if you go around the world on college campuses today, and you go to the United Nations, there is only one issue, one issue that is a focus of international condemnation, and that’s Israel. You don’t get condemnation of others. The hard left doesn’t really care about the Palestinians. The hard left cares about Israel, about the Jewish state, and there’s an effort to demonize and delegitimize it, and inadvertently Peter has played into their hands.

We also have a fundamental disagreement about the nature of the state of Israel. Nothing could be more fundamental than the disagreement between us. Peter thinks Israel is a Jewish state. I do not. I think Israel is a nation-state of the Jewish people. I want Israel to be a secular democracy. Peter says Israel should not be a secular democracy. . . .
Dershowitz on Iran

I agree that sanctions haven’t been given an opportunity to work. But the way I understand your position, you’re saying that, if the sanctions don’t work, if in the end there are two stark options available to the United States, namely Iran developing a nuclear weapon or the United States using—not boots on the ground—but drones and Tomahawk missiles to destroy Iran’s nuclear weapon, you, along with [former defense secretary Robert] Gates and perhaps Dagan, would say it’s less worse to allow Iran to develop these weapons because Iran is a rational actor.

Let’s assume you are probably right. That it’s 60/40 or 70/30 that Iran would never use their bomb. What level of possible uncertainty must a democracy face when it’s confronting this kind of risk? I don’t want to see a military confrontation. But the position of the president of the United States, President Obama, is the military option must be on the table. . . . He is saying to the mullahs, “Look at me. I am telling you if the choice comes between you getting nuclear weapons and we destroying your nuclear weapons, I don’t bluff. We will destroy your nuclear weapons. So why incur the terrible horrors of sanctions when we are never, ever going to let you develop nuclear weapons.” Along come Dagan, Gates, Beinart, saying “Don’t believe the president. We don’t think it’s an existential threat. We don’t think that it would be that terrible if Iran developed nuclear weapons. Oh, it would shift the balance of power, but they’ll never use it against Israel, and therefore don’t believe the president when he says he is going to use the military option.”

Considerable discussion followed about if and where a “red line” should be drawn that Iran dare not cross without triggering an attack on its nuclear facilities. Should Iran be denied a nuclear weapon, a nuclear capacity, the ability to have either? And Beinart suggested as “a plausible scenario” that Iran might choose to stop short—as Japan presumably has done—six months away from having a nuclear weapon.

Nearing the end of the debate, the discussion turned to Israel’s bombing of Saddam Hussein’s Osirak reactor in 1981 and the more recent bombing of Syria’s reactor, bringing from Dershowitz a spirited defense of Israel’s preemptive or preventive attacks.

Dershowitz on preemptive action

Let me tell you what [Menachem] Begin said in his diary just before he authorized the attack in 1981 on the Osirak reactor. He said, “Look, there’s a possibility we have nuclear weapons.” I mean, he didn’t publicly proclaim that, but everybody knew it, and we could have tit-for-tat retaliation. If Iraq were to attack Tel Aviv, we could attack Baghdad. That’s the way the United States and the Soviet Union dealt with it, with Mutually Assured Destruction.

But Israel will never do that. He said, “We are a nation of Holocaust survivors, and therefore we could never drop a nuclear bomb on the city of Baghdad. We are not at war with the children of Baghdad. We could not incinerate a million children. Our air force wouldn’t accept an order from me to drop a nuclear bomb on Iraq.” And I’m not sure that the Israeli air force would accept an order from the current prime minister to drop a nuclear bomb on Tehran. That’s why Israel has always had as its policy preemption and prevention, because it doesn’t believe in retaliation against civilian targets . . . and preemption is always directed at a military target.

Hamas understood that, and so, in Gaza, they hid their fighters amongst civilians precisely in order to induce Israel to attack military targets in a way that would produce civilian casualties.

Retaliation is not a value, so having forty nuclear weapons is not going to stop Iran from doing what Rafsanjani [Iran’s former president and a leading centrist] said. He said—and he has never denied this—that if Iran got a nuclear weapon and dropped it on Tel Aviv, Israel would be destroyed because Israel is a one-bomb country. He said Israel would then retaliate and drop bombs on Tehran killing twenty million Muslims, but the trade-off would be worth it because it would mean the end of the Jewish state and the end of Judaism, but it wouldn’t mean the end of Islam. . . . He’s the liberal leader, he’s the progressive leader. Can you trust a country to have a nuclear bomb that has a leader who would make that kind of statement?

Last Words: Beinart

Alan is throwing around, I think very casually, terms like a 20 percent or 30 percent chance Iran could act. He’s talking about the risk that an Iranian nuclear weapon represents. There is such a risk. But what I think he is not doing justice to is that we are talking about a balance of risk.

To understand this balance of risk, right now, the preponderant weight of opinion of the people who understand this best—and, as Alan said, they are not doves and peaceniks—is in fact that a military...
action would be deeply counterproductive. And, to evaluate Iran’s behavior, I think it is far better to look at what Iran has done—not vis-à-vis their own people about whom they care nothing, but about the survival of the regime about which they care most of all—as opposed to the idiotic and stupid and utterly contradictory statements of its leaders, some of which are bone-chilling, and some of which categorically state that it is against Islamic law to develop a nuclear weapon. Had we only listened to the statements of Stalin and Mao, we would surely have done things we would have lived to regret, because those guys said bone-chilling things too. But in reality, like most dictators, the thing they wanted most was to remain in power. I think that’s the vantage point that is guiding the security leaders in both Israel and the United States, and I think it should guide us, too.

Last Words: Dershowitz

I agree that leaders want to remain in power, and can you imagine what would happen if an Iranian nuclear-weapon country had yet another green revolution of the kind that they had several years ago, and how the mullahs, who want to remain in power, would use their nuclear weapons against their own people. Imagine Syria today, if Assad had nuclear weapons, how he would be using them against his own people—how many thousands of people he has killed and how the hard left doesn’t care about that and doesn’t talk about that. All I ask for, and these will be my final words here tonight, is to apply a single standard of criticism to the imperfect democracy called Israel. Do not hold it to a double standard. Impose upon it the same standard you would impose on any other secular democracy, struggling for survival, struggling to do the right thing, struggling to balance civil liberties against the need to prevent terrorism and the need to prevent external threats. Realize that Israel lives in a dangerous neighborhood. Do more to bring about peace with the Palestinians. I agree with all of that, but do not subject Israel to a unique standard of delegitimization, of defamation, and of the kind of criticism that we see on university campuses today.

All I want is a single standard. Once we have a single standard, I can join Peter in being part of that criticism if I know the criticism is proportionate to Israel’s wrongs. If I know that Israel is being criticized comparatively, contextually, and constructively, but I am afraid that’s not happening today.

The evening ended as it began, with concurrence, for both agreed there was more to say, and plan to return, when it can be scheduled, for Beinart vs. Dershowitz Part II.

—ISM
We take pride in announcing the following awards and honors conferred on members of the Graduate Center doctoral faculty.

Four members of the doctoral faculty in mathematics were named 2013 Fellows of the American Mathematical Society, the world’s largest and most influential society dedicated to mathematical research, scholarship, and education: Distinguished Professor Dennis P. Sullivan, who holds the Albert Einstein Chair in Science, Distinguished Professor Lucien Szpiro, Professor Linda Keen, Professor Alvany Rocha, and Assistant Professor Jason Behrstock.

Three junior members of the doctoral faculty in the sciences have received five-year National Science Foundation (NSF) Faculty Early Career Development Awards to fund their research: Diana Bratu (Biochemistry, Biology), for her research on messenger RNAs in living cells; Stacey Brenner-Moyer (Chemistry), for her study of organocatalyzed cascade reactions to generate useful synthetic intermediates in the synthesis of natural products and medicinal compounds; John Denneyh (Biology), for his research on the spread of viruses from one host to another as a means for understanding the evolutionary processes and population dynamics that underlie viral spread.

Herman L. Bennett (Professor, History), best known for his work on the history of the African diaspora, was honored with the 2012 Equity Award from the Committee on Minority Historians of the American Historical Association. The prize recognizes excellence in recruiting and retaining members of underrepresented racial and ethnic groups as professional historians.

Emily Braun (Distinguished Professor, Art History), as a contributing author (“Saturday Evenings at the Steins”) to The Steins Collect (Yale University Press, 2011), was a corecipient of the first annual Robert Motherwell Book Award from the Dedalus Foundation.

Gerald Creed (Professor, Anthropology), executive officer of the Ph.D. Program in Anthropology, is co-winner of the 2012 William E. Douglass Prize in Europeanist Anthropology for his Masquerade and Postsocialism: Ritual and Cultural Dispossession in Bulgaria, awarded by the Society for the Anthropology of Europe.

Evelyne Ender (Professor, Comparative Literature, French) has been appointed to the editorial board of PMLA, the journal of the Modern Language Association of America. Since 1884, PMLA has published members’ essays judged to be of interest to scholars and teachers of language and literature.

Terrie Epstein (Professor, Urban Education) won a Fulbright Senior Scholar Research Award, which will take her to New Zealand for five months to examine the influence of ethnic identities on interpretations of national history and society, for her project titled “How the Past Informs the Present: New Zealand Adolescents’ Perspectives on the Treaty of Waitangi.”

Charter Schools and the Corporate Makeover of Public Education, coauthored by Michael Fabricant (Professor, Social Welfare) and Michelle Fine (Distinguished Professor, Psychology, Urban Education), was named one of the year’s fifteen must-read books about K–12 education in the United States by the Christian Science Monitor.

Melvin Fitting (Professor, Computer Science, Mathematics, Philosophy) won the 2012 Herbrand Award for Distinguished Contributions to Automated Reasoning, which recognized his “outstanding contributions to tableau-based theorem proving in classical and non-classical logics, as well as to many other areas of automated reasoning, logic programming, and philosophical logic.”

The American Studies Association, the nation’s oldest and largest association devoted to the interdisciplinary study of American culture and history, awarded its 2012 Angela Davis Award for Public Scholarship to Ruth Wilson Gilmore (Professor, Earth and Environmental Sciences), associate director of the GC’s Center for Place, Culture and Politics.

Mitchell Goldfarb (Professor, Biochemistry, Biology) has been named Simons Foundation Autism Research Initiative (SFARI) Investigator. His lab at Hunter College is studying the potential contribution of two neighboring genes to the development of autism spectrum disorder in individuals who carry deletions near the tip of chromosome 22.

Jonathan Kalb (Professor, Theatre) was honored with the 2011–12 George Jean Nathan Award and the Theatre Library Association’s 2012 George Freedley Memorial Award for his recent book Great Lengths: Seven Works of Marathon Theater.

Franklin E. Mierer (Professor, Public Health) was the 2012 recipient of the Donald E. Cummings Award at the annual American Industrial Hygiene Conference and Exposition, the premier gathering for occupational and environmental health and safety professionals. As part of the celebration, Mierer presented the award lecture “All Dressed Up—But Where Are We Going?”

Barbara Ann Naddeo (Associate Professor, History) was awarded the 2011 Jacques Barrun Prize in Cultural History for Vico and Naples: The Urban Origins of Modern Social Theory (Cornell University Press). The prize, which is named for the eminent historian and cultural critic, has been awarded annually since 1993 by the American Philosophical Society (APS) to the author whose book exhibits distinguished work in American or European cultural history. The first learned society in the United States, APS—which is not to be confused with the American Philosophical Association, the professional body for academic philosophy—was founded in 1743 by Benjamin Franklin and served as the prototype for later such organizations.

Graham George Priest (Distinguished Professor, Philosophy) was awarded a Humboldt Fellowship from the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation. The award provides support for research Priest is undertaking with colleagues in Germany and the United States.

Katherine Verdery (Julian J. Studley Faculty Scholar, Distinguished Professor, Anthropology) was honored with several awards for Peasants Under Siege, coauthored with UCLA sociologist Gail Kligman. The book won Honorable Mention for two American Sociological Association prizes in August: the Barrington Moore Book Award in Comparative and Historical Sociology, and the Political Sociology section book award.

Deborah Walder (Assistant Professor, Psychology) won a NARSAD Young Investigator Award for a study that aims to examine the role of stress, genetic factors, and symptoms in predicting a novel biomarker of risk for depression among adolescents.

John Waldman (Professor, Biology, Earth and Environmental Sciences) was honored in October with the 2012 New York Conservation Leader Award from the Wildlife Conservation Society. Among other research interests, Waldman studies environmental issues affecting New York and surrounding areas.

Suzanne Wasserman (Director, Gotham Center for New York City History) directed and produced her fourth documentary film, Meat Hooked!, which won Best Feature Film at the NYC Food Film Festival in October.

Eleanor Wurtzel (Professor, Biochemistry, Biology) was honored by the American Society of Plant Biologists with their annual Fellow of ASPB award, in recognition of her “distinguished and long-term contributions to plant biology and service to the Society.”
All members of the doctoral faculty are invited to contact comms@gc.cuny.edu with information about their books once final proofs have been submitted. More complete descriptions and links for purchase may be viewed at http://www.gc.cuny.edu/Faculty/GC-Faculty-Publications.

HARRIET HYMAN ALONSO (Prof., History), Yip Harburg: Legendary Lyricist and Human Rights Activist (Wesleyan University Press, 2012). This interview-based biography of Wizard of Oz lyricist E. Y. Harburg (1896–1981), also known as “Broadway’s social conscience,” brings us Harburg’s story from his early childhood on the Lower East Side of Manhattan to his work on Broadway and in Hollywood, including his McCarthy-era blacklisting. Underlying the stories is Harburg’s commitment to human rights.

TOM ANGOTTI (Prof., Earth and Environmental Sciences), The New Century of the Metropolis: Urban Enclaves and Orientalism (Routledge, 2012). Using the concept of “urban orientalism” as a theoretical underpinning of modern urban planning grounded in global inequalities, Angotti argues for new, progressive approaches to community and metropolis, and for an understanding of the city as a necessary and beneficial accompaniment to social progress.

GEOFFREY BATCHEN (Adj. Prof., Victory University of Wellington, Art History) Mick Gidley, NANCY K. MILLER (Dist. Prof., Comparative Literature, English, French), and Jay Prosser (alum, English), eds., Picturing Atrocity: Photography in Crisis (Reaktion Books, 2012). Essays from prominent writers and critics cover the historical and geographical range of atrocity photographs and probe why viewers feel compelled to look rather than look away.

DAR J. BEARISON (Prof. Emer., Educational Psychology, Psychology), The Edge of Medicine: Stories of Dying Children and Their Parents (Oxford University Press, 2012). Bearison tells the stories of dying children and their families, capturing the full range of uncertainties, hopes, and disappointments involved, using narrative to bridge the disconnect among abstract theories, medical technologies, and clinical realities.

ALBERT BERMEL (Prof. Emer., Theatre), Thormbo and Other Plays (Performing Books, 2012). This collection includes nine suspenseful, darkly comic plays, including Thormbo: A Food Farce, set in a fictional African nation; Shoots, featuring an array of literary roles performed in a Hollywood agent’s office; and Give and Grab, about a tough British merchant who tries to befriend Gypsies.

CLAIRE BISHOP (Assoc. Prof., Art History), Artificial Hells: Participatory Art and the Politics of Spectatorship (Verso, 2012). In this overview of socially engaged participatory art, Bishop challenges its political and aesthetic ambitions and calls for a less prescriptive approach to art and politics, and for more compelling and troubling forms of participatory art and criticism.

PATRICIA J. BROOKS (Prof., Psychology, Speech-Language–Hearing Sciences) and Vera Kempe, Language Development (BPS Blackwell, 2012). Aimed at students from a wide range of disciplines, this textbook emphasizes how language development interacts with social and cognitive development and shows how these abilities work together to turn children into sophisticated language users.


MARC DOLAN (Assoc. Prof., English, Liberal Studies), Bruce Springsteen and the Promise of Rock ’N’ Roll (W. W. Norton & Company, 2012). Drawing on a range of new and little-known sources, Dolan combines political analysis, music history, and colorful storytelling to trace the cultural, political, and personal forces that have shaped Springsteen’s music and what, over decades, he has wanted it to say.

CYNTHIA FUCHS EPSTEIN (Dist. Prof., Sociology), Women in Law, rev. ed. (Quid Pro, 2012). With a new foreword by Stanford’s Deborah Rhode, the thirtieth anniversary edition of this classic book continues to provide a sociological and historical analysis of the overt and subtle ceilings placed on women in the legal profession in their various roles.

JOSHUA B. FREEMAN (Prof., History), American Empire: The Rise of a Global Power, the Democratic Revolution at Home 1945–2000 (Viking, 2012). Freeman shows a nation both galvanized by change and driven by conflict, as World War II set the stage for its rise to global dominance and power slipped from the hands of individual citizens into those of private corporations.

OFELIA GARCÍA (Prof., Hispanic and Luso-Brazilian Literatures and Languages, Urban Education), Zeena Zakharia, and Bahar Otcu, eds., Bilingual Community Education and Multilingualism: Beyond Heritage Languages in a Global City (Multilingual Matters, 2012). This book explores the educational spaces shaped and organized by American ethnolinguistic communities for their children in the multilingual city of New York.

MARTIN GETTERMAN (Prof. Emer., Speech–Language–Hearing Sciences), MIRA GORAL (Prof., Speech–Language–Hearing Sciences), and LORAINNE K. OBLER (Dist. Prof., Linguistics, Speech–Language–Hearing Sciences), eds., Aspects of Multilingual Aphasia (Multilingual Matters, 2012). This volume provides a broad overview of current work in aphasia in individuals who speak more than one language.

CYNTHIA HAHN (Prof., Art History), Strange Beauty (Penn State Press, 2012). While Hahn treats issues that cut across the class of medieval reliquaries as a whole, she is particularly concerned with portable reliquaries that often contained tiny relic fragments, which purportedly allowed saints to actively exercise power in the world. Above all, Hahn argues, reliquaries are a form of representation.
Hildegard Hoeller (Prof., English), From Gift to Commodity: Capitalism and Sacrifice in Nineteenth-Century American Fiction (University of New Hampshire Press, 2012). Hoeller shows how novelists in the nineteenth century grappled with the role of the gift based on trust, social bonds, and faith within an increasingly capitalist culture based on self-interest, market transactions, and economic reason.

Alan Huffman (Prof., Linguistics) and Joseph Davis, eds., Language: Communication and Human Behavior—The Linguistic Essays of William Diver (Brill, 2011). The foundational works of William Diver, many never before published, appear here newly edited and annotated, presenting for the first time to a wide audience the depth and originality of Diver’s iconoclastic thought.

Barbara Ann Nadeo (Assoc. Prof., History), Vico and Naples: The Urban Origins of Modern Social Theory (Cornell University Press, 2011). An intellectual portrait of the Neapolitan philosopher Giambattista Vico (1668–1744), this book reveals his politics and motivations, showing that not only classical scholarship but also experience of civic crises informed his views. Winner of the Barzun Prize in Cultural History.

David Nasaw (Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr. Chair in American History; Dist. Prof., History), The Patriarch: The Remarkable Life and Turbulent Times of Joseph P. Kennedy (Penguin Press HC, 2012). Patriarch of America’s greatest political dynasty, Joseph Patrick Kennedy was an indomitable and elusive figure. With exclusive access to unpublished archival material, Nasaw unearths a man far more complicated than the popular portrait.

Paul Oppenheimer (Prof., Comparative Literature), Machiavelli: A Life Beyond Ideology (Continuum, 2011). Oppenheimer recreates the adventurous life of Niccolò di Bernardo Machiavelli as he actually lived it, from his heights as a diplomat and a reformer of the Florentine military to his exile and rehabilitation, and explores the originality of his theories of treachery and social transformation.

Frances Fox Piven (Dist. Prof., Political Science, Sociology), Who’s Afraid of Frances Fox Piven? (New Press, 2011). This is a concise, accessible introduction to Piven’s thinking, from her early work on welfare rights and “poor people’s movements” through her influential examination of American voting habits and her most recent work on the possibilities for a progressive reform movement.

Andrew J. Polsky (Prof., Political Science), Elusive Victories: The American Presidency at War (Oxford University Press, 2012). This study of six wartime presidents draws larger lessons about the limits of the power of the White House during armed conflict, including the erosion of a president’s freedom of action: each decision propels him down a path from which he cannot turn back.

Shilomo Silman (Prof., Audiology, Speech–Language–Hearing Sciences) and Michele B. Emmer (Prof., Audiology), Instrumentation in Audiology and Hearing Science: Theory and Practice (Plural Publishing, 2011). In this comprehensive and accessible look at instrumentation, the authors introduce the laws of physics as they relate to audiology and hearing science and explain relevant concepts in electronics.

Paul Julian Smith (Dist. Prof., Hispanic and Luso-Brazilian Literatures and Languages), Spanish Practices: Literature, Cinema, Television (Legenda, 2012). Smith focuses on some of the important works in contemporary Spain and addresses three pairs of linked issues central to Hispanic studies and beyond: history and memory, authority and society, and genre and transitivity.

Vidette Todaro-Franceschi (Assoc. Prof., Nursing Science), Compassion Fatigue and Burnout in Nursing: Enhancing Professional Quality of Life (Springer, 2012). The book presents a unique healing model designed to identify, treat, and, where possible, avert compassion fatigue with holistic strategies and action plans that help cultivate a healthier, more satisfying work environment and consequently better quality of patient care.

Steven Tuber (Prof., Psychology) and Jane Cafisch, Starting Treatment With Children and Adolescents: A Process-Oriented Guide for Therapists (Routledge, 2011). Twelve case studies include verbatim transcripts of individual play-therapy sessions with running commentary on techniques and theory and a fine-grained analysis of what worked and what did not. Tuber also published Understanding Personality through Projective Testing (Jason Aronson, 2012), which provides a comprehensive framework for linking key domains of personality functioning to the quality of responses by both children and adults to projective testing.

John Van Sickle (Prof., Classics, Comparative Literature), Virgil’s Book of Bucolics, the Ten Eclogues Translated into English Verse (Johns Hopkins University Press, 2011). Van Sickle provides an artfully rendered translation as well as explanatory notes that identify cues for casting, dramatic gesture, and voice and offer clues to the ambitious literary program implicit in the voices, plots, and themes.


Craig Williams (Prof., Classics), Reading Roman Friendship (Cambridge University Press, 2012). Approaching friendship as something performed in and through language, Williams explores a wide spectrum of Latin texts, including inscriptions carved in stone across the Roman Empire—hundreds of epitaphs, commissioned by men and women, citizens and slaves, to commemorate their friends.
Investiture of Lerner Clothing workers into the Local 65 United Warehouse Workers Union in 1941. Local 65 was known for innovative organizing. Workers sit under a banner, which says “Organize Your Next Door Neighbor.”

Carol Quirke (History, 2005), associate professor of American studies at SUNY College of Old Westbury, has authored *Eyes on Labor: News Photography and American Working Class* (Oxford University Press, 2012), which narrates an essential part of early twentieth-century American history. Using well- and lesser-known photographs of the time, Quirke examines the role of photojournalism in documenting workers’ social and political activism during the Great Depression and the era of the New Deal. She considers how these historical movements were interpreted by magazines and emphasizes how artistic decisions on the part of the photographers elicited political responses from workers whose labor struggles were changing political attitudes within the nation. A former community organizer for economic justice, immigrant rights, and public housing issues, Quirke has a personal connection to the events described in *Eyes on Labor*, connections that evidence the family schisms that strikers can experience. One chapter treats news imagery of the Memorial Day Massacre of 1937, when Chicago police shot nearly one hundred men, women, and children picketing outside Republic Steel. Quirke’s great-uncle was gravely wounded that day, while her grandfather was inside, working with the nonstrikers in the mill.

Erica L. Ball (History, 2002), assistant professor of American studies at California State University, Fullerton, has authored *To Live an Antislavery Life: Personal Politics and the Antebellum Black Middle Class* (University of Georgia Press, 2012). Ball uses slave narratives, sermons, fiction, convention proceedings, and advice literature printed in forums such as *Freedom’s Journal* to make her argument.


Samuel Cohen (English, 2003), associate professor and director of graduate studies in the University of Missouri’s Department of English, coedited, with Lee Konstantinou, *The Legacy of David Foster Wallace* (University of Iowa Press, 2012). This accessible critical work provides a portrait and defines the style of a writer considered by many to be the greatest of his generation.


Andrew L. Erdman (Theatre, 2001), author and writer, published *Queen of Vaudeville: The Story of Eva Tanguy* (Cornell University Press, 2012), a biography that tells of Tanguy’s remarkable career in musical comedy and how she became an icon of American popular culture.

Maria Franziska Fahey (English, 2006) recently published *Metaphor and Shakespearean Drama: Unechaste Signification* (Palgrave, 2012), which was shortlisted for the Shakespeare’s Globe Book Award. Fahey explores the fruitful and potentially disorderly nature of metaphorical utterances in Shakespearean drama and includes analyses of *Othello*, *Titus Andronicus*, *Macbeth*, *King Henry IV Part I*, *Hamlet*, and *The Tempest*.

Abou Ali Farman Farmaian (Anthropology, 2012), a visiting assistant professor of anthropology at Bard College, has published, under the pen name Abou Farman, *Clerks of the Passage* (Linda Leith Publishing, 2012), an intriguing meditation on migration over the centuries. He has won recognition as an artist, screenwriter, and producer, and has been the recipient of numerous grants, awards, and artist residencies, including a Guggenheim.

Kaja Finkler (Anthropology, 1973), a professor emerita of anthropology at the University of North Carolina–Chapel Hill, where she taught for twenty-five years, authored *Lives Lived and Lost: East European History Before, During, and After World War II as Experienced by an Anthropologist and Her Mother* (Academic Studies Press, 2012). The memoir draws on more than one hundred audio tapes her mother, Golda Finkler, left behind upon her death in 1991, tapes that describe her life and the spirituality that helped her resist the Germans and survive the war.

Submit news: comms@gc.cuny.edu
Earl E. Fitz (Comparative Literature, 1977) has been named to the Distinguished Alumni Board of the University of Iowa’s Department of Spanish and Portuguese. Fitz has both B.A. and M.A. degrees from the University of Iowa.

Khaled Furani (Anthropology, 2004), who teaches at Tel Aviv University in the departments of anthropology and sociology, has published his first book, *Silencing the Sea: Secular Rhythms in Palestinian Poetry* (Stanford University Press, 2012). Talal Asad (Dist. Prof., Anthropology) called this scholarly study “a wonderful ethnography of contemporary Arabic poetry.”


Gail Gurland (Speech–Language–Hearing Sciences, 1979), with Klara Marton (Speech–Language–Hearing Sciences, 2004), coauthored “Assessment of language disorders in school-age children” in *Hearing Sciences*, 2004), coauthored, with C. J. Crowley, “Beliefs regarding the impact of accent within speech-language pathology practice areas” in *Communication Disorders Quarterly* (online May 21, 2012). Levy is an assistant professor and director of the speech production and perception laboratory, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Monica Hanna (Comparative Literature, 2009) began a tenure-track position as assistant professor in the Chicana and Chicano studies department at California State University–Fullerton this fall. She made the move back to southern California, her home territory, after serving last year as a tenure-track assistant professor of English at the United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland.

Mary Anne Hunting (Art History, 2007), an architectural historian, published Edward Durell Stone: Modernism’s Populist Architect (W. W. Norton & Company, 2012). Stone (1902–78) was the visionary architect for buildings in thirty-two American states and thirteen countries. Among the testaments to his impressive forty-year career are New York City’s Museum of Modern Art and the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts in Washington, D.C. However, until Hunting’s new book, his story as a progressive figure in modernist architecture has been absent from the scope of “scholarly examination.” Edward Durell Stone surveys his innumerable contributions to both the national and international landscape of architecture, his influence on the artistic movements that architect Frank Lloyd Wright once commanded, and his artistic legacy. Moreover, Hunting shows how, at the pinnacle of his popularity in the United States, Stone reconciled modernist styles with the changing consumer culture of the twentieth century. The book is a continuation of a dissertation that Hunting wrote under the guidance of her GC faculty mentor, art history executive officer Kevin D. Murphy. On January 22, Hunting will discuss her work at a special alumni event in the GC’s Segal Theatre.


Mark Kelley (English, 2004), an associate professor of humanities at American Public University, Charles Town, West Virginia, explains why he is a strong believer in the humanities in “Why are the Humanities Still Important?” which was published by onlinelearningtips.com on September 20.


Erika S. Levy (Speech–Language–Hearing Sciences, 2004) coauthored, with C. J. Crowley, “Beliefs regarding the impact of accent within speech-language pathology practice areas” in *Communication Disorders Quarterly* (online May 21, 2012). Levy is an assistant professor and director of the speech production and perception laboratory, Teachers College, Columbia University.


Gustavo Lins Ribeiro (Anthropology, 1988), who serves as professor of anthropology at the University of Brazil, has been elected president of Brazil’s National Association of Graduate Programs in the Social Sciences (ANPOCS) and vice-president of the International Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences. ANPOCS is made up of 104 centers of research and graduate studies in anthropology, international relations, political science, and sociology. The association meets annually and publishes the foremost social science journal in Brazil.

Maureen Ruprecht (English, 2012), now Maureen Ruprecht Fadem, has a position as a full-time tenure-track assistant professor at Kingsborough Community College as of September 1, 2012. She is serving on the faculty of the English department and is also appointed as coordinator of KCC Reads, a campus-wide common reading program.

William Seraile (History, 1977), professor emeritus in African and African American Studies at Lehman College, was honored with a Distinguished Alumni Award from Central Washington University (CWU) in October. He graduated from CWU College of Arts and Humanities in 1963.

Valeriya S. Shafiro (Speech–Language–Hearing Sciences, 2004) coauthored, with E. S. Levy (see above) et al., “Perceptual confusion of American English vowels and consonants by native English and native Arabic bilinguals” in *Language and Speech* (online May 17, 2012). Shafiro is an associate professor of communication disorders and sciences, College of Health Sciences, Rush University, Chicago.

Naomi J. Stubbs (Theatre, 2012), who was hired as a full-time tenure-track assistant professor of English at LaGuardia Community College this fall, has had her manuscript “Cultivating National Identity Through Performance: American Pleasure Gardens and Entertainment” accepted by Palgrave Macmillan. The expected publication date for the book is late 2013.

Harold Takooshian (Psychology, 1979), a professor at Fordham University, was appointed a U.S. Fulbright Scholar to Haigazian University in Lebanon for 2013 to give classes on the social psychology of city life. In June, he served as a visiting professor at the Higher School of Economics in Moscow.
Spring 2013 at the Graduate Center

The GC’s Public Programs presents:

Extraordinary Lives
GC President Bill Kelly interviews outstanding public figures, including novelist and essayist Marilynne Robinson (May 1).

Perspectives
Peter Beinart hosts conversations with the New York Times’ David Carr & CUNY Graduate School of Journalism’s Stephen B. Shepard (Feb. 19) and Harvard law professor Alan Dershowitz (May 9).

Conversations
Notable writers discuss their recent work, including James Oakes & Sean Wilentz (Feb. 4), Barbara Fields & Ta-Nehisi Coates (March 7), and Aleksandar Hemon & André Aciman (May 6).

Elebash Presents Live@365
A showcase for world music, featuring master Persian storyteller Morshed Torabi (March 12), Hungarian gypsy band Budapest Bar (April 9), and Chinese jaw harp virtuoso Wang Li (May 7).

Save the date! The GC’s Advanced Research Collaborative and the Luxembourg Income Study Center present:

Inequality and Economic Growth: Paul Krugman and Tony Atkinson
Paul Krugman, Nobel laureate and New York Times columnist, will discuss the relationship between inequality and economic growth with Sir Tony Atkinson, professor of economics at Oxford University and one of the world’s foremost scholars on inequality (May 20).

For a detailed schedule of public programs visit www.gc.cuny.edu/publicprograms after January 28, 2013, or call GC Public Programs at 212-817-8215.