Art of the State conference, October 21-22, 2005
On October 21 and 22 the Center held its major, two-day conference for 2005-06. Buck Professor of Chinese History Douglas Howland (Fellow 2004-05) was one of the organizers, together with Luise White (History, Florida). Following welcoming remarks by Vice Chancellor for Research and Dean of the Graduate School Abbas Oormazd and Center Director Daniel Sherman, the proceedings began with a keynote address by Siba Grovogui (Political Science, Johns Hopkins). Grovogui not only provided a rich historical and disciplinary overview of the uses of sovereignty, but also urged the audience to think about the many "constitutionally-unclaimed" in today's world and how they will eventually "determine on their own the conditions of their entry into the global sovereign compact."

Grovogui’s address was a fitting introduction to a conference seeking to link theoretical or scholarly work on sovereignty with today’s social, economic, and political realities. In keeping with Center practice, all papers in subsequent sessions were pre-circulated so that more time could be devoted to discussion.

In the first panel, “States and Laws,” Eileen Scully (Social Sciences, Bennington) used the story of the repatriation of so-called “pauper lunatics” in the late 19th century to raise broader questions about extraterritoriality and diplomatic protection of Americans traveling overseas. Douglas Howland addressed a related topic from approximately the same era, namely that of the treaties concluded between Western powers and the governments of Japan and China over jurisdiction questions regarding non-Chinese and non-
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From the Director

Not long after arriving in Milwaukee in 2002, I received a fortune in a Chinese restaurant that read “Your wish to reach the top will be realized.” After I had taped it to my office door, more as an ironic comment on the Center’s location on the “top” floor of Curtin Hall than anything else, two people who have known me for a long time had opposite reactions. One took the fortune as a declaration of achievement, a sense that I had reached the top. Another viewed it as signaling ambition. When, not long afterwards, he received one of the Center’s fund-raising appeals, he concluded – erroneously, I hasten to add − that I aspired to be a college president.

In a sense, both of these friends of the Center had it right. The Center is at the top of its game, but we always aspire to do more, to expand our reach, to excel in new ways. And the time when seeking outside support for academic programs could be the exclusive concern of a university’s chief executive and its development office is long past. In recent discussions of UWM’s just-launched Research Growth Initiative (RGI), one way the university is addressing this issue, the heads of the two units from which the Center receives its primary support, the College of Letters and Science and the Graduate School, took pains to reassure many concerned faculty that the initiative would not affect the Center’s core programs or funding. Both Dean Meadows and Vice-Chancellor Ourmazd recognize the vital role that the Center has played over the years in doing exactly what the RGI aspires to do: provide seed funding for new ideas that will reap returns in research productivity. By the measure most commonly used in the Humanities, publications, our achievement is impressive. In the past decade alone, Center fellows and staff have produced forty books.

The Center’s international reputation for cutting-edge research does not, however, allow us to rest on our laurels. Even if the funding equation in the arts, humanities, and qualitative social sciences differs somewhat from those in the sciences and engineering – our research costs less, but it also brings less revenue in – the overall downward trend in public funding for higher education affects all of us. As long as I am director, the Center will continue to do what it has done superbly for over a quarter century, and on a very tight budget: provide talented faculty and graduate students with time and space to pursue their own work as part of a lively, ongoing interdisciplinary community. But we will also participate in the RGI and other efforts to find outside support for expanding our activities in ways that grow organically out of faculty research interests. In so doing, I hope that the Center will find even more partners both within UWM and beyond it, and will realize the full potential of its mission to engage with the twenty-first century.

–Daniel Sherman
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THE CENTER’S CURRICULAR PROJECT
The Center seeks to increase campus-wide involvement in its programming, encouraging all interested community members, faculty, and students to incorporate these symposia (and other Center events) into professional development, curriculum, and special projects. Please visit www.21st.uwm.edu, e-mail ctr21cs@uwm.edu, or contact Ruud van Dijk at 414.229.2229 for more information.

conference panelists Eileen Scully, Mark Philip Bradley, Douglas Howland and moderator Terry Nardin during discussion, Curtin 175, Friday, October 21, 2005
Japanese sailors. In his larger work, Howland seeks to rethink international law as a (flawed) project of modernity. Mark Philip Bradley (History, Northwestern) presented research he worked on during a stint as a Center fellow in 2003. His paper examined the effects of international law in a domestic context, specifically the ways in which civil rights activists in postwar America used international covenants, such as the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, to combat segregation at home. Bradley noted that this tactic also produced a backlash against what many saw as a threat to U.S. sovereignty; and as a result the U.S. became more wary of participating in international human rights law.

The first day of the conference concluded with a panel on “Laws about States.” Luise White discussed the case of post-1965 Rhodesia as a way to think about sovereignty. Rhodesia at this time, White argued, was not really representative of a (former) colony, but it was not truly an independent state either. The international context of the time, White argued, is crucial for thinking about sovereignty, as the economic sanctions imposed on Rhodesia demonstrated. Sanctions both limited Rhodesia’s sovereignty, and also forced the ruling economic and political classes to be “creative” in subverting them, i.e. act independently (albeit also illegally). The second paper, by anthropologists Martha Kaplan (Vassar) and John Kelly (Chicago) explored the “legal fictions used to constitute sovereignty in the nation-states of the UN world.” The body of their paper discussed some of the unintended consequences of the U.S.-led effort in the 20th century to fashion a world of nation states moderated by U.S.-designed international institutions. Diaspora, “leveling crowds,” political armies, “new wars,” and “strange wars” (state military power challenged by a non-state actor employing global media to tell a moral tale) complicate traditional sovereignty in many countries around the world today.

The second day, held at UWM’s Hefter Conference Center, opened with a panel on “States and Outlaws.” Aida Hozic (Political Science, Florida) discussed what she called the underlying tensions of sovereignty in the Balkans with a particular focus on the role of crime in states such as Bosnia-Herzegovina. She argued that crime, criminality, and the criminalization of cross-border practices and particular states are constitutive elements of sovereignty on the Balkans today. In a paper entitled “Media and the Sovereign Police,” Thomas Lamarre (East Asian Studies, Cornell) presented work on the nature of Japanese animation and its power both to reflect and shape reality. Focusing especially on the films of Oshii Mamoru and the writings of Giorgio Agamben, Lamarre explored the contingency of concepts of authority and sovereignty in 21st-century popular culture and politics.

The next panel focused on “Questions of Territory.” Aims McGuinness (History, UWM, Fellow 2003-04) discussed the close links between sovereignty in 19th-century Latin America, United States policies, and activities by private U.S. individuals and organizations. Latin American intellectuals tried to imagine a genuinely sovereign space, “América Latina,” in response to U.S. intervention, thus creating what would later emerge as the concept for a distinct geopolitical region. Fred Cooper continued on next page

conference participants Siba Grovogui, Thomas Lamarre, and Luise White

continued from front cover
History, NYU) presented his work on the post-World War II French empire and nation under the title “Alternatives to Empire: France and Africa after World War II.” He argued that the French empire at the time, including metropolitan France, was a layered and shared entity whose destiny—and distribution of sovereignty—was very much an open question in 1945. The ultimate outcome—independence for the African parts while France itself integrated with the wider European community—was not a given, least of all for the French and West African leaders involved.

Finally, Kevin Dunn (Political Science, Hobart & William Smith) explored how the creation and utilization of national parks have been connected to the evolution of state sovereignty in the African Great Lakes region, specifically Uganda, Rwanda, and Congo. Echoing other speakers, Dunn argued that “in the 21st century, the political-territorial foundation of Westphalian sovereignty increasingly appears to be in crisis.”

The final panel, “Questions of Populations,” also consisted of three papers. Leonard Smith (History, Oberlin) presented a paper on “Sovereignty and Wilsonian Idealism in the Middle East: The King-Crane Commission of 1919.” More than the story of a campaign contributor and college president put in charge of reconfiguring the Middle East, Smith’s paper was a reminder of the transitional nature of the post-World War I moment. Westerners now assumed quasi-sovereignty in the Middle East through League of Nations mandates, and tried to determine what groups were entitled to their own states (and ultimately sovereignty), while realizing that time was not on the West’s side in the region. David Tucker (History, Iowa) explored the status of Manchukuo in the early 20th century, focusing on the motives and practices of Japan, Manchukuo’s founder. Tucker argued that while Japanese motives were not always very clear, Manchukuo’s story needs to be viewed in the context of Japan’s imperial competition with Western imperial powers. The final speaker took the participants back to the Balkans. In a paper entitled “Sovereignty after Socialism at Europe’s New Borders,” Keith Brown (International Studies, Brown) investigated the prospects for sovereignty in Macedonia after the uprising of 2001. Considering three “scripts”—reformist, nationalist, and criminal—Brown concluded that the precise nature of insurgent motives remains open to interpretation, but that in any case answers ought to be sought within Macedonian society, by paying “close attention to the micropRACTICES of sovereignty,” and not through “the work of stereotype-construction by outside observers.”

A closing general discussion moderated by the two organizers was preceded by remarks by Robert Ricigliano (Institute of World Affairs, UWM) who commented on the conference proceedings from his experience in conflict mediation in Africa and the former Soviet Union. Throughout the two days, lively, engaged discussion among the speakers and other participants made “Art of the State” a provocative and intellectually stimulating event.
Autonomy and Its Histories: A Lecture by Jerome Schneewind

On September 16, the Center launched its new research theme, “States of Autonomy,” with a lecture by philosopher Jerome Schneewind entitled “Autonomy and its Histories.” An audience of about 75—faculty and graduate students from the UWM campus and members of the wider Milwaukee community—had gathered in the newly renovated Curtin 175 to hear Schneewind, professor emeritus at Johns Hopkins University and the author of over a dozen books, including The Invention of Autonomy: A History of Modern Moral Philosophy (1988).

Emphasizing that widespread interest in the concept of autonomy is a fairly recent phenomenon, Schneewind discussed ways in which autonomy may be thought of historically. Discussing in particular the work of Immanuel Kant, but then also the 19th-century thinkers Friedrich Hegel, Auguste Comte, John Stuart Mill, and Friedrich Nietzsche, he explored the circumstances in which the concept of autonomy first came to have an important role in moral philosophy. The most important distinction between Kant’s view of autonomy and those of later philosophers, especially Mill, Schneewind argued, is that between an ahistorical (or moral) understanding of autonomy and a personal one. “For Kant all rational beings are necessarily autonomous. Mill does not think everyone possesses liberty of thought and action.”

From the late-19th century through the 1960s, autonomy virtually disappeared from philosophers’ agendas, Schneewind said. The major impetus for renewed interest in the topic came from the importance given to Kantian autonomy in John Rawls’s A Theory of Justice (1970). Rawls spurred a proliferating series of new work by other modern-day Kantians, but also by feminist scholars, so-called anti-Kantians (including utilitarians referencing Mill), and scholars working in medical ethics. In the final parts of his paper, Schneewind briefly explored some of the current debates about autonomy that have developed since the 1970s, concluding that “moral autonomy is [. . . ] as Kant thought it, ahistorical. Or so, at least, it requires us to presume.”

A lively question and answer session, with the speaker traveling the aisles of Curtin 175 further to engage his questioners, made clear that Professor Schneewind’s rich and challenging talk was extremely stimulating for both the philosophers and non-philosophers in attendance.

“You can’t drop dead voluntarily.”
—Jerome Schneewind
What Does Autonomy Mean in the Age of Nanotechnology?
A Lecture by Phi Beta Kappa Distinguished Lecturer
N. Katherine Hayles

On November 4, N. Katherine Hayles (English and Media Arts, UCLA), visiting UWM as Phi Beta Kappa Distinguished Lecturer, addressed an attentive audience on nanotechnology as it figures in Neal Stephenson’s science fiction novel, *The Diamond Age*. As prelude to her talk, “What Does Autonomy Mean in the Age of Nanotechnology? Body Boundaries and Recursivity in ‘The Diamond Age,’” Hayles called for an expanded understanding of cognition: human communication is increasingly mediated by machines, from cell phones to the internet, and cognition can now be seen as both endogenous and exogenous – in other words, not merely as something that happens in the neo-cortex but rather as an interface between the brain and the cognitively rich built environment of intelligent machines.

Hayles used *The Diamond Age* to examine a world in which bodily boundaries become as permeable as economic or political ones, as a result modifying the notion of the autonomous self. Using as reference the isolationist premises of Thomas More’s *Utopia*, she argued that the elements in *The Diamond Age* do not cohere to a utopia, but rather to a mutopia – a post-human condition that interrogates the nano-biological convergence. According to Hayles, nanotechnology initiates a deconstruction of the geopolitical into the phylopolitical, subverting traditional spatio-temporal boundaries and forfeiting the subject as a psychoanalytical selfhood when, on the nano scale, the conscious totality is disrupted by the nanosites operating within. Hayles concluded that our own comprehension of the autonomy of the body is thus complicated by this idea of mutopia; More’s utopia, grounded as it is in geographical isolation, is inimical to the postmodern and can no longer hold true today.

As part of the Center’s Curricular Project, Hayles visited Professor Thomas Malaby’s course on Ethnography and Cultural Processes (Anthropology), Professor Andrew Kincaid’s seminar on Backgrounds of Modernism (English), and Professor Rudi Strickler’s Honors class, Grand Theories of Biology. She also attended a lunch for graduate students before her lecture, providing an opportunity for engaged discussion in an informal setting.

New Working Paper on the Center Web Site
The Center is pleased to announce the posting of a new paper as part of its on-line Working Paper series: Twenty First Century Papers. Derek Counts (Art History, Fellow 2004-05) has written “Hybridity and Representation in an Ancient Mediterranean Context: The Cultures In-Between Cypriote Culture.” As always, we hope that publishing new, emerging work in this medium will enable authors to receive quick feedback from readers. If you have something to share with an author in our series, please click on the contact information on the title page to send your response by e-mail. Readers can access the paper at: http://www.uwm.edu/Dept/21st/workingpapers/index.shtml.
Learning as Equals: A Lecture by Debra Satz

Philosopher Debra Satz (Stanford) visited UWM on November 18, to deliver her paper “Learning as Equals: What is Wrong with Inequality in K-12 Education?” Originally scheduled for an appearance in Spring 2005 under the Center's previous research theme, Geographies of Difference, the presentation seemed to fit quite well with the rest of this year’s Center programming under States of Autonomy. Professor Satz's paper certainly sparked the interest of the UWM community, as Curtin 118 quickly overflowed with an impressively interdisciplinary audience of faculty and students from departments such as Art History, Economics, Education, English, History, and Philosophy.

In an engaging presentation, Satz examined two different kinds of arguments that have been made against our unequally funded and resourced K-12 education. One argument condemns inequalities in educational resources as a consequence of a commitment to an ideal of equality of opportunity applied to education. The other argument presents its case primarily in terms of adequacy. Satz drew out the differences between these two approaches and pointed out their respective strengths and limitations. She then indicated why she believes the adequacy approach to be more promising—although not without weaknesses, because mere “adequacy” of educational outcomes is likely to be inadequate for democratic purposes. She proposed instead an amended view of adequacy she calls democratic adequacy. Satz’s paper provoked a good deal of discussion, immediately following the lecture as well as, more informally, at a reception at the Center.

In addition to her Center talk Professor Satz participated in a lively meeting of the Center-supported Feminist Theory research workshop, which discussed two of her articles on women’s labor issues: “Markets in Women’s Reproductive Labor” (Philosophy and Public Affairs, 1992) and “Markets in Women’s Sexual Labor” (Ethics, 1995). Last but not least, Professor Satz graciously agreed to be interviewed by UWM philosophy graduate student Ashley Falzetti as part of the Center’s Curricular Project. We hope to be able to present the results of this encounter on our website soon.

THANK YOU!
The Center would like to express its sincere gratitude to the following people who in the past year have made financial donations to the Center: Margaret Atherton, Gilberto Blasini, Mark Bradley and Anne Hansen, Derek Counts and Elisabetta Cova, David Crane, Joan Dobkin and Ruud van Dijk, Jane Gallop, Carlos Galvao-Sobrinho, Rina Ghose, Alice Gillam, Victor Greene, Jeffrey Hayes, Christina Hernandez-Malaby and Thomas Malaby, Stanley Hoffmann, Douglas Howland, Raymond Isaacs, Judith Kalter, Gwynne Kennedy, Lisa Krahn, Kate Kramer, Anthony Lemelle, Aims McGuinness, Philip Nord, Robin Pickering-Iazzi, Scott Purl, Robert Schwartz, Claire and Stanley Sherman, Daniel Sherman, Carol Tennesen, Gabrielle Verdier, William Wainright, Kit Wallingford, Andrea Westlund, and two anonymous donors.

These donations are used exclusively for either Center programming or to support graduate research at the Center in the form of Tennessen Fellowships, depending on the donor’s designation. The Center is currently working to increase the level of outside funding for our activities. Our most recent Fall 2005 campaign has only been launched recently. If you haven’t taken the time yet to send us a donation, please consider doing so now. Your support at any level is not only greatly appreciated, it is vital! For information about how you can contribute, please contact Deputy Director Kate Kramer at kkramer@uwm.edu or 414.229.4141.
IN THE NEWS

Current Center Fellows and Staff

Ellen Amster (History) led a discussion among 28 scholars, researchers, and practitioners on “Meeting the Needs of a Neglected Region: A Newly Established Global Network of Researchers on HIV/AIDS in the Middle East and North Africa,” at the 2005 Middle East Studies Association annual meeting.

Ruud van Dijk (Assistant Director and Editor) published “Did the ‘Sonnenfeldt Doctrine’ Originate in the Economist?” in Die DDR in Europa - zwischen Isolierung und Öffnung, ed. Heiner Timmermann (Münster: LIT Verlag, 2005).

Susan Funkenstein (Art History, UW-Parkside) presented a paper entitled “The Bauhaus Parties: Where Modernism and Popular Culture Mingled” at the German Studies Association conference in October.


John McGuigan (English, UW-Whitewater) organized a panel called “The Politics of Heritage” at the Modernist Studies Association annual conference, Chicago November 3-6. He presented a paper on the panel called “The Unwitting Anarchism of Virginia Woolf.”

Daniel J. Sherman (Director) participated in a workshop on “New Approaches to the History of the French Empire” at Oberlin College, November 18-19, 2005.


Former Center Fellows

Douglas Howland (History, Fellow 2004-05) has published Personal Liberty and Public Good: The Introduction of John Stuart Mill to Japan and China (University of Toronto Press, 2005).

Howland analyzes translations of John Stuart Mill’s On Liberty into Japanese and Chinese. As with their political leaders, Mill’s Japanese and Chinese translators feared that individual liberty could undermine the public good and standards for public behavior, and so introduced their own moral values into On Liberty. Howland mirrors this mistrust of individual liberty in Asia with critiques of the work in England, which itself had trouble adopting liberalism.
Spring 2006 Calendar of Events

FRI FEB 10
Walid Raad (Art, Cooper Union)
A multi-media presentation for the Midwest Interdisciplinary Graduate Student Conference Archival Bodies at UWM (Feb 10-11, 2006)
The Loudest Muttering Is Over: Documents from the Atlas Group Archive
co-sponsored by the Department of Visual Art
3 pm CRT 175

FRI MAR 3
Janice Boddy (Anthropology, British Columbia)
A lecture, Autonomy and the Pull of Convention: Colonial Efforts to Stop Female Circumcision in Sudan, 1920-46
3:30 pm CRT 118

FRI MAR 31
Art and Its Autonomies
A symposium organized by Daniel J. Sherman (History, Center Director) with Debra Castillo (Women’s and Latin American Studies, Cornell), Jacqueline Francis (Art History, Michigan), and Eric Michaud (Art History, École des hautes Études en Sciences Sociales)
1 pm CRT 175

FRI APR 7
In/Dependence: Disability, Welfare, and Age
A symposium organized by Anne Basting (Theatre, Center on Age & Community) and Andrea Westlund (Philosophy, Women’s Studies) with speakers Margaret Morganroth Gullette (Women's Studies, Brandeis), Eva Feder Kittay (Philosophy, SUNY-Stony Brook), and Sanford F. Schram (Social Work, Bryn Mawr), and moderator Atwood Gaines (Anthropology, Bioethics, Nursing, and Psychiatry, Case Western Reserve). The symposium, co-sponsored by the Center on Age & Community, UWM, is funded in part by a grant from the Wisconsin Humanities Council, with funds from the National Endowment for the Humanities. Any views, findings, conclusions or recommendations expressed in this project do not necessarily represent those of the National Endowment for the Humanities.
10 am - 5 pm, CRT 175

continued on next page
In late March the Center turns to the concept of the “autonomy of art,” which treats creative work as the expressions of individual minds and talents best interpreted according to aesthetic criteria proper to a specific medium or genre. Long influential in a number of fields of inquiry, this concept has also been subjected to sustained critique, not least from practitioners of the visual, lyrical, and performing arts.

The symposium **Art and Its Autonomies** (March 31, 2006) is designed to explore and challenge the notion of the “autonomy of art” by examining the categories and situations that both constrict and empower artistic production. Among the topics the speakers will address are Spanish-language writers in the U.S., concepts of “racial art” in the 20th-century Atlantic world, and theories of the European avant-garde.

The interdisciplinary symposium **In/Dependence: Disability, Welfare, and Age** (April 7, 2006) brings together diverse, interdisciplinary audiences – academic and community-based – to ignite discussion and foster understanding of the meanings and implications of dependency and independence. Specifically, it will consider how issues of dependency affect the lives and self-understandings of individuals and groups and examine resulting challenges for public policy and social justice.

Special events related to the symposium include an art exhibition created by Raoul Deal (Peck School of the Arts, UWM) and Cheryl Ajirotutu (Anthropology, UWM) at the Zelazo Center for the Performing Arts. The exhibition is part of a larger project supported by the Greater Milwaukee Foundation’s Mary L. Nohl Fund and features art work based on conversations with older adults from Walnut Way, a historically black neighborhood in Milwaukee. The exhibition reception will be open to all symposium participants and will begin following the close of the symposium at 5:30 pm. The evening will culminate with a special preview of Simone Ferro’s (Dance, UWM) choreographed performance about the Walnut Way community.

Photo credits

Pete Amland, Krysta H. Chapin, and Alan Magayne-Roshak (Visual Imaging, UWM)
coffee break during the Art of the State conference, October 22, 2005, Heftner Center
standing, l to r: Center director Daniel J. Sherman, Fred Cooper, Kevin C. Dunn;
seated, l to r: Aims McGuinness and Mark Philip Bradley