Happy New Year Everyone!

I hope you are off to a healthy 2017, filled with good luck and good fortune! I, myself, feel particularly fortunate and honored to be writing to you as the chair of the Sociology of Law Section of the ASA. I have been a member of this section since graduate school and have always enjoyed serving the section – on the council, organizing the roundtables, and as a member or chair of various committees. This is a section that truly gives me a sense of belonging. My hope is that many of you also feel this way, and, as we add even more members, they, too, will enjoy this warm welcome. (Remember, only $5 to sponsor a student for membership!)

I know you all will enjoy the article by Joachim Savelsberg about the founding of the Sociology of Law Section. It’s fascinating to learn how, in the early 1990s, forward-thinking scholars came together to form this section.

(continued on Page 2)
That was before some of us were in graduate school (including yours truly) and before other members were even born! We certainly owe these founding members a debt of gratitude.

To help the section get to know our current council members, this newsletter includes an interview with section treasurer/secretary Sida Liu. Interviews with other council members are scheduled for the summer newsletter. My thanks go to graduate student Elizabeth Nalepa for conducting this excellent interview!

Please consider running for section council yourself or nominating another member. You may send Ron Levi, our nominations committee chair, your nominations for council members, secretary/treasurer, and chair-elect. Self-nominations are more than welcome. You may contact him at ron.levi@utoronto.ca. Nominations are due January 2.

One the most exciting parts of the ASA annual meetings is our section panels. This newsletter includes information on Becky Sandefur’s list of panels for the next ASA. She’s created a great line-up for our meeting in Montreal. Thanks to the amazing work of the Membership Committee, Mary Rose (chair) and Julia Tomassetti, we have over 400 members, which entitles us to three sessions at the ASA (plus the additional session co-sponsored with Organizations, Occupations and Work section). Our membership total is also thanks to all of you who signed up friends, students, and colleagues in our effort to make the 400-person mark.

Another great part of the annual meetings is our awarding of the section prizes. Our section is currently accepting nominations for our upcoming prize competitions: graduate student paper, undergraduate paper, book, and article. The full calls for these competitions are further down in the newsletter, but they all have deadlines for nominations in late February (February 24 or 28). Each competition’s chair’s contact information is provided within the calls so that you may contact any of them with questions — or, even better, with your nominations! I’d like to thank the prize committees for their willingness to do this important work for the section, especially the chairs: Jessie Finch (undergrad. paper), Brian Gran (grad. paper), Mary Nell Trautner (article), and Elaine Draper (book).

On the day before this year’s annual meeting, our section is going to try something new: a pre-conference. Other sections do this, but 2017 will be the first time that our section hosts a Sociology of Law mini-conference. This one-day conference on August 11 will give members the chance to connect with each other about our research in a smaller setting than the ever-larger annual meetings. Joe Conti, who is chairing the committee, has written a brief description for this newsletter. Please watch for the call for papers in the next few months, consider submitting papers to it, and plan to attend. It should be great!

I’d like to encourage our section members to connect with each other through mentoring. Jennifer Earl and Carroll Seron have written about their experiences as mentee and mentor. I’d like to thank them for sharing this with us. My thanks also go to
Ellen Berrey for continuing to chair the Mentoring Committee. Please feel free to contact her at ellen.berrey@utoronto.ca.

I also want to thank our webpage creator, Roberto Rivera, who stepped up to create a webpage for us when the ASA stopped hosting whole webpages for the sections. He has initiated many great ideas for our section webpage, including having links to sociology-of-law related blogs that might be of interest to our members. I believe OOW, for example, does this currently. If you have blog suggestions, please email him at rrive011@ucr.edu.

Finally, I want to thank Mikaila Arthur for editing this newsletter. She always does such great work!

Best,

Ellizabeth A. Hoffmann

MEET YOUR COUNCIL MEMBERS

Here, we introduce a new feature in which we will run interviews with council members to introduce them and their work to the section membership. –MMLA

MEET SIDA LIU, INTERVIEWED BY LIZ NALEPA

Professor Sida Liu is currently a part of the Department of Sociology at the University of Toronto. He is also a Faculty Fellow at the American Bar Foundation and a Member of the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton. His research interests include the sociology of law, organizations and professions, criminal justice, globalization, and social theory, particularly theories of social space and social process. Liz Nalepa is a doctoral candidate at Case Western Reserve University in Cleveland, Ohio. Her work on reproductive rights and reproductive justice spans medical sociology, the sociology of law, and theories of intersectional inequality.

What are you working on right now?
This academic year I am doing research at the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton. My main project there is to write a paper tentatively entitled “The Ecology of Activism: A History of Lawyer Mobilization in China.” Collaborating with Professor Terry Halliday at the American Bar Foundation, I use the case of lawyer activism in China in the early 21st century to develop a spatial theory for understanding social and political movements. In contrast to the dominant cause lawyering approach in the law and society literature, we shift the unit of analysis from issues or “causes” to the social
space of lawyer activism. In this social space, there is not always a fixed structural link between activist lawyers and the causes around which they mobilize. Both lawyers and causes emerge simultaneously in an ecology of activism.

What is the most challenging aspect of doing this work? What are the most surprising things you have found?
The most challenging aspect is the fieldwork, which required us to interview not only ordinary law practitioners all over China but also a number of high-profile human rights lawyers who were under the constant surveillance of the state. Soon after we completed the last round of fieldwork, several of our informants were detained by the Chinese government in a large-scale crackdown against human rights lawyers, then charged with the serious crime of subverting state power. While I felt fortunate to finish our data collection before the crackdown, it has been extremely painful to watch these lawyers on trial and, in some cases, giving public confessions on TV. This is also a main reason that motivates me to write this new paper tracing the history of lawyer activism after completing our book *Criminal Defense in China: The Politics of Lawyers at Work* (Cambridge University Press, 2016).

The most surprising thing that I have found in this research is the “non-strategic” aspect of lawyer activism. Most existing theories of social space, such as the work of Bourdieu and Fligstein & McAdam, assume that actions in a field are “strategic” and actors always actively fight for power and dominance. In our study, however, many lawyers were drawn into the ecology of activism accidentally and, facing strong and persistent state repression, their collective action was not only sporadic but also passive and non-strategic in many situations. Using this case and following the interactionist tradition of Simmel and the Chicago School, we intend to develop an emergent and processual perspective for explaining collective action in social and political movements.

What is the most important issue facing lawyers working in China?
Chinese lawyers face many problems in their practice. The most important issue, if I have to pick one, is the lack of autonomy from the state. Bar associations in China function like the extended arms of the Ministry of Justice and they spend more time controlling and sanctioning lawyers rather than protecting their rights. As a result, when lawyers are attacked by the public or persecuted by the state, there is little protection that they can get from their professional association. The lack of autonomy leads to a delicate relationship between lawyers and the state that I call “symbiotic exchange,” that is, many Chinese lawyers have to attach themselves to state power and exchange resources with judges and state officials in order to survive and gain advantages in their everyday work. The prevalence of symbiotic exchange also constraints Chinese lawyers’ political mobilization against the authoritarian regime.

How did your LL.B. degree prepare you for this work? Do you feel that formal legal training is important for people researching the Sociology of Law?
A law degree is certainly useful for researching the sociology of law, but I don’t think it is a necessity at all. My LL.B. degree is a four-year undergraduate degree at Peking
University Law School, in which I spent much of the time reading political philosophy and social theory in addition to doctrinal studies of law. Now when I look back, I think my theoretical training in law school has proved to be more helpful for my scholarship than the course work in different areas of doctrinal law. Legal education also builds network and social capital, which eases access to the legal profession and the court. But a law degree is also a double-edged sword: it gives the researcher a normative perspective, which is often in conflict with the pursuit of objectivity in social science. Even after studying and teaching sociology for nearly 15 years, I sometimes still feel this tension in my own work.

**Are there any new areas or new topics of research that you think demand analysis informed by Sociology of Law?**

There are always new empirical topics of research, especially if we look globally. For example, in the past a few years I have been involved in the GLEE (Globalization, Lawyers, and Emerging Economies) Project, a Harvard Law School research project co-directed by David B. Wilkins and David M. Trubek. We use a socio-legal approach to analyze the impact of globalization on the legal professions in Brazil, India, and China, three of the BRICS countries. The project is at the key intersection between the rise of the emerging markets and the globalization of the legal profession, two new empirical phenomena in the early 21st century. Some recent political events, such as Brexit or the U.S. presidential election, are also likely to present new questions for sociologists of law. However, in my opinion, the most challenging question for law and society research today is how to further advance its theories, which are not only U.S.-centric but also narrowly focused on what I call the “power/inequality” approach. Last year, I published a paper calling for a “powerless” approach to the sociology of law (“Law’s Social Forms”). It is my preliminary effort to develop an alternative way of doing law and society research, one that emphasizes the structural and processual forms of the legal system rather than its power and inequality.

**SECTION FOR THE SOCIOLOGY OF LAW: BIRTH, HOPES, & SAFEGUARDS**

Joachim J. Savelsberg
University of Minnesota

The Section for the Sociology of Law was born in the early 1990s. Three colleagues, Terry Halliday, Kim Scheppele, and myself served as “midwives.” As it takes a village to raise a child, and as the interest was substantial, others soon joined into the effort.

Moving to the United States from my native Germany in 1989, I was struck by the absence of a Section for the Sociology of Law in the American Sociological Association. In 1991, I wrote a brief statement, in which I laid out some substantive and some institutional reasons why a Sociology of Law section would be a good idea. I paraphrase:

*The American Sociological Association does not adequately institutionalize the sociology of law despite its central importance for the understanding of society, its subsystems, social action, culture, formal organizations, social structure and conflict, and social change. The last three Annual ASA Meetings offered only one session each on the sociology of law. Papers presented at sessions of the Section for Crime, Law, and
Deviance almost exclusively dealt with issues of criminal behavior or criminal justice organization. At the same time, there is considerable interest in issues of law within the discipline. The ASA Guide to Graduate Departments documents more than 170 sociologists who indicate 'law' or some special type of law—excluding criminal law—as an area of specialization. The Law and Society Association's membership directory lists about 120 members whose addresses are in sociology departments or who are known to us as sociologists. Together these two directories list more than 220 persons (there were overlaps) who document an interest in the sociology of law (Savelsberg 1991).

One year later the Section for the Sociology of Law was under way. Terry Halliday led the effort, and he became our first chair. Kim Scheppelle coordinated our efforts with Jim Coleman (then the ASA president) and Felice Levine (then the ASA executive director) about how to get the section listed, registered and approved. She also conducted delicate negotiations with the crime/law/deviance section to demonstrate that we had no intention of upstaging or replacing them. Members of the initial Steering and By-laws committees included this trio and, I will have to trust my notes here, Donald Black, Lauren Edelman, Butler Jones, Bob Kidder, Rick Lempert, Setsuo Miyazawa, Frank Munger, Al Reiss, Robert Rosen, and Larry Ross. Once we got approvals all around and by-laws drafted, membership soared in the first year to enough to sustain the section.

Finding a home for the sociology of law within ASA, we had institutionalized a place where we would connect with other sub-sociologies such as sociological theory, organizations and occupations, gender, political, and medical. And we made it a principle from the beginning to co-sponsor sessions with other sections. We did not want to add just another niche, not contribute to growing intra-disciplinary boundaries (Vaughan 1999:310), but counteract, in one small area, the fizzling out at the edges that several scholars have diagnosed for competitive and decentralized fields like sociology (Fuchs 1993; Halliday 1992).

Such fizzling out had been advanced by the foundation of thematically specialized associations, in criminology the American Society of Criminology, in our field the Law & Society Association. Not to be misunderstood, meeting in cross-disciplinary settings avoids disciplinary narrowmindedness. Yet, it also entails the risk of separating members of disciplines from other disciplinary subareas. Craig Calhoun (1992) rightly observed that the foundation of such interdisciplinary programs holds the risk of creating new boundaries between academic fields rather than advancing exchange between disciplines.

Further, while the “pull of the policy audience” risks in socio-legal studies may not be as grave as elsewhere, law’s representation by a comparatively powerful legal profession in combination with its normative and interpretive logic—as opposed to socio-logic of our discipline—may at times overwhelm social science partners in a joint multi-disciplinary enterprise. Influence may occur directly through research funding or indirectly as academic institutions change their internal organization in response to government-induced demand for professional training. Wolf Heydebrand (1990) has argued that academic institutions have become increasingly responsive to such demands. We find
this confirmed for criminology and criminal justice studies (e.g., Savelsberg, Cleveland and King 2004), where authors affiliated with criminology and criminal justice programs focus more strongly on topics and theories suggested by the state than authors from sociology programs (“program effects”), where articles based on funding provided by political agencies are more likely to relate to substantive and theoretical concerns articulated by the state (“funding effect”), and where the relationship between a changing ideological climate and criminological knowledge is almost fully explained through funding and program effects.

Again, law and society studies are not part of an organizational field with one dominant actor outside the world of scholarship as powerful and clearly defined as the criminal justice system. Yet, caution may be warranted nevertheless given the law and society studies’ closeness to the field of law, more prestigious than the social sciences, and to the legal profession and the state as producers of law, both obviously more powerful than social sciences. Encounters with the multi-disciplinary world of law and society studies will, of course, continue to provide us with challenges, stimulations, provocations, and exposures to the world of law. Institutionalizing the sociology of law, however, for example through the Sociology of Law section, may provide a safe haven to guard the conceptual, theoretical, and methodological integrity of the sociological endeavor and to secure continued exchange with other branches of sociology. Maybe its first quarter of a century has fulfilled some of these hopes and provided safeguards against the pull of the policy audience, the alienation from discipline and the splintering of from other specialties.
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**CALL FOR NOMINATIONS FOR SECTION AWARDS**

**DISTINGUISHED UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT PAPER IN THE SOCIOLOGY OF LAW**

The Sociology of Law Section solicits nominations for the 2017 Undergraduate Student Paper Award, recognizing an outstanding paper written between 2015 and 2017 in the sociology of law. The first author must have been an undergraduate student when the piece was written. Entries should be double-spaced and no longer than 35 pages (including tables, appendices, and references). We accept nominations from authors, faculty advisors, and section members. To nominate a paper, please include a brief (no more than one page) letter noting its contributions to the field. The deadline is February 28, 2017. Please email materials (including the paper) to each committee member: Jessie Finch, chair, jessiekfinch@gmail.com; Roberto Rivera, rrive011@ucr.edu; and Jack Jin Gary Lee, jackjin@ucsd.edu.

**DISTINGUISHED GRADUATE STUDENT PAPER IN THE SOCIOLOGY OF LAW**

The Sociology of Law Section solicits nominations for the 2017 Graduate Student Paper Award, recognizing an outstanding paper written between 2015 and 2017 in the sociology of law. The first author must have been a graduate student when the piece was written. Entries should be double-spaced and no longer than 35 pages (including tables, appendices, and references). We accept nominations from authors, faculty advisors, and section members. To nominate a paper, please include a brief (no more than one page) letter noting its contributions to the field. The deadline is February 28, 2017. Please email materials (including the paper) to each committee member: Brian Gran, chair, brian.gran@case.edu; Sarah Brayne, sbrayne@utexas.edu; Nate Ela nela@wisc.edu; Ashley Rubin ashley.rubin@utoronto.ca; and David John Frank frankd@uci.edu.

**DISTINGUISHED ARTICLE IN THE SOCIOLOGY OF LAW**

The 2017 Sociology of Law Distinguished Article Award committee is currently accepting nominations of outstanding and innovative articles published in 2015, 2016, or 2017. Self-nominations are accepted. To nominate an article for this award, please submit a one-page letter explaining why the article makes a significant contribution to sociology of law, along with a PDF of the article to the award committee’s chair, Mary Nell Trautner, at trautner@buffalo.edu. In the subject line of your email please write “Nomination for Sociology of Law Article Award.” While not a requirement, we encourage nominees to become members of the ASA’s Sociology of Law section. Nomination deadline is February 24, 2017.
DISTINGUISHED BOOK IN THE SOCIOLOGY OF LAW

The Sociology of Law Section solicits nominations for the 2017 Distinguished Book Award, recognizing an outstanding book published between 2015 and 2017 in the sociology of law. We accept nominations from authors, editors, publishers, and section members. To nominate a book, please submit a brief (no more than one page) letter noting its contributions to the field. The deadline is February 28, 2017. Please mail a hard copy of the nominating letter as well as the review copy of your book to: Elaine Draper, chair, 1031 25th Street, Santa Monica, CA 90403; Lauren Rivera, 2001 Sheridan Road, Evanston, IL 60208; Michael Raphael, CUNY Graduate Center, Department of Sociology, Room 6112, 365 Fifth Avenue, New York, NY 10016; and Ellen Berrey, Department of Sociology, University of Toronto, Mississauga, 3359 Mississauga Rd., Mississauga, ON L5L 1C6. In addition, please email a copy of the nominate letter to committee chair. Elaine Draper at edraper@calstatela.edu.

Winners of all four awards will be recognized at the 2017 ASA Annual Meeting in Montreal. See http://www.asanet.org/sections/law_awards.cfm for more information.

SECTION CALLS FOR PAPERS

Our Section’s program at the 2017 American Sociological Association annual meeting includes three panels (one co-sponsored with the Section on Human Rights) and a roundtable session. Please consider submitting papers to these sessions. Our section day is Monday, August 14th.

1. Human Rights and Law from Above and Below: Comparative Perspectives. Co-sponsored by the sections on the Sociology of Law and Human Rights. Papers in these sessions will explore the relationship between law and human rights. Questions include: how do legal guarantees secure human rights, and how do they fail to do so? How do human rights guarantees generate (or not) mobilization of law? How do human rights shape legal consciousness, and how does legal consciousness shape human rights? Papers will address these issues from a comparative perspective, across social groups, regional and national contexts. Law established by states and international actors, as well as legal mobilization from below and legal consciousness will be addressed. Session Organizer: Frank Munger, New York Law School
2. **Law and Culture.** This session invites papers exploring topics in the area of law and culture, broadly construed. Possible topics include legal cultures; organizational and occupational cultures of legal workers and organizations; law, culture and crime; law, culture and rights; cultural representations of law; how law shapes culture and the converse. Session Organizer: Kathryne M. Young, University of Massachusetts-Amherst

3. **Law and Inequality: Criminal, Civil and the Intersection of the Two.** This session invites papers exploring topics in the area of law and inequality, broadly construed. Possible topics include: how law and civil or criminal justice systems create or support social or economic inequality; how law shapes inequality at work, home, school and in civic life; inequalities in people's civil or criminal justice experiences; inequality among lawyers and other staff of legal institutions; the limits and promise of law's equalizing power; tensions between goals of legal systems and other policy goals; inequality and the intersection of criminal and civil justice. Session Organizer: Erin York Cornwell, Cornell University

4. **Section on the Sociology of Law Refereed Roundtables** (one-hour). Session Organizer: Michael W. Yarbrough, City University of New York- John Jay College (CUNY). Session will be one-hour in length; followed by the Section’s 40-minute business meeting.

The Sociology of Law section is also planning a mini-conference for August 11, 2017, in advance of the 2017 American Sociological Association annual meeting in Montréal, Quebec, Canada. Organized around the theme of “**Law, Culture, and Inclusion/Exclusion**,” this one-day conference is designed to provide intensive engagement with participants’ research examining the cultural role, processes elements of, and politics of law or the legal elements of culture that result in exclusion and inclusion. Our conception of law is broad, including hard or soft law, legal and quasi-legal institutions, and legal consciousness. By linking the mini-conference theme to that of the ASA, we hope to attract a broad array of sociologists to consider the relationships between law and culture. Stay tuned for the call for papers.

Other ASA sessions which section members might be interested in include:

- Regular session on Law & Society, organized by Nicole Gonzalez Van Cleve, Temple University
- Regular session on the Sociology of Law, organized by Ron Levi, University of Toronto
- Section on Human Rights Roundtables, organized by our council member Lynette Chua, National University of Singapore
- Section on Inequality, Poverty, and Mobility session “The Diverse and the Poor,” which seeks papers on “the relationship between labor law and anti-discrimination law” or “on anti-discrimination laws and welfare policies,” among other topics, organized by Alexandra Kalev, Tel Aviv University
Section on Organizations, Occupations, and Work session “Making Organizational Compliance Real,” which “will explore when, where, and how law, regulation, and practice generate substantial—if very rarely complete—conformity to rules and expectations,” organized by our chair-elect Becky Sandefur, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Section on Sexualities session “Criminalizations and Decriminalizations of Sexuality,” organized by Angela Jones, SUNY Farmingdale

---

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**NEXT AMICI DEADLINE**
The deadline for submission for the *Amici* summer issue will be June 15, 2016, so plan ahead. Besides news and announcements, submissions of short essays are encouraged. Please consider writing something for the summer issue, and if you have graduate students, encourage them to consider a submission as well. For questions and inquiries, please contact the editor, Mikaila Mariel Lemonik Arthur, at marthur@ric.edu.

**SUBMIT TEACHING RESOURCES TO TRAILS**
TRAILS, a peer-reviewed online database of teaching resources. We accept course syllabi, class activities, assignments, PowerPoints, or anything else you have related to law and society or sociology of law courses. Submissions are processed, and subscriptions purchased, through the TRAILS site at http://trails.asanet.org; while they cannot be submitted to area editors directly, I (marthur@ric.edu) am happy to answer questions about the site and the submission process. Submissions from your graduate students/teaching assistants are welcome too!

**CALL FOR RESOURCES: TRANS JUSTICE SYLLABUS**
The Committee for Advancing Trans Studies in Sociology is seeking resource suggestions and curriculum ideas for the creation of a Trans Justice syllabus, which will be shared online through its own website and through ASA TRAILS. The #TransJusticeSyllabus is an integral part of the Trans Justice initiative launched this year by Dr. Laurel Westbrook and Dr. Eric Grollman to advance public understanding of transgender issues, to support trans studies scholars, and to eliminate bias against transgender and non-binary people in the discipline. Relevant resources may include readings, films, and other supplemental material that you think should be included on the syllabus. If you have any recommendations for resources or syllabi of your own to share, please forward them to Ghassan Moussawi (moussawi@illinois.edu) and Anne Marie Champagne (anne.champagne@yale.edu).
MENTORING MATCH PROGRAM

CALL FOR MENTEES AND MENTORS

Would you benefit from professional guidance and support from a faculty member outside your department?

Are you an advanced faculty member who would find it rewarding to mentor a more junior sociologist of law?

If so, we hope you will join the Sociology of Law Section’s Mentoring Match program. This long-standing program pairs graduate students and assistant, associate, and adjunct professors with more senior professors to create an ongoing, supportive relationship. Participants typically arrange for regular times to talk throughout the year and keep their conversations confidential. If you are interested in participating—as either a mentee or mentor—contact Ellen Berrey (ellen.berrey@utoronto.ca) by Jan. 15, 2017. In your email, please explain your career stage, general intellectual interests, and anything else she might need to know. Mentees should also note the type of mentoring they are seeking (e.g., finishing a dissertation, finding a job at an R1/teaching college/law school/non-academic institution, getting tenure, managing academia as a person of color/woman/someone who is LGBT, negotiating dual academic spouse situations, etc.), and mentors can note what types of mentoring they are best equipped to provide.

SOME THOUGHTS ON MENTORING

The article below originally ran in Amici in 2009. We reprint it here, slightly edited, because of its valuable guidance for those embarking on a mentoring relationship. – MMLA

Jennifer Earl, University of Arizona
Carroll Seron, University of California Irvine

In 2002, we met through the Sociology of Law mentoring program, and we thought it might be helpful to share some of our experiences. Let us begin by saying that it has been a remarkably satisfying experience for each of us, Carroll, the mentor and Jennifer (Jenn), the mentee; indeed, after many years, we are now good friends and colleagues. But, in the beginning, our mentoring was much more formal and yet very important professionally for Jenn. So, what made it a good experience for each of us?

First, we established a regular time to meet on a monthly basis. We usually set aside an early morning slot on Friday, when life is generally quieter. All of our meetings were of course by telephone; indeed, we did not actually meet each other face-to-face until about a year or so after we began meeting by phone. The regular interactions built a sense of common values, understandings, and trust that allowed a very enriching and deep mentoring relationship to develop.
Second, we always had the understanding that Jenn could call Carroll at any time during the month should something come up that required a more immediate conversation. This happened on one occasion. By the time of this off-schedule call, we had established a solid rapport so that Jenn felt completely comfortable contacting Carroll to debrief after a difficult encounter. The trust built over preceding years also strengthened the mentoring support that Carroll could provide.

Third, Jenn prepared for our telephone meeting by developing a list of questions or topics that she wanted to talk about. This was a critical ingredient. It helped to structure our conversations and created an opportunity for Jenn to reflect on her professional life each month. Many mentees think they need to have a problem or need major advice for a mentor to be helpful, but young professors actually face a wide array of new situations and choices that they could use confidential advice on. This opportunity to reflect always turned up some issue that Jenn wanted more insight into and allowed her to prioritize her questions. Our conversations ranged from discussing events at faculty meetings that were hard to interpret or understand, to advice on how to handle a somewhat difficult graduate student situation, to timing on when to send out a book prospectus. In hindsight this structure was also enormously helpful because we always had something to talk about!

Fourth, the kinds of questions that were often of concern to Jenn revolved around the tacit knowledge that one learns through years of socialization in the profession. In other words, there was no need for Carroll to know the ins and outs of Jenn’s particular department or university in order to be helpful. Jenn did not have to have a problem to have a conversation; she could just have several run of the mill questions. From the standpoint of a mentoring experience, one of the most interesting aspects of this experience has been to have the opportunity to pass on this tacit knowledge in a more structured way.

Fifth, for many years both of us kept our mentoring process confidential. Carroll did not talk about issues Jenn raised, even in a general manner, nor did Jenn did not talk about it with others. When asked how we knew each other, Carroll carefully said something like “we’ve just been friends for a while,” unless Jenn jumped in with an explanation. The confidentiality certainly helped to build trust that Jenn could air concerns knowing that it would remain confidential.

Sixth, Carroll created a positive environment where having questions, difficult situations, or problems was part of a regular and healthy professional development process. This meant that there was no face saving necessary, which is an invaluable gift to a young professor facing what at times can seem like a very bewildering world. It also meant that our conversations often quickly got down to the bone of a problem and could be incredibly helpful problem-solving sessions.

We have now moved on to the second generation, as Jenn has mentored a younger colleague. There is an expectation that the day will come when the mentee of this thread will become the mentor. When Jenn assumed her new role, she too found what Carroll
discovered some years ago, that it is very gratifying to pass on the tacit knowledge of professional socialization to the next generation of our scholarly community. Moreover, since mentees can rarely if ever directly pay the debt of gratitude they owe to their mentors, Jenn finds great satisfaction in at least extending the same kindness that Carroll showed her to someone else. We hope that these thoughts are helpful as you embark on what is a very gratifying experience and that you strive to make it a rewarding experience; good mentoring requires an active mentee, an approachable mentor, and great cultivation over time.

NEW PUBLICATIONS AND MEMBER NEWS


**Chiarello, Elizabeth** was awarded the Outstanding Junior Scholar Award from the ASA’s Section on Alcohol, Drugs & Tobacco.


In Working Law, Lauren Edelman argues that we have become a symbolic civil rights society in which symbols of diversity substitute for equal opportunity at work. Employers prominently display their antidiscrimination and diversity policies, yet race and gender still dramatically shape employees’ experiences. Even judges are often convinced that an organization is in compliance by the mere presence of an antidiscrimination policy or grievance procedure, irrespective of whether these policies effectively protect the rights of women and minorities. Judicial deference to symbolic compliance helps to explain why race and gender inequality at work persists more than a half century after the 1964 Civil Rights Act.


Precarious Claims tells the human story behind the bureaucratic process of fighting for justice in the U.S. workplace. The global economy has fueled vast concentrations of wealth that have driven a demand for cheap and flexible labor. Workplace violations such as wage theft, unsafe work environments, and discrimination are widespread in low-wage industries such as retail, restaurants, hospitality, and domestic work, where jobs are often held by immigrants and other vulnerable workers. How and why do these workers, despite enormous barriers, come forward to seek justice, and what happens once they do? Based on extensive fieldwork in Northern California, Gleeson investigates the array of gatekeepers with whom workers must negotiate in the labor standards enforcement bureaucracy and, ultimately, the limited reach of formal legal protections. The author also tracks how workplace injustices—and the arduous process of contesting them—carry long-term effects on their everyday lives. Workers sometimes win, but their chances are precarious at best.


Kirkland, Anna. 2016. *Vaccine Court: The Law and Politics of Injury.* NYU Press. The so-called vaccine court is a small special court in the United States Court of Federal Claims that handles controversial claims that a vaccine has harmed someone. While vaccines in general are extremely safe and effective, some people still suffer severe vaccine reactions and bring their claims to vaccine court. In *Vaccine Court*, Anna Kirkland draws on the trials of the vaccine court to explore how legal institutions resolve complex scientific questions. While many scholars argue that it’s foolish to let judges and lawyers decide medical claims about vaccines, Kirkland argues that our political and legal response to vaccine injury claims shows how well legal institutions can handle specialized scientific matters.

Joachim Savelsberg’s *Representing Mass Violence: Conflicting Responses to Human Rights Violations in Darfur*, a cross-field- and cross-national study on representational effects of UN and International Criminal Court interventions in the violence in Darfur received 2016 Best Book awards from both the SSSP Theory Division and the ASC International Division. Published in 2015 by the University of California Press, the books is also available as an open access-online edition at [http://www.luminosoa.org/site/books/detail/3/representing-mass-violence/](http://www.luminosoa.org/site/books/detail/3/representing-mass-violence/).


Liu, Sida and Terence C. Halliday. 2016. *Criminal Defense in China: The Politics of Lawyers at Work.* Cambridge University Press. *Criminal Defense in China* studies empirically the everyday work and political mobilization of defense lawyers in China. It builds upon 329 interviews across China, and other social science methods, to investigate and analyze the interweaving of politics and practice in five segments of the practicing criminal defense bar in China from 2005 to 2015. This book is the first to examine everyday criminal defense work in China as a political project. The authors engage extensive scholarship on lawyers and political liberalism across the world, from seventeenth-century Europe to late twentieth-century Korea and Taiwan, drawing on theoretical propositions from this body of theory to examine the strategies and constraints of lawyer mobilization in China. The book brings a fresh perspective through its focus on everyday work and ordinary lawyering in an authoritarian context and raises searching questions about law and lawyers, politics and society, in China’s uncertain future.