With the rise of right wing populism in the U.S. and around the world, cities, and the relative diversity and progressivism of the communities to be found in them, have become a potent political target. In the U.S., we see proposals for billions in cuts to agencies that oversee vital urban programs, from the Department Chair, p. 2
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In preparation for this contribution, the opening line of a joke keeps popping up in my head: “A sociologist and a physician walk into a bar…” I am not exactly sure where this idea comes from, because — to the best of my knowledge — no such joke exists. But humor often utilizes the unusual to tell its unique stories. Maybe that explains the idea to use a non-existent joke as a captivating introduction to this piece. Certainly, being a sociologist at a medical school is unusual; being a qualitative Childhood sociologist is even more unusual — unique, even, in many ways. Unusual not because sociologists have not been studying health, disease, or other topics related to the medical field for a long time. But as much as sociology as a discipline and sociologists as individual scholars have looked at and into the medical field, medicine as a discipline and medical professionals as individuals have not necessarily looked at and into topics of sociological relevance to the same extent. Similarly, many medical professionals are not aware (enough) of the sociological perspective — our way of approaching our worlds and the ways in which those who inhabit these worlds view and make sense of them.

My family and I relocated to Springfield, Illinois from Germany in 2015. While my husband grew up in the rural Midwest, I was born and raised in Berlin — a city of about 3.7 million people. In fact, pretty much everything about me was “urban” until 2015: I considered myself a true “city person”, insisted that I would never permanently live more than an hour outside of a big city, and even my professional interests were deeply rooted in the urban context. My dissertation research focuses on punitive disciplinary practices at a U.S. inner-city school and ar
of Education to Housing and Urban Development to the Civil Rights Division. Programs long fought for by urban movements, like the Office of Environmental Justice, has been targeted for elimination. With the denial of climate change, and cuts to the EPA and FEMA, devastating fires and storms in urban areas are becoming “the new normal.” And in response to progressive legislative victories at the local scale, Conservative state legislatures and chambers of commerce increasingly use “preemption laws” to override ordinances on labor (living wage and paid sick leave), discrimination (fair hiring and housing policies), the environment (plastic bag fees and fracking bans), the sale of firearms (background checks and assault weapon bans), and the right to establish “sanctuary city” status protecting undocumented immigrants within local boundaries.

The situation causes me to reflect on a book from the 1990s by geographer Neil Smith, in which he framed attempts in that era to roll back progressive urban policies as a form of class-based revanchism — referencing the political revenge sought by old guard elites following the French Revolution (Smith, 1996). Among Smith’s main targets was the “revanchist city” of Giuliani-era New York, in which, he argued, the combination of gentrification, austerity, and “zero-tolerance” policing targeted the urban poor, working people, and communities of color for both discipline and displacement. In a similar vein, I’ve argued the 1970s-era rebranding of liberal cities like New York as good for business and tough on crime, alongside service cuts and market-oriented restructuring, served as a model for national scale neoliberalization under Reagan and later Clinton through the 80s and 90s. (Greenberg, 2008)

Are we seeing a similar revanchist move today, if in a more rightward and anti-urban direction? Raised amidst the same outer-borough animus as Giuliani in the 1960s, and his staunch supporter through the 1990s, President Trump seems to be carrying on the divisive mayor’s legacy on a national stage. His vengeful combative ness has resonated as much with fellow elites as people left behind, both economically and spatially, by neoliberalism — with the spatial dimension of particular significance for our section. Post-election analysis found that a major determinant of Trump support, especially amongst previous Obama voters, was living in “low-output America” — from rural areas and small towns to deindustrialized rust-belts and declining suburbs. (Muro and Liu, 2016) Trump offered hope to people in these hinterlands that they could be winners again, albeit in a zero-sum game in which the “high-output cities” would lose. Here the anti-urban imaginary combined urban elites and the underserving poor, particularly immigrants and people of color. Thus, much like the revanchism of the post-1960s era, diverse cities and communities become populist targets, justifying corporate tax breaks, cuts to social services, and federal immigration raids. Ironically, as in the 70s and 80s, many leading the anti-urban charge are themselves urbanites, living in luxury highrises in the heart of the city. A difference from the 70s is the cost of those highris es, and degree of inequality they represent.

Yet as much as cities and communities are embattled under this new regime, they are also battling. Indeed, most high-profile popular struggles today—Fight for 15, Black Lives Matter, resurgent tenant organizing, movements for just sustainability, community policing, immigrant rights — have been taking place in growing urban areas, and arguably the revanchist backlash is a sign of their strength. (Greenberg and Lewis, 2017) These movements helped drive the rise of “the progressive mayor,” and the “blue city in the red state” phenomenon. Clearly these shifts have been limited. We know that urban politics are embedded in multiple scales and forms of power, belying the notion of “home rule,” “mayoral control,” or “cities saving the world.” Growing inequality, precariousness, environmental degradation, and housing insecurity straddle regions and scales. But in this sense local limitations can also be generative. In urban studies, we see an increasing interest in research that pushes beyond the old borders of “the city” to make sense of social-spatial, economic, and ecological dynamics of urbanization more broadly. Also increasing is an interest in research that bridges the rural-urban divide — as we see in the piece by Anne Scheer in this newsletter. In the political realm, we see moves towards stronger coalitions within and between cities, and beginning, between the city and its “hinterlands”—from struggling rural areas to threatened tribal lands. We hear calls for urban and community research and organizing that recognizes the impact and resonance of racism, sexism, and xenophobia, so potent in blocking these new coalitions. And we see work that is increasingly global in scope and informed by dynamics across the North/South divide. In this sense, community and urban research in all its forms — from ethnography to political economy, affect studies to GIS analysis, neighborhood studies to comparative global research—has never been more relevant.

Participating in CUSs at this moment feels exciting. We’ve had an upsurge of membership to 600 members this
The 2017-18 academic year marks the CUSS Newsletter’s 30th anniversary. While the current Park Award recipient writes the fall edition’s feature article, Robert Sampson will write his feature in the winter edition set for March 2018. Anne Scheer offered to write her feature on rural community health for this edition instead of the winter one. This edition includes Miriam Greenberg’s first Chair’s Message as she took over from Deirdre Oakley at the 2017 ASA Meetings in Montreal.

While many of us may have just submitted fall term final grades, it is time already to start planning for the 2018 ASA Meetings in Philadelphia, PA this August. Since CUSS reached 600 members, we will host four open panels, one invited panel, and roundtables.

This newsletter edition includes the 2018 CUSS Call for Submissions for the open panels and roundtables on page 4. The ASA submission deadline is January 11th. All materials should be submitted through the ASA Conference website submission system.

This edition includes regular features such as New Books as well as a New Dissertation. You will find many new articles by section members in the News & Notes section.

For CUSS members looking for publishing opportunities, the newsletter provides many. Ever since we went digital in 2011, the newsletter is no longer bound by the constraints of traditional paper publishing. For each edition I am always looking for suggestions from CUSS members for new ideas and materials. Also, we have the capacity to include other formats. Feel free to contact me with proposals.
2018 CUSS Panels & Roundtables

The 2018 ASA Annual Meetings will be held in Philadelphia, PA from August 11-14. CUSS events are scheduled for Tuesday, August 14. The CUSS Section will sponsor four open sessions, one invited session as well as roundtables. All papers should be submitted though the conference website at www.asa.net.org by January 11, 2018.

OPEN SESSION: “Feeling Race,” and Spatial Inequalities, 50 Years after the Kerner Commission Report
Co-Organizers: - Chase Billingham - Rahim Kurwa, - Brandi Thompson Summers

Addressing the 2018 ASA theme “Feeling Race,” this session upholds the idea that the lived and felt experience of race has profoundly spatial dimensions, as this experience interacts with spatialized forms of power and inequality—from segregation, ghettoization, and racialized policing to gentrification and the privatization of public space. Further, mindful that 2018 marks the 50th Anniversary of the Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, aka the Kerner Commission Report, and of the urban unrest and uprisings of 1968, the session is interested in how racialized emotions and the experience of spatial inequality may contribute to new forms of contestation. In the wake of urban crises, police violence, and protests in Flint, Ferguson, Baltimore, and around the country, we welcome work that reflects on this intersection. This could include responding to an array of questions, such as:
- What are the processes by which racial/spatial inequalities are reproduced and contested?
- How does unequal urban space help shape racial categories, identities, experiences, and/or racialized emotions?
- How do people “feel race” as they navigate and experience daily life in the city—from the search for housing, to interactions in public space, to residents’ encounters with the police?
- How have contemporary urban uprisings and social movements been shaped by these race/space inequalities, and the feelings they produce?

We also welcome new scholarship that reflects on the Kerner Report, assesses its contributions, flaws, and omissions, and considers the merits of the solutions prescribed by its authors—as well as those proposed by contemporary thinkers, scholars, and movements.

OPEN SESSION: Re-conceptualizing U.S. Cities from a Global and Comparative Perspective
Co-Organizers: - Ernesto Castañeda - Xuefei Ren

American urban sociology is often disconnected from the debates that preoccupy the larger field of global urban studies. While the former tends to focus on core questions such as neighborhood effects, the reproduction of inequality, and the causes and consequences of black/white segregation in the United States, the latter tends to engage broad urban processes, including global urban networks, urban and suburban governance, and socio-spatial marginalization across multiple forms of difference, including in ghettos, barrios, banlieus, and informal settlements. One way to bridge this divide is to engage urban comparisons across north and south. Another is to focus on questions of space, marginalization, and difference that animate both fields, if often in different ways. This session seeks papers that can put U.S. and non-U.S. cities—especially those in the global South, on an even analytical plane, whether through direct comparison and/or by reconceptualizing U.S. urban dynamics from a global perspective. Particularly welcome are theoretical and empirical works that examine housing inequality, “ghettos,” immigration, citizenship, and the marginalization and racialization of space.

OPEN SESSION: The Social and Cultural Construction of Places
Co-Organizers: - Robin Bartram - Japonica Brown-Saracino - Ryan Centner - Jeffrey Nathaniel Parker

While the emergence of Big Data and the persistence of urban inequality demand sociologists attend to quantifiable aspects of urban spaces, there is still a great deal that can only be understood with careful attention to social and cultural processes as they occur on the ground. We invite papers that address the formation, articulation, and contestation of social and/or cultural constructions of places, as well as methodological issues in how social scientists conceptualize the places we study. This could include, though is not limited to, research on how cities construct visions for themselves in the form of plans and broad identity discourses, and how these matter for cities as social places that are inherently uneven in terms of power and influence. We welcome papers that employ both top-down and bottom-up perspectives, as well as efforts to apprehend the interactions between these as they take shape in the adoption of or resistance to visions, plans, and processes of social construction. Building on a long line of research on the role of symbols and culture in urban theory as well as sociological research on the politics of urban boosterism and brand-
ing, this panel explores social and cultural construction as an object of research in itself, as well as in terms of its influence on how we come to know something—or we come to think we know something—about places, neighborhoods, and cities. In the tradition of Firey and Suttles, as well as Lefebvre and Zukin, we ask how the city is both socially and culturally produced.

**OPEN SESSION:**
Sociological Perspectives on the Affordable Housing Crisis
Co-Organizers: - Jacob William Faber, Brian J. McCabe- Eva Rosen

Today, more than 11 million renters pay at least half of their income toward rent. Housing assistance programs, like the Housing Choice Voucher program, have been targeted by federal budget cuts while traditional, place-based public housing developments are being transformed by private development. Rents are rising quickly in American cities as incomes stagnate. Growing housing instability presents unique challenges for low-income renters. For this panel, we invite papers that investigate the causes and consequences of the housing affordability crisis in American cities. In recent years, sociologists have played a larger role in explaining this crisis. Our work explores how low-income households search for housing and navigate state bureaucracies for federal housing vouchers. It tackles the role of the state in providing assistance and the growing importance of non-profit and community-based organizations. Sociologists have wrestled with the effects of unstable housing in urban neighborhoods and the way homeowners often work to keep their neighborhoods segregated. Papers for this panel should broadly deal with the housing crisis, and topics may include the experiences of landlord, tenants or state institutions involved in providing housing assistance, or the broader social policies and structures that limit the production of affordable housing. We invite papers from diverse methodological perspectives, including quantitative analysis of administrative data and ethnographic accounts, as well as case studies from places hit hardest by the challenges of finding safe, decent and affordable housing. We hope that this specific focus on housing affordability contributes to the re-emergence of housing as a central topic of sociological inquiry.

**CUSS ROUNDTABLES**
Co-Organizers: - Antwan Jones - Chandra Ward

**SPECIAL SESSION:**
The Fight for Fair Housing: Causes, Consequences, and Future

**Implications of the 1968 Federal Fair Housing Act**
Organizer: - Gregory Squires - Douglas S. Massey - Lisa Rice - Thomas J Sugrue
Discussant: - Paul Jargowsky

The Federal Fair Housing Act of 1968 was passed at a time of turmoil, conflict, and conflagration in cities across the nation. The Act had a dual mandate: ending discrimination and dismantling the segregated living patterns characterizing most cities. The Fight for Fair Housing, edited by Gregory D. Squires and published in 2018, commemorates the 50th anniversary of this law and tells what happened, why, and what remains to be done. The book brings together the nation’s leading fair housing activists and scholars to tell the stories that led to passage of the Fair Housing Act, its consequences, and the implications of the Act going forward. This session will bring together four contributors to this volume to recount and update their stories. Squires will provide an overview of evolving patterns of discrimination and segregation, and the politics framing past, present, and future fair housing scholarship and activism. Thomas Sugrue will survey the public policies and private practices that generated the activism leading to the 1968 law. Douglas S. Massey will examine the intersection of race and class focusing on the role of zoning in creating and perpetuating segregation. Lisa Rice will describe the dual housing finance market that has provided a critical structural underpinning of segregation. Paul Jargowsky will serve as a discussant and provide recommendations for future research and policy.
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gues that the often high-poverty, high-minority student populations urban public schools serve are written off as “always already hopeless” at the level of local educational policy – long before they set foot on school ground or interact with teachers on site.

Needless to say, moving from a city of 3.7 million to Springfield – population 117,400 according to the city limits sign – was an adjustment. To say that I was positively surprised to be recruited by Southern Illinois University’s School of Medicine (SIU SOM) in what, to me, is a small town in an overwhelmingly rural area is an understatement. Never in a million years did I think my skills and perspectives would be actively sought after in such a small town. In the summer of 2016, I was approached by a faculty member at the School of Medicine to see if I was interested in joining the soon to be launched “Office of Population Science and Policy” (OPSP) – an interdisciplinary research and policy organization dedicated to improving health outcomes – because, as I was told, they had been “looking for someone just like” me: a sociologist with experience in qualitative methods. My experience of working directly with children to elicit their own views and voices in line with the “new” Sociology of Childhood was an added bonus in a team whose leadership comprises two former educators and a pediatrician who had set out to improve children’s health in the School of Medicine’s service region. SIU School of Medicine (SIU SOM) serves 66 mostly rural counties in central and southern Illinois. Like other areas in the rural United States, this region faces various health problems, including cancer disparities, obesity, diabetes, smoking and related health problems, and, of course the recent opioid crisis that has reached an epidemic extent in many communities. In line with the School of Medicine’s mission “to assist the people of central and southern Illinois in meeting their health-care needs through education, patient care, research and service to the community”, the Office of Population Science and Policy (OPSP) was launched in October 2016 to improve the health, development, and wellness of residents through a detailed understanding of the region SIU SOM serves.

This month marks my 6th month at OPSP, where most of my work focuses on exploring how children in rural communities view health and well-being, and, more broadly, helping to tell the stories of rural communities in the context of health and well-being from a holistic perspective. Of course, six months is a very short timeframe, especially in the world of qualitative research. In fact, when I say “exploring”, I should specify that I am in the process of planning to explore, currently waiting for initial review from the IRB, after a lengthy process of a qualitative sociologist familiarizing herself with the “do’s and don’ts” of a medical school’s IRB and vice versa. In addition, given my previous professional focus on education in an urban context, I have much to learn about health in rural communities – from a sociological but also from a medical and healthcare perspective. Nevertheless, my work here at OPSP has surfaced three important challenges of adding a sociological perspective to the way a medical school approaches rural health that I would like to outline in this contribution: 1) conveying the value of qualitative research in a field that continues to be dominated by a quantitative mindset, 2) communicating and translating the sociological way of seeing and doing to medical professionals, and 3) defining and delineating the meaning and boundaries of “community” in the sparsely populated rural areas we serve.

The first challenge that has surfaced in my work at OPSP centers on the often difficult endeavor to explain and justify qualitative research methods and the philoso-
that informs them in a professional context so dominated by quantitative methods. Even though much of medical practice is relational in nature, the medical field continues to be dominated by quantitative methods. Many conversations with medical professionals center on large-scale screening, randomized controlled trials, or evidence-based programs, where “evidence” tends to con-note exclusively quantitative evidence. The possibility that “evidence” can also come in the form of qualitative data, of narratives of success or healing, or that “qualitative” is not synonymous with “unsystematic” can be something of an oddity for practitioners and scholars who have used a quantitative mindset for most of their careers. How can research be meaningful, let alone valid, if it hasn’t been conducted using statistical methods? How can results be relevant if only a handful of children or only one community were studied? Similarly, the idea that not every issue of interest to the medical community is best addressed through large-scale screening or lends itself to randomized controlled trials – even more, that RCTs raise serious ethical concerns, especially in research “testing” interventions designed to improve children’s lives – can be a hard sell in the medical community. Even where an awareness exists of the various factors influencing health outside of people’s bodies – housing, poverty, or social relationships to name just a few – the methods of choice proposed to study and understand such factors are often exclusively quantitative in nature. In the six months that I have been at OPSP, I have explained the rationale and nature of qualitative methods on multiple occasions and probably will continuously need to offer such explanations in the future.

The second challenge that has surfaced centers on the sociological perspective that is often difficult to translate to medical professionals and the field of medicine more generally. Professionally and personally, I consider myself very fortunate that the leadership and other team members here at OPSP understand the need for a comprehensive perspective on people and communities in the context of health and well-being. The expressed consensus at the Office is that knowing which health problems plague the people and communities in our service region (e.g. upper respiratory diseases) and why they are plagued by these problems (e.g. because people smoke) is only part of the picture. In order to understand and actually address these ailments, we also need to know why people do or do not engage in certain health-related behaviors: Why do people make poor health choices? Why do people smoke, drink, eat poorly, and don’t exercise? Why do people, especially in some rural communities, underutilize available prevention tools such as cancer screenings? Or, as one physician summarized his perpetual professional puzzle: “We already told them it’s bad for them – why do they keep doing it anyways?” Particularly this physician’s perspective highlights the need to translate between doctor and patient, between the medical community and the communities entrusted to its care: Are doctors using terms and explanations their patients actually understand or do they rely too much on technical terminology that many of their patients are unfamiliar with and may be reluctant to ask about? On a more complex level, even if patients are hearing the messages their doctors communicate, are they internalizing them in the way intended by their physician? Do they even have the tools and resources to implement what they are “supposed” to do or not do from a health perspective? Based on my limited and unsystematic observations, many physicians do not think about questions such as these – or at least they do not think about them enough. Too many medical professionals too often approach their patients as isolated individuals who present with certain clinical symptoms and not as individuals who are socially, economically, or culturally situated in a complex web of institutions, experiences, and relationships that can make or break someone’s health and well-being. Even those members of the medical community who underline that they “treat the patient, not the disease” often reveal an insufficient awareness of the social situatedness of their patients. The physician’s statement cited above – “We already told them it’s bad for them – why do they keep doing it anyways?” – is a testament to this perspective. In part, I attribute this to the specific training many medical professionals receive or have received that continues to be dominated by a positivistic, deductive “hard” science approach. Of course, there are physicians and other medical professionals out there who emphasize that medicine really is much more of a social, rather than a “natural”, science – precisely because so many factors inside and outside of a patient’s body influence the face and course a disease can take. In addition, the growing awareness of the so-called social determinants of health – the “conditions in the places where people live, learn, work, and play [which can] affect a wide range of health risks and outcomes” – can help draw attention to dimensions of patients’ lives medical professionals long neglected. By and large, however, the medical community continues to be dominated by an input-output model that only Community, p.8
This helps them consider their patients from a different point of view. Finally, the third and largest challenge that has surfaced in the short time since I joined OPSP centers on the definition and meaning of “community” in the rural areas we serve. One of the most important principles at OPSP is to focus on community-identified health problems and community-driven solutions. The goal is to concentrate on community-specific adversities, needs, and resources. What are the specific health risks that most plague a community? What does the community need to address and solve these problems? And what resources are available to do so? OPSP wants to help communities answer these questions and find community-specific solutions always focusing on the communities themselves as experts, not on us as outside professionals. We believe that the key to sustainable change is community buy-in. We treat the communities themselves as experts with invaluable knowledge of their specific problems. As such, we see ourselves much more as facilitators, as a team of professionals seeking to facilitate, not impose, processes that have been identified by members of a community and that are driven by the community itself.

However, before we can help identify, let alone address, community-specific risks, the question to be answered is how to define community in the rural areas we serve and who to ask for their definition. Altogether, only 2.2 million people inhabit the 66 counties in our service region. Of course, each of these counties comprises various small towns with clearly delineated boundaries. But not only are there people who reside in between these boundaries, the boundaries of such towns do not necessarily correspond to the idea of “community” the people themselves have. At a recent conference, for example, I spoke to educators from one of these rural counties in our service region who identified housing and homelessness as a big concern in their school district. They described a scenario in which parents would move between towns in a triangle of three local towns to avoid eviction or rent collection, effecting a school change for their children each time the family moved. What defines “community” for such transient populations? How do the children of these families define “community”? How do children in these rural areas define their communities? Many children are bused in and out of towns away from their homes to attend schools according to their school boundary zones. Is community to them the place they attend school or the place they call home? Do they have multiple concepts of community or does community denote
something much different altogether in their perspective? Similarly, seeking to define the "community" in community-specific also raises the question of how similar – or how different – these communities are. Wanting to facilitate community-initiated and community-driven change can also translate into a need to facilitate a program to mentor pregnant teenagers in one community while facilitating a school-based intervention to reduce suspension rates in another. Also related to the question of what comprises "community" in community-specific is the problem that many health-interventions have been designed in and for urban communities. An after-school program in a local church for example, designed to keep children engaged in healthy activities and relationships, may easily serve dozens or hundreds of children in an urban neighborhood. In rural areas, however, where many miles often separate children from available resources intended to serve them, such a program may fail to reach those it seeks to help. In addition, many grant opportunities – implicitly or explicitly – give preference to programs or initiatives designed to serve large numbers of children (or adults, for that matter). In the context of rural communities, it can be difficult to show that a program serves several hundred children – especially if interventions are supposed to be community-specific.

The Office of Population Science and Policy celebrated its first birthday in early October of this year. Surely, we have much to learn. But we also have much to offer. One of the key ways we seek to respond to this challenge is through a flexible framework that allows us to tailor our facilitating role in health-related interventions to the needs and resources specific to each community. Regarding the challenges of bringing a sociological perspective and a qualitative methodological philosophy to a medical school, I hope that my work and the insights to be gained from my research projects will help translate and bridge the gap between the medical community and the communities it serves. I will certainly need a good dose of humor to navigate the unusual position I occupy. In the meantime, I welcome any insights from those of you who have worked in relevant fields much longer than the short time rural communities and rural health have been on my professional horizon. Please send any feedback to ascheer65@siumed.edu.

ENDNOTES
1. https://www.cdc.gov/socialdeterminants/
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NEWS & NOTES

● Allen Glicksman and Lauren Ring, Philadelphia Corporation for Aging, put together a special issue of the Journal of Housing for the Elderly that was just published in electronic form. The entire issue is devoted to articles that address a new approach to age friendly communities. They suggest, based on a framework proposed by Verena Menec that age friendly efforts should focus on three things – building connectivity among older persons; increasing access to formal programs; and increasing empowerment especially among those older adults who are low income and minority. The article is an analysis of data looking at older adults in Philadelphia stresses the importance of considering how neighborhood environment as well as individual risk factors influences health outcomes for older persons. http://www.tandfonline.com/toc/wjhe20/current?nav=tocList

● Elizabeth Korver-Glenn, University of New Mexico, has a forthcoming article, “Brokering Ties and Inequality: How White Real Estate Agents Recreate Advantage and Exclusion in Urban Housing Markets,” in Social Currents. Korver-Glenn argues that the real estate brokerage industry has long perpetuated overt discrimination against minority housing consumers, but we know little about how it may reproduce inequality through less overt means. In this paper, she highlight real estate agents’ reliance on social networks as key to how this ‘new inequality’ happens. Specifically, she investigates the contextual factors that enable White agents to maintain predominantly White networks and how disparate-impact consequences for minority home buyers and sellers emerge when White agents deploy their networks in ordinary housing situations. Her examination relies on one year of ethnographic research with 10 real estate agents and 49 in-depth interviews with real estate agents, home buyers, and home sellers in the Houston housing market. She begin her analysis by documenting agents’ racially stratified networks. She then unpacks how agent pay structure and status as market gatekeepers supported the persistence of White agents’ White networks and constrained minority agents’ business opportunities. Finally, she shows how White agents’ reliance on White networks came together with other widely-shared practices to negatively affect minority home buyers and sellers, excluding them from for-sale homes and competitive customer service. She concludes by discussing the implications of my findings for mitigating housing market inequality.

● Victoria Reyes, University of California, Riverside, has two new articles forthcoming. In “Port of Call: How Ships Shape Foreign-Local Encounters” Social Forces published online first, October 27, 2017 https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/sox074. The study of foreign-local encounters is at the heart of much of social scientific research, from the dynamics of globalized travel and migration to the study of colonialism and places of foreign control. These interactions are often both shaped by structural inequalities and fleeting. How do organizations shape these interactions? This question of how organizations interact with their environment is a central puzzle that motivates the field of organizational studies. Yet most research assumes that organizations are, or intend to be, permanent. What about transient organizations, those that neither have nor intend to have a permanent presence? How do these types of organizations shape foreign-local interactions? Using qualitative interviews, documents, and ethnographic observations, She argues that Goffman’s work on total institutions is useful for understanding this question in places where transient organizations are self-sustaining. Examining a US military ship and an evangelical mission ship docked at the Subic Bay Freeport Zone, Philippines, she shows how a ship’s total institutional form and logics shape— or affect— foreign-local encounters in three ways, by: (1) generating the geography of the host community, (2) perpetuating stereotypes, and (3) influencing local markets. By shifting scholarly focus from the dynamics of permanent organizations to the intended and unintended consequences of transient total institutions, She reveals how transient actors can have profound effects on social life. Given the proliferation of ships around the world, my findings have broader implications beyond the two she studies. The second article is “Three Models of Transparency in Ethnographic Research: Naming Places, Naming People, and Sharing Data” Ethnography (Special Issue on innovations in ethnographic research), published online first, September-29-2017 10.1177/1466138117733754. Ethnographic research consists of multiple methodological approaches, including short and/or long-term participant observation, interviews, photographs, videos, and group field work, to name a few. Yet, it is commonly practiced as a solitary endeavor and primary data is not often subject to scholarly scrutiny. In this paper, she suggests a model in which to understand the different ways in which ethnographies can be transparent – naming places, naming people, and sharing data — and the varied decisions ethnographers have made with regard to them: whether to name a region, city or specific neighborhood, name pri-
mary participants or public officials, and to share interview guides, transcripts, or different kinds of field notes. In doing so, this paper highlights how decisions regarding transparency are part of an ethnographer’s methodological toolkit, and should be made on a case-by-case basis depending on the who, what, where, when and why of our research.

Joel Stillerman, Grand Valley State University, has published “Housing Pathways, Elective Belonging, and Family Ties in Middle Class Chileans’ Housing Choices.” Poetics. 61 (April): 67-78. The article argues that much research on culture and stratification focuses on cultural consumption, but this article examines housing to understand social reproduction. Research on housing choice often uses rational actor models. In contrast, scholars combining the “housing pathways” concept with Bourdieu’s framework demonstrate that states shape housing markets, and families deploy different forms of capital to access housing. Additionally, scholars use the concept of “elective belonging” to understand middle class housing tastes. This analysis of 68 interviews with 77 middle class adults in Santiago, Chile finds that middle class families’ differential access to family wealth and subsidies sorts them into distinct market niches. High cultural capital families alternatively choose neighborhoods to display aesthetic taste, accumulate social capital, or reproduce cultural capital through schools. Some patterns reflect elective belonging while others illustrate traditional inheritance strategies. Extended family is an important source of housing wealth and a key influence on middle class Chileans’ housing decisions.

Sharon Zukin, Philip Kasinitz, and Xiangming Chen editors of Global Cities, Local Streets, the transnational research on gentrification, migration, and “everyday diversity” on local shopping streets in six global cities around the world and published by Routledge in paperback in 2016, is circulating through East Asia, with a new Korean translation published in Seoul by the Korean Research Institute for Human Settlement joining the Chinese translation published in Shanghai by Tongji University Press. Commercial gentrification and social integration of recent immigrants and refugees continue to be significant issues in many, if not most, cities, as Zukin has discovered when speaking about the book at a conference in Paris ("Changement urbain, commerce urbain") and a lecture at KTH architecture school in Stockholm, and Xiangming has confirmed when speaking at book launchings in Shanghai and Shenzhen. Please check out the videos on the book’s website, http://globalcitiesll

City & Community Call for Papers:
Special Issue on Community and Crime
Guest editor: Rachael A. Woldoff, West Virginia University

Urban and community sociologists have long studied the subject of crime and disorder, but the subject of crime is often viewed as a separate specialization area. In fact, urban sociologists’ insistence that “context matters” is especially relevant to the subject of crime right now. In the past few years, current events and social media coverage of them have drawn much attention to the fact that poor and nonwhite places are disproportionately affected by violence, crime, and disorder, as well as by aggressive, and sometimes, deadly policing practices. This special issue seeks to unite the urban, community, and crime scholars by calling for original papers that either empirically examine or conceptually extend the crucial connections between community and crime.

Some examples of topics that could explicitly link community context and crime include:
- Police use of excessive force
- Re-entry of inmates
- Social capital and crime
- How residents cope with crime
- Cultural values or norms regarding crime and disorder
- Residential mobility and crime
- Neighborhood preferences and crime
- Racial/ethnic aspects of community life and crime

All papers will be subject to normal blind review by at least two reviewers. Publication decisions will be made by City & Community editor, Professor Lance Freeman in consultation with Professor Rachael A. Woldoff, the guest editor.

Deadline for submission: January 9, 2018

Papers submitted to City & Community. To submit the paper, go to the journal’s website (http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/10.1111/(ISSN)1473-6320) and follow the regular submission guidelines. Please note in the submission letter that the manuscript is submitted for the planned special issue.

For further information, please contact the guest editor, Rachael A. Woldoff at Rachael.woldoff@mail.wvu.edu.
NEW BOOKS


Jean Beaman Purdue University

While portrayals of immigrants and their descendants in France and throughout Europe often center on burning cars and radical Islam, Citizen Outsider: Children of North African Immigrants in France paints a different picture. Through fieldwork and interviews in Paris and its banlieues, Jean Beaman examines middle-class and upwardly mobile children of Maghreb, or North African immigrants. By showing how these individuals are denied cultural citizenship because of their North African origin, she puts to rest the notion of a French exceptionalism regarding cultural difference, race, and ethnicity and further centers race and ethnicity as crucial for understanding marginalization in French society.


Gregory D. Squires, ed. George Washington University

The Federal Fair Housing Act of 1968 was passed at a time of turmoil, conflict, and often conflation in cities across the nation. It took the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. to finally secure passage. While the Kerner Commission warned in 1968 that “to continue present policies is to make permanent the division of our country into two societies; one largely Negro and poor, located in the central cities; the other, predominantly white and affluent, located in the suburbs and outlying areas” the Fair Housing Act was passed with a dual mandate, to end discrimination and to dismantle the segregated living patterns that characterized most cities. The Fight for Fair Housing tells us what happened, why, and what remains to be done.

In subsequent decades the causes and consequences of housing discrimination and segregation have been glaringly revealed. At the same time, significant progress has been made. The Fight for Fair Housing brings together the nation’s leading fair housing activists and scholars (many of whom are in both camps) to tell the stories that led to the passage of the Fair Housing Act, its consequences, and the implications of the Act going forward. Everyone concerned with the future of our cities, race and ethnic relations in all communities, surging economic inequality and the many other schisms that are dividing us, will better understand why, and what can be done if we so choose.


India is the largest producer and consumer of feature films in the world, far outstripping Hollywood in the number of movies released and tickets sold every year. Cinema quite simply dominates Indian popular culture, and has for many decades exerted an influence that extends from clothing trends to music tastes to everyday conversations, which are peppered with dialogue quotes.

With House Full, Lakshmi Srinivas takes readers deep into the moviegoing experience in India, showing us what it’s actually like to line up for a hot ticket and see a movie in a jam-packed theater with more than a thousand seats. Building her account on countless trips to the cinema and hundreds of hours of conversation with film audiences, fans, and industry insiders, Srinivas brings the moviegoing experience to life, revealing a kind of audience that, far from passively consuming the images on the screen, is actively engaged with them. People talk, shout, whistle, cheer; others sing along, mimic, or dance; at times audiences even bring some of the ritual practices of Hindu worship into the cinema, propitiating the stars onscreen with incense and camphor. The picture Srinivas paints of Indian filmgoing is immersive, fascinating, and deeply empathetic. House Full: Indian Cinema and the Active Audience. 2016. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
giving us an unprecedented understanding of the audience’s lived experience—an aspect of Indian film studies that has been largely overlooked.


Ernesto Castañeda, ed.

American University

Immigration and Categorical Inequality explains the general processes of migration, the categorization of newcomers in urban areas as racial or ethnic others, and the mechanisms that perpetuate inequality among groups. Inspired by the pioneering work of Charles Tilly on chain migration, transnational communities, trust networks, and categorical inequality, renowned migration scholars apply Tilly’s theoretical concepts using empirical data gathered in different historical periods and geographical areas ranging from New York to Tokyo and from Barcelona to Nepal. The contributors of this volume demonstrate the ways in which social boundary mechanisms produce relational processes of durable categorical inequality. This understanding is an important step to stop treating differences between certain groups as natural and unchangeable. This volume will be valuable for scholars, students, and the public in general interested in understanding the periodic rise of nativism in the United States and elsewhere.


Tricia C. Bruce, Maryville College

The Catholic Church stands at the forefront of an emergent majority-minority America. Parish and Place tells the story of how America’s largest religion is responding at the local level to unprecedented cultural, racial, linguistic, ideological, and political diversification. Specifically, it explores bishops’ use of personal parishes – parishes formally established not on the basis of territory, but purpose. Today’s personal parishes serve an array of Catholics drawn together by shared identities and preferences, rather than shared neighborhoods. They allow Catholic leaders to act upon the perceived need for named, specialist organizations alongside the more common territorial parish that serves all in its midst.

Parish and Place documents the American Catholic Church’s movement away from “national” parishes and towards personal parishes as a renewed organizational form. Tricia Bruce uses in-depth interviews and national survey data to examine the rise and rationale behind new parishes for the Traditional Latin Mass, for Vietnamese Catholics, for tourists, and more. Featuring insights from bishops, priests, and diocesan leaders throughout the United States, this book offers a rare view of institutional decision making from the top. Parish and Place demonstrates structural responses to diversity, exploring just how far fragmentation can go before it challenges unity.


Mario L. Small

Harvard University

Someone To Talk To examines how people use their networks to cope with loss, victimization, failure, and other debilitating stressors. An important part of this process is deciding whom to turn to for support, and both network analysis and common sense would suggest that people will turn to their strong ties, their close friends and family. Someone To Talk To probes this idea based on repeated in-depth interviews with graduate students coping with stress, self-doubt, failure, health problems, and poverty. Shifting attention from what people say about themselves to what they have actually done, Small finds that people are far more likely to confide in weak ties than typically believed. And they are more reticent about turning to strong ones than network theory has suggested. Testing his propositions Books, p. 14
Most CUSS events at ASA 2018 are scheduled for Tuesday, August 14.


Joan Maya Mazelis
Rutgers University-Camden

Surviving Poverty carefully examines the experiences of people living below the poverty level, looking in particular at the tension between social isolation and social ties among the poor. Joan Maya Mazelis draws on in-depth interviews with poor people in Philadelphia to explore how they survive, and the benefits they gain by being connected to one another. Half of the study participants are members of the Kensington Welfare Rights Union, a distinctive organization that brings poor people together in the struggle to survive. The mutually supportive relationships members create, which last for years, even decades, contrast dramatically with the experiences of participants without such affiliation. In interviews, participants discuss their struggles and hardships, and their responses highlight the importance of cultivating relationships among people living in poverty. Surviving Poverty documents the ways in which social ties become beneficial and sustainable, allowing members to share their skills and resources and providing those living in similar situations a space to unite and speak collectively to the growing and deepening poverty in the United States. The study concludes that productive, sustainable ties between poor people have an enduring and valuable impact. Grounding her study in current debates about the importance of alleviating poverty, Mazelis proposes new modes of improving the lives of the poor. Surviving Poverty is invested in both structural and social change and demonstrates the power support services can have to foster relationships and build sustainable social ties for those living in poverty. https://nyupress.org/books/9781479870080/


NEW DISSERTATION

Learning obsolescence: Urban school discipline in the making and management of illiberal subjects

-Anne Scheer
Freie Universität Berlin, Germany/Southern Illinois University School of Medicine, Office of Population Science and Policy (OPSP)

Advisors:
-Harald Wenzel, Markus Kienscherf, Lauren Silver:

This dissertation explores the extra-pedagogical function of school discipline as an instrument for the management of the urban poor. Drawing on a qualitative analysis of disciplinary policies at a large urban school district in the Midwest and how these are put into practice at one elementary school, she argues that the district has abdicated its responsibility for the moral and social education of its students. In theory and practice, discipline has been stripped of its educative purposes and instead serves as a means to sort and prepare this inner-city student population for futures in which they have been constructed as civically and economically obsolete. Against the background of its own history of failure and the decline of the ideal of educability and the broader socioeconomic realities of social insecurity and mass incarceration, the district constructs its high-poverty, high-minority student population as always already hopeless. The punitive ideology of the second Bush Administration’s No Child Left Behind legislation gives rise to an amalgamation of morality and performance in which the district seeks to meet the law’s demands by “cracking down” on the state of its students. In so doing, it offers important insights into the disciplinary character of the district and the city. In so doing, it offers important insights into the disciplinary character of the district and the city.

NEW BOOKS from page 14

Jessica M. Barron
Frontline Solutions, Inc.

Rhys H. Williams
Loyola University, Chicago

The Urban Church
Imagined explores the role of race and consumer culture in attracting urban congregants to an evangelical church and illuminates the dynamics surrounding white urban evangelical congregations’ approaches to organizational vitality and diversifying membership. Many evangelical churches are moving to urban, downtown areas to build their congregations and attract younger, millennial members. The urban environment fosters two expectations. First, a deep familiarity and reverence for popular consumer culture, and second, the presence of racial diversity. Church leaders use these ideas when they imagine what a “city church” should look like, but they must balance that with what it actually takes to make this happen. In part, racial diversity is seen as key to urban churches presenting themselves as “in touch” and “authentic.” Yet, in an effort to seduce religious consumers, church leaders often and inadvertently end up reproducing racial and economic inequality, an unexpected contradiction to their goal of inclusivity.

Barron and Williams explore the cultural contours of one such church in downtown Chicago. They show that church leaders and congregants’ understandings of the connections between race, consumer culture, and the city is a motivating factor for many members who value interracial interactions as a part of their worship experience. But these explorations often unintentionally exclude members along racial and classed lines. Indeed, religious organizations’ efforts to engage urban environments and foster integrated congregations produce complex and dynamic relationships between their racially diverse memberships and the cultivation of a safe haven in which white, middle-class leaders can feel as though they are being a positive force in the fight for religious vitality and racial diversity.

The book adds to the growing constellation of studies on urban religious organizations, as well as emerging scholarship on intersectionality and congregational characteristics in American religious life. In so doing, it offers important insights into racially diverse congregations in urban areas, a growing trend among evangelical churches. This work is an important case study on the challenges faced by modern churches and urban institutions in general. https://nyupress.org/books/9781479887101/
portune time to reflect critically on ongoing forms of urban marginalization and political upheaval; how these are lived, felt, and experienced in the U.S. and beyond; and how to apply multiple methods to the multi-layered reality of our object of study.

In a time of both embattled and battling cities, I look forward to our section joining together and engaging in these critical discussions, and feel fortunate to have the opportunity to serve as chair. Please don’t hesitate to contact me this coming year if you would like to get more involved in CUSS, or have any thoughts on future directions for our section and field.
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