Letter From The Chair

Dear Section Members:

We have a very full newsletter this month, filled with book reviews, announcements and essays. This is a strong indication of the vibrancy of our section and the importance of the topics of peace, war, and social conflict. I hope you will take the time to read through this newsletter closely but I also want to draw attention to a couple critical issues.

First, in the next couple months you will be receiving ballots for our section elections. I want to thank all the candidates for their willingness to run and I would like to express my gratitude to Patrick Coy and David Segal for their diligent work on the nominations committee. The ballots will give you short biographical blurbs on each candidate but you will also find brief statements from them in this newsletter. We hope this gives you some insight into the experiences and interests that led them to get involved in our section.

Second, we are launching an exciting new project. As many of you know, last year we were fortunate to receive an anonymous donation for two student scholarships that covered the cost of ASA membership and the Peace, War and Social Conflict section fees. Our donor has generously renewed these funds again this year. These scholarships are to honor the memory of Sergio de Vieira de Mello and his 21 United Nations co-workers who were the victims of the bombing attack on the UN mission in Baghdad in August 2003. The council has decided to establish a mini-endowment to create a permanent basis for these memorial scholarships. We believe it powerfully expresses what the section stands for and helps young scholars pursue the goals that the 22 UN workers embraced – an end to the brutality of war, a systematic engagement in peacekeeping, and a reduction of social conflict through diplomacy and reconciliation.

Our membership committee will soon begin asking you to consider making a donation to this fund. We also invite you to act now by sending a check to our esteemed Secretary-Treasurer, John Crist. All checks should be payable to ASA Peace, War, and Social Conflict Section, with a note indicating that this is for the UN Memorial Scholarship fund. Please send the checks to John at the following address: United States Institute for Peace, 1200 17th St. NW, Washington D.C. 20036. We also need your help in encouraging graduate students to apply for these memberships. If you have students who would like to join ASA and our...
section, please have them send their curriculum vita and a personal statement about their research interests on the topics of peace, war and social conflict to: Lynne Woehrle, Chair of the PWSC Membership Committee, Mount Mary College, 2900 N. Menomonee River Parkway, Milwaukee, WI 53222. Applications and inquiries can also be sent electronically to woehrlel@mtmary.edu; please type PWSC Award in the subject line of all email messages. The application deadline is June 15, 2005.

I am also delighted to inform you that we have an interesting set of papers lined up for our section’s panels and roundtables at the ASA annual meeting in Philadelphia. The summer newsletter will give you more information about section activities and presentations.

Best wishes to all of you as we head into the final weeks of the spring semester. I look forward to seeing you in Philadelphia!

Sharon Erickson Nepstad

How America Goes to War: Ethical Reasoning in Editorials Debating an Attack on Iraq

By Doug Porpora, Head, Department of Culture and Communication, Drexel University

After September 11, 2001, President George W. Bush cast the war on terrorism in language known as moral dualism. Moral dualism is Manichean language in which the US represents the good against foes who are not simply opposed to US national interests but categorically evil. Such moral dualism resonates with America's founding myth that the US uniquely champions freedom and democracy in the world so as to be, like a new Israel, a light unto nations.

Moral dualism also resonates with the American public because of what has been called American exceptionalism. In contrast with other advanced, industrialized nations, the US population remains deeply religious. Ninety-five percent of Americans believe in God, and 85% identify as Christian. Even today, some 40% of Americans attend religious services twice a month or more. In 2002, however, the nation that is a light unto nations struck the first blow against another, sovereign nation. Although the decision to attack Iraq was an executive order, the use of force was authorized by Congress and ultimately by the American public.

As it considered an attack on Iraq, did the nation that is a light unto nations deliberate morally or only prudentially (i.e., in terms of its own, national self-interest)? This question is complex, encompassing the presidency, Congress, the media, and the general public. One site of deliberation is newspaper editorials and opinion pieces (hereafter referred to collectively as editorials). Between August and October 2002, the prospective attack on Iraq was widely debated in the op-ed pages of American newspapers. This period was pivotal. August 2002 was when the Bush administration began its campaign for war, and October when Congress authorized the administration to use force if necessary against Iraq.

In an effort to examine how America reasons morally about war, I, together with a colleague in communications, have been examining the moral reasoning displayed in 500 editorials written during this period in 19 newspapers and news magazines from across the political spectrum -- including both religious and secular publications. Although we are still in the process of coding all the data, we can report some provisional findings.

Our major finding is the hegemony of political realism, especially in the elite press -- the NY Times, Washington Post, Christian Science Monitor, Time and Newsweek. Political realism is the doctrine, fashioned after World War II, according to which morality has no place in matters of foreign policy, particularly war. Henry Kissinger is perhaps the most emblematic figure in this tradition. In war, political realists believe, enough hatred is inspired without invoking a moral overlay of good and evil. Instead, it is better to understand that wars are never about cosmic good and evil but only about competing national interests.

The language of moral dualism invoked by Bush and the neoconservatives is an explicit rejection of political realism. In contrast, political realism dominates editorial opinion. In her own study of editorials written in the NY Times between October 2002 and March 2003, Valerie Funk (2003) found that moral arguments were made by only about 13% of opinion pieces. Another 7% utilized legal arguments.

We have not yet fully coded the more than a hundred editorials from the NY Times written during the time period of our study, but already our sense of our data is that there are comparably few moral and legal arguments. What we can offer now are some statistics from a broader perspective. For purposes of establishing inter-rater reliability, we have co-coded a random sample of fifty of our five hundred editorials (with 80% agreement on moral type). In this sample, again from 19 newspapers and news magazines spanning the political spectrum, 5% made arguments that were exclusively moral or legal (which we considered a species of moral argument) while another 15% made arguments that were equally both moral and prudential. Eighteen percent (18%) of the pieces made arguments that were either morally indistinct or unspecified. The arguments in 59% of the pieces were exclusively -- or ultimately -- prudential.

We speak of arguments being ultimately if not exclusively prudential because of a fascinating subcategory of argument that shows up 11% of the
time, a subcategory in which morality is ultimately subordinated to prudence. It is as if the hegemony of political realism is so strong, especially in the elite press, that even moral points need to be couched or framed as considerations of prudence. Examples include suggestions that aggression or violations of international law should be avoided not ultimately because such acts are wrong in themselves but because they will yield negative consequences for US national interests. If it is not realism that promotes such framing, perhaps it is the writers' lack confidence that moral appeals alone are sufficiently persuasive in the nation that is a moral light unto nations.

Although the hegemony of prudence over morality continues across the political spectrum, morality does somewhat resurface away from the elite press. In fact, there seemingly exists across the political spectrum something of a series of moral sub-communities, which differ not just in their position on war but more fundamentally in the moral frameworks they adopt to arrive at those positions. For example, in the Christian press -- both left and right, debate on the war was amply discussed in terms of just war theory. In the liberal Tikkun, the one Jewish periodical examined, high moral principle was likewise a distinguishing feature of debate.

On the secular left -- The Nation and The American Prospect, arguments tended to be legalistic or communitarian. The latter made appeal to the moral kind of nation we are or, within the community of nations, the kind of superpower we should aspire to be.

Moral dualism and moral idealism (i.e., the call to spread freedom and democracy) surface on the secular right -- the National Review, the Weekly Standard, and the Wall Street Journal. Here, the United States was depicted, sometimes explicitly, as the global Leviathan, uniquely responsible for world order. As George Lakoff (2003) suggests, the secular right seems partial to an authoritarian ethic of resolve, force, and power. Even on the secular right, however, arguments tended more toward pure utilitarianism.

The most troubling aspect of all these findings is the meagerness of specifically moral debate on war, especially in the pages of the elite press. It is one thing to separate politics from faith. It is another to separate politics from morality. If we separate our talk of war from morality, it cannot surprise us when we end up with wars that are less than moral. The problem is compounded because when moral discourse is ceded, it is ceded to the loudest moral voice. So far, the loudest moral voice has been the voice on the right of moral dualism.


Peace, War, and Social Conflict Section Awards

Robin Williams Distinguished Career Award
This award honors an individual with an outstanding scholarly career in the study of peace, war, genocide, military institutions, or social conflict and/or important contributions to teaching these subjects, or outstanding service to the ASA section on Peace, War, and Social Conflict. Send all inquiries and letters of nomination (including a copy of the nominee’s curriculum vita) to Sharon Erickson Nepstad, Chair of the Robin Williams Distinguished Career Award Committee, Duquesne University, Department of Sociology, 600 Forbes Avenue, Pittsburgh, PA 15282 or by email to nepstad@duq.edu. The nomination deadline has been extended to April 30, 2005.

Elise M. Boulding Student Paper Award
The Peace, War, and Social Conflict section invites undergraduate and graduate students to submit a paper on any topic related to the sociology of peace, war, military institutions, or social conflict for the 2005 Elise M. Boulding Student Paper Award competition. The first place award for both undergraduate and graduate student papers is $150.00 each toward the cost of travel to the 2005 annual meeting of the American Sociological Association in Philadelphia.

AWARDS: Two awards are offered: one for the best paper by a graduate student (masters or doctoral level) and one for the best paper written by an undergraduate. Winners are expected but not required to be present in Philadelphia to present their papers. All submitters will be notified by June 1, 2005 on the status of their submission. ELIGIBILITY: The contest is open to any student or former student (within two years) with a high quality paper dealing with the sociology of peace, war, military institutions, or social conflict. Papers can be multi-authored. SPECIFICATIONS: Papers must have been written within the past two years. They must be typed, double-spaced with a 12-point font. The page limit is 25 pages including tables, references, and illustrations. Each submission should include a separate cover page listing the name of author(s), contact information (including mailing address, telephone number, and email address), paper title, and whether the paper was written as an undergraduate or graduate student paper.

DEADLINE: Students should send five copies of their papers and a cover letter (including names,
affiliations, and contact information) by April 30, 2005 to: Juanita Firestone, Chair of the Elise M. Boulding Student Paper Award Committee, University of Texas-San Antonio, Department of Sociology, 6900 N Loop 1604 W, San Antonio, TX 78249.

Book Reviews


By Ken Cunningham, Assistant Professor of Sociology, Penn State University Harrisburg

Perhaps unwittingly anticipating the postmodern fashion in academia, the military, militarism and war have been somewhat “de-centered” within sociology for quite a long time. As sociologist Martin Shaw noted more than a dozen years ago:

Central though the experience of war and war-preparation has been to society in the twentieth century, it has been determinedly marginalized in our intellectual culture. Sociology’s neglect has been remarked whenever its writers have finally brought themselves round to the subject.

Following 9/11, there has been a substantial and very necessary expansion in the past few years of excellent works on war-making, militarism, imperialism and US foreign policy by David Harvey, Michael Mann, Chalmers Johnson, Richard Clarke, Carl Boggs and many others, but these works have tended to give short shrift to examination of the US military itself; its complex organization, recruiting, training, rules, system of justice, and so forth.

America’s Military Today: The Challenge of Militarism, by Tod Ensign, is a very thorough, well-researched and useful new book explaining the various important component parts of how the US military operates today. It is an excellent resource for scholars (in sociology, peace studies, political science and related areas,) as well as for people in the military and for young people considering military service. The author has more than three decades of experience as an attorney specializing on the US military and as the director of Citizen Soldier, a nonprofit GI rights advocacy group established during the Vietnam War. The book has several chapters and sections of chapters by Ensign, as well as several chapters by other contributors who are specialists in particular areas of study.

The first chapter gives a very informative account of the increasingly well-funded, sophisticated and professionalized system of military advertising and recruiting. The military is currently spending about $3 billion annually on recruiting, trying to attract new recruits with college aid, job training, adventure, patriotism and more. The chapter on training is equally enlightening and would be particularly useful for young people (and their family members) considering military service.

Chapters on Women and Minorities and Gays in the military provide good overviews of key issues, policies, problems and concerns; and are augmented by the highly informative chapter on the quite elaborate system of military justice. There is an important chapter entitled “Voices from Iraq: Letters from GIs and Family Members,” which brings to life the struggles, hopes, dreams and fears of soldiers serving in Iraq and their family members. It is a good and necessary antidote to the often distorted and distancing discourse of “official” commentary and “briefings.”

Other chapters address: the major problems of toxic exposure in the military, including coverage of depleted uranium, Gulf War Illnesses and significant concern with the various military vaccination programs; the expanding use of the US military within US national borders; and an illuminating and very salient review of the debates around the all-volunteer-force and possible reinstatement of the Draft. The book concludes with a chapter on some of the major technological changes transforming the US military and “the Art of Killing in the 21st Century.”

Though an excellent resource on the military itself, the book would have been strengthened by more analysis connecting it with the literature noted above on the trends in US foreign policy, militarism and imperialism. The Preface of the book touches briefly on some of these broader contextual issues, but they are under-developed in the body of the text. However, given the narrower focus, the book functions very well in complement to the other, broader literature, which sometimes lacks sufficient detail, factual information and data, particularly regarding the US military. This text will be very useful to scholars in a wide range of fields, and may be a good text (or selected chapters) for courses in peace studies, military sociology and the like. It will also be invaluable to young people (and their families) considering military service, and to many current service members.

By Mary Jo Deegan, Professor, University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Scott H. Bennett documents the history of the War Resisters League (WRL) from its founding in 1915 until the first stages of the United States' growing involvement in Vietnam had emerged by 1963. Bennett documents in considerable detail the persons involved in the WRL and their various positions in the organizations. He discusses various chronological issues and the WRL responses to them during times of war and peace. Bennett asserts that this is "radical pacifism" and reflects a radical pacifist stance throughout these decades. Additionally, it represents a nonreligious or secular pacifism which historically was the least accepted form of pacifism, especially during wartime.

Starting with the resistance to World War I, continuing through the years before the "good war" of World War II, and the pacifist positions during the latter war, the WRL focused on the "resistance" to war. A growing interest in Gandhian strategies to confront violence during the 1940s led to a struggle within the WRL to define the mission and strategies of the organization. The question confronting the group was: Should the group resist not only war but also the many conditions associated with it which lead to its social legitimation?

The major officers of the WRL represented a "traditionalist" position with a narrow focus on protesting against war and state violence versus the more broadly defined, multiple focus which was associated also with Gandhian principles of nonviolence. In a telling passage Bennett writes:

Beginning in 1955, the peace movement experienced a renaissance during which nonviolent activism became broad-based and Gandhian techniques of resistance and protest were popularized and Americanized (p. 204).

Thus a clear support of Gandhian nonviolence in America within the WRL did not emerge until 1955 and this story is told in the last topical chapter of the book (following by a brief "Epilogue"). Various leaders in the WRL, such as A. J. Muste and Bayard Rustin, fought against the conditions of war during the 1940s and employed Gandhian principles, but the WRL did not officially adopt their positions.

I often found the book tedious to read and the arguments were confusing to follow. Bennett's text moves between eras and as a result the chronology is not straightforward. The biographies, moreover, are detailed but not well-integrated into the text. The strategies of Gandhian nonviolence, and Satyagraha's spiritual force, are not discussed by Bennett.

The often wishy-washy WRL seems hard to defend at times as a form of "radical pacifism." For example, the WRL "failed to organize a militant campaign against the Korean War" (p. 191) and "The WRL was too marginal to influence the Cold War" (p. 203). Repeatedly, pacifists stood up against the U.S. war machine, but they did so with the alliance and support of other groups while the WRL issued statements that it might support this or that issue or person, but the organization did not support a general program pledging its membership to such an alliance, actions, or protests.


By G. John Ikenberry, Book Reviewer, Foreign Affairs

Optimism is unfashionable. Nevertheless, this analysis suggests that the world will grow more peaceful and prosperous as the future unfolds. More individuals will lead better lives and violence will be increasingly unprofitable. Skills in promoting conflict resolution and cooperation, and in utilizing diverse human talents, will yield ever greater benefits. The advent of such a world may, of course, be hastened or retarded by what is done now.

This relatively cheerful outlook is based on several long-term worldwide trends. People everywhere are now expecting and demanding greater material and nonmaterial benefits than ever before. These benefits, including security, respect and good health, as well as better food, elaborate entertainments and
modern conveniences, are provided by thousands of increasingly specialized groups, associations and agencies, many of which require the cooperation of people with diverse skills who come from different countries and cultures. To satisfy these expanding human aspirations, a world society that can draw on the resources of many different societies is developing.

Whether in one society or in the world as a whole, efficient networks of groups serving human needs cannot be constructed unless increasing cooperation among very diverse people is possible. Also, the efficiency of these groups and even their existence often require an environment where the emergence and testing of new ideas is encouraged, free and open communication channels exist, and people can get a good education and develop their unique abilities. Hence, the long-term trends favoring peace and democracy, as well as a world society.

Part One of this book describes the structure and operation of social groups that enable people to satisfy most of their wants and needs, and explains why democracies usually provide a more favorable environment for building and operating such groups than traditional or authoritarian societies can provide. It also emphasizes that successful groups must be able to adapt to environmental change. Part Two suggests actions that might be taken by individuals, governments and educators, among others, to hasten the arrival of a more democratic, peaceful and prosperous world.

Things Might Go Right may interest not only those concerned with the expansion of peace, freedom and prosperity, but also readers wishing to improve the operation of social groups to which they belong, whether families, businesses, sporting clubs, or circles of friends. This non-technical discussion may also help students considering further study in the social sciences to appreciate the importance and fascination of social organization.

Publication Announcements


Patrick G. Coy (Kent State University) and Timothy Hedeen (Kennesaw State University) were awarded a $15,000 grant in December, 2004 from the Hewlett Foundation's Knowledge Gaps program for their 18 month-long research project, “Assessing the State of Undergraduate Conflict Resolution Education.”


Amitai Etzioni. “From Empire to Community: A New Approach to International Relations” (Palgrave, 2004). For more information, please visit http://www2.gwu.edu/~ccps/empire.html.


Forthcoming Publications

Allyn & Bacon is about to publish a new anthology by William M. Evan called War and Peace in an Age of Terrorism.
Candidate Biographies/Statements

Chair

John Crist
I am currently the Peace, War and Social Conflict section Secretary-Treasurer and I previously served as a council member (1999-2002) and the chair of the nominations committee (2001-2002). I am a program officer in the United States Institute of Peace’s Jennings Randolph Fellowship Program and have taught courses in sociology, peace studies, conflict management, and research methods at the School of Advanced International Studies at Johns Hopkins University, Syracuse University, the Peace Studies Program at Colgate University, and the department of Sociology at the Catholic University of America. I have published articles on social movements, nonviolent action, and the policing of demonstrations. As a fellow of the Albert Einstein Institution (1990-1993), I conducted extensive archival research in England and India on the politics of nonviolent mobilization during the Gandhian anti-colonial struggle in India.

Lee A. Smithey
Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology & Anthropology Peace and Conflict Studies, 500 College Avenue, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, PA 19081

I serve as the chair of the Peace and Conflict Studies program at Swarthmore College where I am also appointed in the college’s Department of Sociology and Anthropology. Swarthmore is a secular institution that nonetheless cherishes its Quaker roots and houses the Friends Historical Library and the world's largest archival collection of peace movement and peace studies documents and artifacts. (We just recently secured the papers of Dr. Gene Sharp and the Albert Einstein Institute!). Not surprisingly, I have the privilege of working with faculty and students who, in their various disciplines, earnestly seek to understand human conflict, develop effective nonviolent methods, and pursue just outcomes. You can read more about our program and the Peace Network Forum panel series that we have been co-sponsoring by visiting www.swarthmore.edu/socsci/peace

My research interests include social conflict and social movements, especially identity conflict and the use of nonviolent methods. Much of my work has focused on conflict in Northern Ireland, addressing issues such as conflict transformation and the strategic "choreography" of parading disputes. Other interests have included the role of nonviolent social movements in the fall of the Soviet Bloc and transformative mediation.

When I first became active in the section a decade ago and created the section's website, I recall being favorably impressed with how potentially productive it was for peace studies sociologists and military sociologists to share the section. Our collaboration seems more relevant today than ever in a global context of preventive war and transformation within the military. I have appreciated the opportunity to work with many of you as one of the section's media editors and as a council member. I look forward to more of the same in years to come.

Council

Joyce A. Apsel
Both my personal and professional life have been concerned with issues of war and peace for the last decades. I finally started my own small non-profit called RightsWork in which I do in class workshops for teachers and students (elementary through university) teaching about issue of human rights. I am this semester teaching at La Pietra, NYU in Florence and am doing a series of human rights workshops here for students in English as well as teachers. My courses include emphasis on issues of war and peace and social justice issues. Some of my students have gone on to be teachers, writers, worked in non-governmental organizations, and this seems to me one of the most meaningful aspects of teaching about human rights.

Ken Cunningham
I have been a member of the PWSC Section for several years and a member of the ASA for about 10 years and I have always been surprised and frustrated by the relative neglect of peace, war and social conflict by the discipline of sociology. It is difficult for me to imagine any set of issues more central to sociology – to the human condition and human wellbeing – and more urgent in the current historical juncture. And I believe it is not enough to leave this terrain to other fields, such as international relations, because sociology has very distinctive and important foci, insights, concepts, theories and methods to contribute. My research interests are in examining the intersections between ideology, political culture and peace, war and social conflict.
I have published scholarly articles in the past few years on the critical theory of U.S. foreign policy and the resurgence of militarism since 9/11. As an undergraduate in the mid-1980s I became active in the Central America solidarity movement, and worked in several non-profit social change groups for many years. These experiences cemented my interests in social change, social movements, social justice, and the roles of ideology and culture in these. I am currently an assistant professor of sociology at Penn State Harrisburg, associate director of the Center for Community Action and Research, and director of the service learning program. I am in the process of writing an article re-assessing activism around the Three Mile Island nuclear accident after 25 years.

Yuko Kurashina
I am a Ph.D. candidate in sociology at the University of Maryland, College Park where I am also a graduate research fellow at the Center for Research on Military Organizations. I have recently published articles on military sociology in Japan and the impact of peacekeeping participation on the professional identities of the Japan self defense personnel.

Steve Trainor
(Ph.D. University of Maryland, 2004) Assistant Professor and Leadership Section Head, Department of Leadership, Ethics and Law U.S. Naval Academy Annapolis, MD

In the course of my graduate studies, I developed an interest in understanding the relationship between organizational socialization and values, which led to my dissertation research on the effects of organizational socialization at the Naval Academy on the job values and career orientations of midshipmen. Other areas of interest to me include the relationship between leadership and group cohesiveness in the field of group dynamics and understanding the relationship between attitudes about equal opportunity in the military and propensity to pursue a military career. At present I teach the freshman and junior core leadership courses at USNA, but I will teach an elective on Armed Forces and Society for the Fall semester 2005.

I have served for 21 years as an active duty naval officer and before attending grad school at Maryland I was a Navy helicopter pilot for 16 years. I became interested in the field of Peace, War, and Social Conflict as a result of a mentor's conversation about the need for sociology in the curriculum of the Naval Academy. I am married and have three teenage sons.

Meeting Announcements

The International Sociological Association (ISA) Conference will be held in Durban, South Africa from July 23 to July 29, 2006. It is not too early to consider presenting papers at this World Congress. Here is the information about one session.

Research Committee 1: "Conflict Resolution for Building and Sustaining Peace"

(Organizers: Professor Proshanto Nandi, USA, (p.nandi@insightbb.com), and Dr. Alemayhu Kumsa, Czech Republic. Session proposed by Bandana Purkayastha).

This session will showcase papers on contemporary forms of conflict resolution, especially those that highlight ways of building and sustaining peace. Papers will include theoretical discussions on diverse understandings of security and resolution of conflict, human rights and conflict resolution, as well as empirical work on diverse ways of building peace within and between societies.

Please contact Bandana Purkayastha bandanapurkayastha@uconn.edu, or Professor Proshanto Nandi, USA, (p.nandi@insightbb.com), for further information on this session. Consult the ISA website for information on membership, registration, conference details:

http://www.ucm.es/info/isa

Section Listservs

Section Announcement Listserv:
Please send your announcements to any of the following officers and they can post your announcement to the listserv: Chair, Chair-Elect, Secretary-Treasurer, Immediate Past Chair. Announcements are automatically sent to all section members via email.

Section Discussion Listserv:
To join the section discussion listserv you need to do the following:
1. In the address field type in majordomo@listserv.asanet.org; leave subject field blank
2. In text of the message type subscribe peace_war
3 Make sure there is nothing else in the message (no signature)
4. Send the message. You will receive confirmation, and an authorization key with which to confirm that you really want to join the list. Once you reply positively to that you will get a welcome message.
Join the Section on Peace, War and Social Conflict, or Renew Your Membership

If you are a member of the ASA, now is the time to consider showing your support for the work of the Section on Peace, War and Social Conflict by joining the section or renewing your membership. To do either online, you can go to https://www.e-noah.net/ASA/Login.asp.

If you are not already a member of the American Sociological Association, and would like to join the Association and the Section, you can do so online by going to https://www.e-noah.net/ASA/Profile/General.asp?S=1.

Any questions you might have regarding membership in the Association or the Section can be addressed to membership@asanet.org; or you can telephone the ASA at 202-383-9005, ext. 389.