

# Peace, War & Social Conflict

## Section of the American Sociological Association

Website: [www.peacewarconflict.org](http://www.peacewarconflict.org)

Issue: March 2006

---

### Section Officers

Chair: **Morten Ender**  
United States Military Academy (2005-2006)  
[morten.ender@usma.edu](mailto:morten.ender@usma.edu)  
Chair-Elect: **Lee Smithey**  
Swarthmore College (2006-2007)  
[lsmithe1@swarthmore.edu](mailto:lsmithe1@swarthmore.edu)  
Past-Chair: **Sharon Erickson Nepstad**  
University of South Maine (2004-2005)  
[snepestad@yahoo.com](mailto:snepstad@yahoo.com)  
Secretary / Treasurer: **John T. Crist**  
United States Institute of Peace (2003-2006)  
[john\\_crist@usip.org](mailto:john_crist@usip.org)

### Committee Chairs

Membership: **Yuko Kurashina**  
University of Maryland, College Park  
[ykurashina@socy.umd.edu](mailto:ykurashina@socy.umd.edu)  
Nominations: **Greg Maney**  
Hofstra University  
[socgmm@hofstra.edu](mailto:socgmm@hofstra.edu)  
Student Awards: **Daniel Egan**  
University of Massachusetts, Lowell  
[Egan.Daniel@uml.edu](mailto:Egan.Daniel@uml.edu)  
Career Award: **Morten Ender**  
United States Military Academy  
[morten.ender@usma.edu](mailto:morten.ender@usma.edu)

### Council Members

**Joyce Apsel**  
New York University (2005-2008)  
[Jaa5@nyu.edu](mailto:Jaa5@nyu.edu)  
**Meredith Gould**  
University of Wisconsin, Parkside (2004-2007)  
[Meridith.Gould@uwp.edu](mailto:Meridith.Gould@uwp.edu)  
**Yuko Kurashina**  
University of Maryland, College Park (2005-2008)  
[ykurashina@socy.umd.edu](mailto:ykurashina@socy.umd.edu)  
**Brigitte Neary**  
University of South Carolina, Upstate (2003-2006)  
[bneary@uscupstate.edu](mailto:bneary@uscupstate.edu)  
**David E. Rohall**  
Western Illinois University (2003-2006)  
[de-rohall@wiu.edu](mailto:de-rohall@wiu.edu)  
**David Segal**  
University of Maryland, College Park (2004-2007)  
[dsegal@socy.umd.edu](mailto:dsegal@socy.umd.edu)

### Media Editors

Newsletter: **Josh Klein**  
Iona College  
[jklein@igc.org](mailto:jklein@igc.org)  
Website: **Amy Hubbard**  
[AmySHubbard@yahoo.com](mailto:AmySHubbard@yahoo.com)

### Letter from the Chair

Dear Section Members:

**Laura Miller** recently sent me a newspaper article titled "Bush steps up pressure on Afghanistan to spare Christian convert" by Richard Sisk in the *New York Daily News*. The article quotes a Wheeling, West Virginia firefighter asking President Bush if he had "...an army of sociologists to plead for the guy in Afghanistan that is going to convert to Christianity." It actually made me think of you folks—an Army of folks around the country reading, writing, researching, advocating, practicing, thinking and teaching about peace, war, the military, violence, and social conflict. I know everyone wouldn't rally around being an "Army of Sociologists" but you know I mean it loosely in the sense of **Ferdinand Tönnies** and Gemeinschaft—a community characterized by the predominance of intimate primary (and secondary) relationships and an emphasis on traditions, consensus, informality, and (intellectual) kinship. As proof, members of the section have been quite busy doing the business of the section.

First, a hearty congratulations to graduate students **Ryan Burgess** (Teachers College, Columbia University) and **Michelle Gawerc** (Boston College) as the **Peace, War and Social Conflict** Section's Graduate Student Fellows. **Ryan** and **Michelle** have demonstrated that they exemplify the goals not only of the **PW&SC** Section, but more importantly, those of the people for whom this award was established. As many of you know, this is the

second year the section has supported Graduate Student Fellowships. The fellowships were created as a result of a generous gift from a Section member who wanted to commemorate those United Nations officials – especially the late High Commissioner of Human Rights, Sergio Viera de Mello – who have lost their lives in the effort to reduce violence. More in-depth bios of **Ryan** and **Michelle** will be forthcoming in the summer issue of the **PW&SC** newsletter. Thanks to the Student Awards committee chaired by **Daniel Egan**, for their stewardship of this award and join me in congratulating **Ryan** and **Michelle**.

Second, note that the Student Awards committee will accept papers until April 15<sup>th</sup> for the **Elise M. Boulding** Undergraduate and Graduate Student Paper Award competition (see more details below).

We also have some outstanding nominations for the **Robin Williams** Career Award. The committee is at work evaluating nomination packages and a winner will be announced in the coming months.

The Nominations Committee, chaired by **Greg Maney**, has slated an outstanding list of candidates for four section positions: Chair (**Louis Hicks** and **Laura Miller**); two Councilpersons: **Pat Coy**, **Mathew Johnson**, **Brigitte Neary** and **Tammy Smith**) and a new Secretary/Treasurer (**John Crist** and **Meredith Kleykamp**). Details are forthcoming on these folks but you need to honor them by voting.

Members of the section are also busy preparing for the coming 101st Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association Meetings in Montreal, Canada, August 11-14. In making your travel plans, our Section Day is on the first day of the meetings this year. We've had a strong pool of papers submitted. Two regular sections sessions 1) *Sociology of the Iraq and Afghanistan Wars*, organized by **Brigitte Neary** and 2) *Global Conflicts and Prospects for Peace* organized by **Meredith Gould**. In addition, we'll have our traditional **PW&SC Roundtables**, organized by **Meredith Kleykamp** and **Louis Hicks**. Other sessions of interest to section members include a session titled *Military* organized by **Peggy McClure** and *Violence* organized by **Robert Peralta**. Section members as well as peace, war, military, and social conflict topics may emerge in other sections of the conference as well—check your programs for updates and we'll keep folks abreast through the listserv and the summer newsletter. Please plan on attending your sessions, your business meeting, and most importantly, your reception. We'll steward the section along and honor our people at these function. Other events are in the works as well—stay tuned.

The section website continues to be updated and managed by **Amy Hubbard**. Visit it at [http://www.peacewarconflict.org/pwsc\\_events\\_at\\_asa\\_2005.htm](http://www.peacewarconflict.org/pwsc_events_at_asa_2005.htm).

I also want to recognize section members who are working with the press and increasing the public's understanding of peace, war, military, and social conflict issues at the intersection of sociology. **Jerry Lembcke**, **Louis Hicks**, and **Patrick Coy** have had OP-ED articles the past year. **David Segal** has been diligently doing numerous press interviews. The ASA granted me permission to reprint a portion of "In the News" from the 2006 February issue of *Footnotes*:

**David R. Segal**, University of Maryland, was quoted in the *Herald-Tribune* on September 25 in an article on marketing the military, in the *Minneapolis Star-Tribune* on October 6, in the *Media General* press on October 7, and in the *Los Angeles Times* on October 14 on military recruiting, in *Salon* magazine on October 10, in the *Rockford Register Star*, in the *Baltimore Sun* on October 24, in the *Globe and Mail* (Canada), and in *Newsday* on October 25, in the *San Francisco Chronicle* on October 26 on responses to Iraq War casualties, in the *Baltimore Sun* on October 23 on the military's zero tolerance policy and on October 30 on geographic and socio-economic bases of military casualties in Iraq, in the *New York Times* on October 30 on evangelical programs to maintain the sexual purity of deployed soldiers, and in the *Herald-Mail* on October 31 on reactions to military recruitment in high schools.

Send your press clipping announcements to be listed in *Footnotes* at: **Johanna Olexy** [ebner@asanet.org]. This type of "press" reflects well on the **PW&SC** section and shows the breadth of the activities of section members and our engagement in peace, war, military, and social conflict matters beyond the classroom, research center, and advocacy groups.

Membership remains an important feature of what we do. You are all recruiters—recruit your students to the section. Contact the membership committee chair **Yuko Kurashina** for all matters related to section membership. At this writing membership is increasing.

Finally, thanks to **Josh Klein** for his continuing work on the **PW&SC** newsletter. This is another rich and full issue. In this issue there are interesting and thoughtful items including essays by **Jackie Smith**, a film review by **Jerry Lembcke**, calls for papers, section member publications, and a host of other announcements.

Thanks for all you do for the section, the discipline and the people you teach, research, and advocate for. I look forward to seeing you on-line and in Montreal.

**Morten Ender**, Section Chair

## **The UN At 60: Ending the Scourge of War will Depend upon ‘We the Peoples of the United Nations’**

By **Jackie Smith** [Published in *Common Sense*, Independent student paper at the University of Notre Dame, November 2005]

On October 24 the United Nations celebrated its 60th anniversary. Most attention to this milestone focused on the major challenges now facing the world body, including issues of representation in the Security Council, the need to address new kinds of security and humanitarian challenges, and the limited capacities for enforcing UN decisions. But there is another vision of history that we should remember at this time, and this story offers more promising ideas for how we might eventually realize a far more effective United Nations than governments have managed thus far.

This history of the UN should start not with the governments and major political figures who dominate conventional accounts of world politics, but rather with the people in whose name these governments and politicians act. It should start with “we the peoples of the United Nations,” whose authority is invoked in the opening lines of the UN Charter, but who have been mostly excluded from meaningful participation in the world body ever since. Even though citizens are denied systematic representation in the United Nations, they have been crucial to helping shape the organization from its inception.

As WWII raged, President Franklin D. Roosevelt began working with key allies to develop a plan for managing the post-war international system. If he was to avoid the earlier failure of U.S. international leadership, he knew he needed to win over a U.S. Congress that had derailed League of Nations by refusing to bring the U.S. on board. To secure legislative support for a new multilateral organization, he involved citizens’ associations in the early planning for the United Nations. Citizens’ groups were included in the U.S. delegation to the UN founding conference in San Francisco in the hopes that this would generate popular pressures on legislators to support the initiative. But involving citizens in political discussions traditionally dominated by states had important influences on the Charter that ultimately emerged from the San Francisco Conference. Most historians see this influence reflected in Article 71 of the Charter, which requires the UN to establish consultative relationships with civil society groups, and in the human rights agenda established for the new organization.

These two provisions have allowed “we the peoples” a foot in the door of what were once highly secretive international meeting rooms where high level government officials bargained over the fate of nations. Citizens’ groups have had to fight hard to keep and in

some ways expand this access, but in doing so they have strengthened the UN in ways most mainstream analyses ignore. Among some key achievements, civil society groups have helped generate new agreements for international cooperation and they have mobilized pressures on governments to enhance their compliance with international agreements.

Looking at the history of the UN, we find behind many of the organization’s key achievements groups of persistent and dedicated citizens working tirelessly to promote change. Throughout history, they have pressed governments to adopt new and different approaches to the challenges arising from the fact that many nations must share a single planet. We now take for granted the idea that slavery is something that no society should allow, that governments engaged in warfare must adhere to some minimal standards of human decency, and that the world’s sea beds are the common inheritance of all people. But without the tireless efforts of a relatively small number of dedicated citizen advocates, governments are unlikely to have agreed to formal sets of rules that limit their possibilities for autonomous action. Time and again, government officials insist that they need freedom from the constraints of international laws and institutions in order to effectively secure their own “national interests.” Indeed, we hear these claims being made rather loudly by the current U.S. Ambassador to the UN, Mr. John Bolton. Nevertheless, over time, most governments have found that it is often in their own interests to accept limitations on their behavior in the form of international prohibitions against slavery, the Geneva Conventions on the Laws of War, the International Law of the Sea Convention, among others.

The influence of citizen activists in global politics has expanded dramatically from these early days, and accordingly we find many recent examples of citizen influence on the evolution of new international agreements. An important example here is the creation of a treaty banning the use of landmines. Few analysts would disagree that without the concerted efforts of citizens’ groups around the world to demand that their governments abandon the use of these indiscriminate weapons, we would not have an international Land Mine Ban today. Indeed, left alone, governments are unlikely to have treated this issue as a priority. But citizens living in countries where landmines had been deployed could not afford to wait for government actions. Thousands of men, women, and children in more than 70 countries were being killed or maimed each year by an estimated 60-70 million landmines. As a result, and despite opposition from the United States, in March of 1999, the Land Mine Ban became the fastest treaty to enter into force. The speed with which the treaty came about demonstrated the extent to which massive citizen pressure can work as an antidote to the glacial pace of many inter-governmental negotiations. The International Campaign to Ban Landmines won the Nobel Peace Prize in 1997 in recognition for its contribution to international peace and security.

Another prominent example of citizen contributions to the development of international law is the International Criminal Court (ICC). The citizen campaign for the ICC emerged in response to a need for new international mechanisms for prosecuting individuals who are accused of the most egregious crimes, including war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide. Many governments—often those lacking democratic legitimacy—found reasons to shield individuals from prosecution for these crimes. An international court would help insure that anyone committing such horrendous crimes would be held accountable to international law. A standing court would also act as a deterrent to those who might commit massive human rights violations, something the existing ad-hoc system could not do. The Convention on the ICC was first passed in 1998, and it went into force in 2002, again setting new speed records in the evolution of international law. Ironically, in the ICC case and in the Land Mine Ban, U.S. citizens played leading roles in mobilizing international citizen pressure to promote a new international agreement that their own government still opposes. U.S. citizens might ask themselves why we find such discrepancies between the actions of citizens' groups and those of our government in the international arena.

A second way that citizen involvement in United Nations processes has shaped the evolution of the global system is by expanding pressures on governments to comply with international norms and standards. Social scientists Margaret Keck and Kathryn Sikkink refer to this as the "boomerang effect," where citizens finding their governments unresponsive to domestic pressures appeal to international allies and institutions to bring pressure from the outside onto their governments. Without such citizen efforts to engage 'boomerangs' in many places around the world, the international human rights system would be very weak indeed. Key international human rights bodies rely upon civil society groups to "name and shame" governments into complying with human rights norms.

This practice was invoked most recently against the U.S. in the Human Rights Committee, the official monitoring body of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The U.S. had failed to submit annual reports on its domestic practices relating to civil and political rights according to its formal obligations under the Covenant. As complaints from citizens' groups mounted against the U.S. government, the Committee specifically invited U.S. civil society groups to submit their own reports directly to the Committee. This eventually prompted the U.S. government to file its delinquent reports so that it could present its own side of the story. We can only hope that these efforts to focus international attention on U.S. intransigence will generate new efforts to remedy the very serious human rights failings of this administration. History abounds with examples of high-minded international agreements signed by governments that have no intention of actually changing their behavior. More recent studies are showing, however, that once governments sign these agreements, their

citizens can find new ways to use these international measures to force those in power to reduce the gaps between their words and their deeds.

Histories tend to be written by society's most powerful actors. That is why studies of world politics emphasize the role of states, and especially of the most militarily and economically powerful states. It also explains why many have used the UN's 60th anniversary to reflect on its many failures. But understanding the evolution of the United Nations, and identifying ways that this world body might overcome some of its most chronic and life-threatening problems requires that we take a bottom-up perspective. The UN should represent "we the peoples" not "we the governments." And governments—especially the most powerful ones—have proved unwilling or incapable when it comes to addressing the urgent crises the world now faces. But looking at just a few cases of the ways "we the people" have sought to shape global politics suggests that popular involvement in world affairs has had some important positive impacts.

So the UN's 60th should be an occasion to honor the work of those visionaries who dared to call on governments to put human rights above their more military-minded notions of national security. And in looking at this people's history of the UN, we should seek lessons from past efforts about how we might more effectively work for a global political order that is truly democratic and responsive to the needs of all the world's people.

### **Creating New Democratic Spaces: The Sixth World Social Forum Meets in Bamako & Caracas**

By **Jackie Smith** [published in *Common Sense* [Independent student paper at the University of Notre Dame, February 2006]

Every January since 1971, the world's corporate and political elites have gathered in Davos, Switzerland (or occasionally in an alternative venue such as New York in 2002) under the auspices of the World Economic Forum. The World Economic Forum is a private interest group that promotes dialogue among business leaders and governments in order to shape the course of the global economy. Over the years an ever-more-impressive list of political leaders have participated in this private event, for which corporate members pay upwards of \$15,000 for the opportunity to schmooze with the global power elite. In recent years, a handful of civil society groups have been invited to help lend some democratic legitimacy to this private and highly influential forum. But for the most part, civil society has been shut out of the process of planning an increasingly powerful global economy.

Civil society groups promoting the rights of workers, the protection of the environment, restrictions on corporate influence, and other social goods have raised their voices in protest against the WEF, arguing that the global economy should be discussed and debated in the open, not in private and non-transparent settings like the WEF. These protesters have been met with severe repression, including the blacklisting of nonviolent activists as “extremists,” mass arrests, police batons, and water cannons (quite dangerous in the sub-freezing temperatures of Davos in January). Activists have responded by forming their own parallel forum to discuss and plan the state of the world, calling their forum the “World Social Forum.”

Following several years of massive transnational protests against the world’s most powerful economic institutions—the World Bank, International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Trade Organization (WTO), and the Group of 8 (G8), a team of Brazilian and French activists launched the first World Social Forum (WSF) in January of 2001. During the late 1990s tens of thousands of protesters gathered wherever the world’s political and economic elite met, calling for greater representation of popular interests, an end to policies that have impoverished the world’s poorest countries and peoples, and in general for more just and equitable economic policies. As the numbers of protesters grew, so did the violence with which governments responded. Governments spent millions and arrested hundreds of nonviolent protesters to insure that their gatherings could take place. Italian police killed a protester at the meeting of the G-8 in Genoa in 2001, dramatizing for Northern activists the brutal repression common against activists in the global South. The size of police mobilizations against these overwhelmingly nonviolent protests was unprecedented in Western democracies, and it signaled the declining legitimacy of the system of economic globalization promoted by the WEF. World Social Forum organizers sought to move beyond a purely defensive strategy of protesting government meetings to create their own space for global deliberation and organizing.

The first WSF met in Porto Alegre Brazil in 2001, with considerable support from Brazil’s Worker’s Party (Partido Trabalhadores or PT). The meeting was an overwhelming success: organizers initially expected a few thousand participants, but more than 15,000 people attended. It inspired what has become known as the World Social Forum process, whereby annual global meetings have been complemented by dozens of regional and hundreds of local variants of the WSF around the world. The second meeting in 2002 attracted more than 60,000, and the following year (also in Porto Alegre) drew at least 100,000. The WSF tested its wings in 2004 by moving the site to Mumbai, India, where a more economically and ethnically diverse collection of more than 100,000 people gathered. The Forum returned to the incubator of Porto Alegre again for its fifth meeting, drawing more than 155,000 registered participants from 135 countries to participate in more than 2500 different

sessions. This year marked the sixth WSF, which was structured as a “polycentric” set of simultaneous meetings in three different cities of the global South: Bamako (Mali) Caracas (Venezuela) and Karachi (Pakistan). The Pakistan meeting had to be postponed due to last year’s earthquake, but the Bamako and Caracas meetings took place as the world’s corporate and governing elites were meeting in Davos.

Despite its limited infrastructures for this kind of world gathering, Bamako drew upwards of 10,000 activists to one of the world’s poorest countries. The Mali gathering aimed to boost participation from African civil society groups in advance of next year’s WSF, which will take place in Nairobi. In previous years, Africans’ participation in the WSF has been limited by the high cost of travel to Brazil or India. But this year hundreds of people from rural areas of Mali and roughly 8,000 people from neighboring African countries gathered around the WSF slogan, “Another World is Possible.” As one reporter observed, kentes and boubous with elaborate head dresses replaced the western-style, slogan-emblazoned t-shirts and caps that were more typical in Porto Alegre. Tom toms replaced Brazilian samba drums at the opening parade of the sixth WSF (Geloo). Africans brought new attention to issues of primary education, rights for women and girls, ongoing violent conflicts in the region, and even the commercialization of sport.

In addition to helping influence the agendas of global civil society, African activists gained new opportunities to network with their international civil society counterparts and to engage in what has become a truly global dialogue about the world’s future. Organizers of the Bamako WSF stressed the importance of the Forum for forging stronger networks between African groups and international activists from Europe and North America. Without coordinated efforts by Northern activists to lobby western governments and support their demands for a more just international political and economic order, Africans on their own can achieve very little. The WSF process aims to nurture and support the transnational networks and solidarity that are essential to addressing the inequalities and violence of the contemporary world order.

In Caracas, Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez welcomed an estimated 70,000-80,000 activists from more than 2200 organizations to the sixth WSF. While the WSF seeks to remain formally independent of political parties and governments, it has depended upon the financial and logistical support of the Brazilian governing party, the PT, and politicians and government officials have participated in forums in various ways. Many Latin American activists attending the forum remain sympathetic with the recently elected leftist governments of the region, and at this WSF in particular, indigenous peoples were buoyed by the rise of one of their own, Evo Morales, to the presidency of Bolivia. This brought a sense that a new kind of politics may indeed be possible, and activists debated how social

movements could support progressive governments while maintaining their independence. Such debates are not new to social movements or to the WSF, but the opportunities the WSF provides to meet regularly and to maintain ongoing international dialogue are. This is what makes the WSF process one of the most important contemporary developments in global politics. It is why participants and analysts repeatedly use the phrase “new politics” to describe the WSF and its multifaceted activities.

WSF organizers see the process as creating “open space” for citizens to consider the impacts of global changes on their local and national experiences at the same time as they cultivate transnational dialogues and networks to enable them to become part of global social movements. In a global system where opportunities for citizen participation are conspicuously absent, the WSF helps address the “democratic deficit” in global institutions. Activists at WSF meetings such as those in Bamako and Caracas help raise issues from local to global agendas, and they generate opportunities for activists to learn how their varied experiences are related to broader global contexts. Events such as the international women's tribunal against free-market patriarchal violence in Caracas, for instance, explored the effects of economic globalization on women around the world. The Caracas forum was organized around six thematic areas—including anti-imperialism (against militarism and “free” trade); the right to resources for life (against climate change and the privatization of water and other vital resources); and communication & democracy—and activists were encouraged to develop programs in specific areas while also exploring connections among them.

The WSF has thus far resisted substantial pressure to launch coordinated programs of action, but it also does not want to be seen as merely a talking shop. A tradition of an annual “assembly of the social movements” has emerged from the process to launch global action agendas such as the global days of action against the war in Iraq and last year's Global Campaign Against Poverty. This year's assembly has called for a week of action against the Iraq war on the anniversary of the U.S. invasion, March 18-27. A civil society conference is planned during that time in Cairo, Egypt by an alliance of 300 organizations and networks representing 900 civil society groups. Also planned are global actions around the right to water to parallel governments' Fourth World Water Forum in March. A campaign to promote the right to public education is set for world students day (November 17), as is a global boycott and education campaign against the union-busting activities of “killer Coke.”

Despite the size, strength, and vitality of the World Social Forum process, mainstream media sources in the United States have given it little serious attention. This alone may be reason to think that the WSF process might indeed make possible another kind of world. This censoring of information about the activities of civil

society actors prevents U.S. citizens from gaining understandings of how the global economy and the policies of the U.S. government affect people around the world. More importantly, it prevents them from seeing the many nonviolent ways that people are seeking to resist U.S. imperialism while promoting a more just and equitable world. This cultivated ignorance fuels the state of fear that justifies the Bush Administration's ongoing “war on terror” and its many human rights abuses. Citizens can move beyond the despair and disempowerment by tuning in to the WSF process. As a global open space, the WSF is a venue for nurturing real democracy. As such it is a threat to the interests of the extremists on both sides of the “global war on terror” who thrive on militarism and war.

One of the most powerful features of the WSF process is that it enables us to think globally while acting locally. This summer, people will gather in Milwaukee for the Midwest Social Forum (<http://www.mwsocialforum.org>). Will we see you there?

Reference:

Geloo, Zarina. “An African Stamp on WSF Opening” *Terra Viva* 19 January 2006. At: [www.ipsterraviva.net/tv/wsf2006](http://www.ipsterraviva.net/tv/wsf2006)

For more information:

<http://www.forumsocialmundial.org.br/>  
<http://www.indymedia.org/or/2006/01/831615.shtml>  
[http://www.choike.org/nuevo\\_eng/informes/1557.html](http://www.choike.org/nuevo_eng/informes/1557.html)

## **Film Review: Jarhead Nation**

“Jarhead Nation” by **Jerry Lembcke\*** is reprinted from *The History News Network* with permission.

Commenting on films nominated for this year's Academy Awards on his February 5, 2006 show, Chris Matthews noted that films are important for what they say about the times in which they are made. For example, *Good Night and Good Luck*, he said, is about the current Bush Administration's attempts to suppress the truth of governmental malfeasance, even though the film is set in the McCarthyite climate of the 1950s. *Munich*, he observed, speaks to our on-going anxiety about national security even though its story is about the Olympic Games of 1972 and the events that followed.

If Matthews' point is that screenwriters can write our present into representations of our past, and by that displacement, create the social and emotional distance we need for a more dispassionate perspective on where we are and where we're going, he could have used another popular film, *Jarhead*, as a contrasting mirror image that represents our present as an extension of our past, but manages to do so in a way that obfuscates more than it illuminates. Although set in Persian Gulf war of

1991 and by implication the current wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, the subtext of *Jarhead* is about the continuing domination of America's Vietnam experience in the nation's present. We see that in the scenes of Marines getting pumped for the Persian Gulf War by watching *Apocalypse Now* and later in Kuwait when they gather to see *Deer Hunter*. As the platoon trudges through the sand toward the Iraqi border, an aircraft passes overhead blasting *The Doors'* song *The End* which prompts a Marine to wonder, "Can't we even have our own music?" Indeed. And since the scene is clearly plagiarized from *Apocalypse Now*, film buffs throughout the theater were adding, ". . . and your own movie too."

Sometimes the medium is the message, and in this case nothing could make clearer than this film that American culture is still in a post-Vietnam phase. Given the power of film to construct new present(s) out of our past(s), *Jarhead* is a disappointing (re)packaging of Vietnam-film subjects—the brutality of boot camp from *Full Metal Jacket*, the Sergeant out of Hamburger Hill with Nietzschean-themed reasons for preferring the warfront to the home front, and *Apocalypse Now* whose influences run right to the jarheads' exhibition of their own primal darkness in their farewell rave to the war. Take the riffs of those three films out of *Jarhead* and there isn't much left.

But what is left is an even more troubling reminder of Vietnam's legacy in American political culture. Like its progenitors, *Jarhead* turns the war into a solipsistic affair about Americans—literally, the only Iraqis we see here are the "crispy critters" left smoldering on the desert floor by the boys with *The Doors*. Oh yeah, and there are the shadowy figures of two Iraqi officers that we see in a guard tower hundreds of meters away just before they're blown to smithereens by an air strike.

For its own finis, *Jarhead* cops one last cliché from the Coppola/Cimino generation, that being the transformation of the war per se into a coming-home story. Almost none of the first 100 Vietnam-war films made prior to 1990 had any discernable account of what the war was about; nor was there a healthy, wholesome veteran of the war portrayed. The historically grounded image of the veteran empowered and politicized by his Vietnam experience was totally AWOL from Hollywood productions, displaced by the strung-out, dysfunctional, and dangerous victim-veteran who brought the war home with him. That wiggled-out stereotype makes a gratuitous reappearance in *Jarhead* as one more cheap-shot at the Vietnam generation of anti-war veterans who continue to work for peace and decent treatment of all veterans.

Political veterans thereby dismissed, we're left with the film's lesson that American wars are all about the Americans we send to fight the wars. It's a lesson that collapses means-and-ends reasoning—support the troops even if you don't support what they're fighting for—and erases the political boundaries around which efficacious debate about the war should be waged—the Right uses the

troops to rally support for the war, the anti-war Left uses the specter of damaged jarheads to oppose the war.

Vietnam-war film reconstructed the war as a coming-home narrative that displaced public memory of the war itself. One of consequences of that revisionism is an American public shorn of the kind of historical perspective that Chris Matthews applauds the Academy for valuing. Unfortunately, *Jarhead*, best-positioned by its subject matter, of all the 2005 films to reinvigorate the political culture, recycles themes and imagery that enervate rather than enliven.

\***Jerry Lembcke** is Associate Professor Sociology at Holy Cross College in Worcester, MA. He wrote about Vietnam-war films in *The Spitting Image: Myth, Memory, and the Legacy of Vietnam*.

### **Peace, War and Social Conflict Section Graduate Student Fellows**

**Michelle Gawerc** (Boston College) and **Ryan Burgess** (Teachers College, Columbia University) have been selected as the 2006 Peace, War and Social Conflict Section Graduate Student Fellows. This award was created as a result of a generous gift from a Section member to commemorate those United Nations officials – especially the late High Commissioner of Human Rights, Sergio Viera de Mello – who have lost their lives in the effort to reduce violence. Michelle's work on people-to-people peace initiatives and Ryan's work on children in conflict areas, as well as their involvement in peace-making activities, reflects the goals not only of the Section but, more importantly, those of the people for whom the award was established.

### **Call for Submissions: 2006 Elise M. Boulding Student Paper Award**

The **Peace, War, and Social Conflict Section** of the American Sociological Association 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 2006 **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 2006 American Sociological Association meeting.

**AWARDS:** Two awards are offered: one for best paper by a graduate student(s) (masters or doctoral level); and one for the best paper written by an undergraduate(s). Award winners are expected but not required to be present at the 2006 ASA meeting to present their papers. All submitters will be notified by June 1, 2006 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, 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 e-mail address), paper title, and whether the paper was written as an undergraduate or graduate student paper. No student identifying information should appear in the body of the manuscript or on any other page. All students will be notified electronically about their submission and about the final selections.

**JUDGING:** The **Elise M. Boulding** Student Paper Award Committee is made-up of 4-5 members of the ASA Section on **Peace, War, and Social Conflict**. The committee encourages papers on a broad range of subjects related to these themes. Papers should reflect a high degree of professionalism, both in their scholarly content and in their clarity of expression.

**DEADLINE:** Students should send five (5) copies of their papers and a cover letter with name, affiliations, and contact information by April 15, 2006 to:

**Daniel Egan**, Chair, **Elise M. Boulding** Student Paper Award Committee, Department of Sociology, University of Massachusetts-Lowell, 850 Broadway Street, Lowell, MA 01854 or [Daniel.Egan@uml.edu](mailto:Daniel.Egan@uml.edu)

### Call for Papers: Research in Social Movements, Conflicts and Change

Research in Social Movements, Conflicts and Change, an annual peer-reviewed volume published by Elsevier Science/JAI Press, encourages submissions for Volumes 26 and 27. Both of these volumes will be non-thematic: submissions appropriate to any of the three broad foci reflected in the series title will be considered.

Research in Social Movements, Conflicts and Change (RSMCC) is a fully peer-reviewed series of original research that has been published annually for over 25 years. We continue to publish the work of many of the leading scholars in social movements, social change, and peace and conflict studies. Although RSMCC enjoys a wide library subscription base for the book versions, all volumes are now published both in book form and also on-line through Elsevier's ScienceDirect program. This will ensure wider distribution and easier access to your scholarship while maintaining the book series at the same time.

To be guaranteed consideration for inclusion in Volume 26, due out in spring 2007, papers must arrive by June

10, 2006. Send submissions to RSMCC editor, **Patrick Coy**, Center for Applied Conflict Management, Kent State University, PO Box 5190, Kent, OH 44242. Send four paper copies, an electronic version, and remove all self-references save for on the title page.

### Section Member Publications

**Ender, Morten G.** (2005). "Military brats: Film representations of children from military families." *Armed Forces & Society*, 32(1):24-43.

**Ender, Morten G.** (2006). "Military brats: Growing Up On the Move," pp. 295-296. In Meg Wilkes Karraker and Janet R. Grochowski (eds.). *Families with Futures: A Survey of Family Studies for the 21st Century* (Mahwah, NJ & London: Lawrence Erlbaum).

**Ender, Morten G.** (2006). "Voices from the backseat: Growing up in military families" In Amy Adler and Carl Castro (Eds.). *Military Life: The Psychology of Serving in Peace and Combat*, Volume 3: The Military Family, pp. 138-166. Westport, CT & London: Praeger Security International.

**Ender, Morten G.** and Ariel Jones. (2005). "Invisible institution: The military, war, and peace in 1990s introductory sociology textbooks." *Journal of Political and Military Sociology*, 33(2):249-266.

**Fenelon, James V.** and **Thomas D. Hall.** (2005). "Indigenous Struggles over Autonomy, Land and Community: Anti-Globalization and Resistance in World Systems Analysis." Pp. 107-122 in Ramón Grosfoguel, Nelson Maldonado-Torres and Jose David Saldívar (eds.) *Latinas in the World-System: Decolonization Struggles in the 21st Century U.S. Empire*, Boulder, CO: Paradigm Press.

**Hall, Thomas D.** and **James V. Fenelon.** (2005). "Indigenous Peoples and Hegemonic Change: Threats to Sovereignty or Opportunities for Resistance?" Pp. 205-225 in Jonathan Friedman and Christopher Chase-Dunn (eds.) *Hegemonic Decline: Present and Past*, Boulder, CO: Paradigm Press.

**Hall, Thomas D.** and **James V. Fenelon.** (2005). "Trajectories of Indigenous Resistance Before and After 9/11." Pp. 95 - 110 in Bruce Podobnik and Thomas Reifer (eds.). *Transforming Globalization: Challenges and Opportunities in the Post 9/11 Era*, Leiden: Brill.

**Hall, Thomas D.** (2006). "Capitalism and Modernity: The Great Debate" by Jack Goody. Book review in *International History Review* 28:1(March, 2006):230-232.

**Hall, Thomas D.** (forthcoming). "Changing National Identities at the Frontier: Texas and New Mexico, 1800-1850" by Andrés Reséndez. Book review in *Pacific Historical Review* 75:2(May, 2006):344-345.

**Maney, Gregory M, Lynne M. Woehrle, and Patrick G. Coy.** (2005). "Harnessing and Challenging Hegemony: The U.S. Peace Movement after 9/11," *Sociological Perspectives*, 38(3).

**Maney, Gregory M.,** Ibtisam Ibrahim, Gareth I. Higgins, and Hanna Herzog. (2006). "The Past's Promise: Lessons from Peace Processes in Northern Ireland and the Middle East." *Journal of Peace Research* 43(2):181-200.

**Purkayastha, B.** (2005). "Through 'Little Steps': Informal Networks as a Resource for Peaceful Conflict Resolution." Pp. 63-79. In C. Caforio and G. Kuemmel (eds.) *Military Missions and their Implications Reconsidered: The Aftermath of September 11th*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: Elsevier Press.

**Rohall, David E., Morten G. Ender,** and Michael D. Matthews (forthcoming). "The effects of military affiliation, sex, and political ideology on attitudes toward the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq." *Armed Forces & Society*.

**Smith, Jackie** and Dawn Wiest. (2005). "The Uneven Geography of Global Civil Society: Explaining Participation in Transnational Social Movement Organizations." *Social Forces*. (December).

**Spencer, Metta.** (2006). *Two Aspirins and a Comedy: How Television Can Enhance Health and Society*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers. Info at <http://twoaspirinsandacomedy.com>.

Woodruff, Todd, **Ryan Kelty,** and **David R. Segal.** (2006). "Propensity to Serve and Motivation to Enlist among American Combat Soldiers." *Armed Forces & Society*, 32(3):353-366.

## Announcements

### Dear Members This Is To Say Thanks & Urge You To Recruit New Members!!

The Present Count of Section Members: 246

As of March 15, 246 members have renewed their membership in ASA & **PW&SC**. Thank you very much for your support!

Yet, we need at least 54 more members in order to continue providing the present level of support for section activities. Membership committee is contacting those who have not renewed their membership this year, but if you know somebody who has not renewed his or her section membership, please urge the person to do so ASAP. We also would like to reach those who share research interests but are not our section members. Please encourage your colleagues, students, and classmates to join our section!

To join and renew ASA and **PW&SC** section memberships, go to the following URL for more information:

<http://asanet.org/page.wv?section=Join+or+Renew&name=Join>

Thank you!

### New International, Interdisciplinary, Bilingual, Online Journal Titled Duh Bosne / Spirit Of Bosnia

The two URLs are <http://www.duhbosne.org> and <http://www.spiritofbosnia.org>. Drawing upon the disciplines of anthropology, literature, philosophy, and sociology, the journal addresses the question of how it is not only necessary but also good to keep a culturally rich and ethnically complex community like Bosnia-Herzegovina whole.

## New Parent

**Lynne Woehrle** is now the proud mother of a baby boy named Thomas Dieter Woehrle Foersterling, born December 24th, 2005. Mom and baby are doing well! ☺

## Events of Interest

### The Patuxent Summer Institute: "Future Roles Of The U.S. Navy"

Sponsored by St. Mary's College of Maryland's Center for the Study of Democracy and The Patuxent Partnership's Center for Strategic Analysis. Monday, June 5, 2006. Opening Reception and Dinner Tuesday, June 6, 2006. Leadership Presentations, SME Panels and Dinner Wednesday, June 7, 2006. Morning Presentations and Lunch Registration fee will include discount pricing for Members of The Patuxent Partnership. Info at: <http://www.smcm.edu/democracy/>

### New "Military Brats" Documentary

A documentary premiered at the ASA Meetings last year is now available. Titled *Brats: Our Journey Home* captures the experiences of growing up military during the Cold War. Narrated and with music by Kris Kristofferson, the film features interviews with scholars and adult children from military families as well as personal film and photographic archives of military children living in the U.S. and abroad. More detailed information available at the film's website:

<http://www.bratsourjourneyhome.com/index.htm>

### International Sociological Conference

Below are details about two sessions **Bandana Purkayastha** (University of Connecticut) and Proshanta Nandi (University of Illinois) co-organized for the forthcoming International Sociological conference in Durban South Africa in July.

Session No 5 "Conflict resolution for Building and Sustaining Peace- I". Chair and Discussant: Proshanta Nandi, University of Illinois at Springfield & Illinois Board of Higher Education.

1. Hugh Harris, University of Illinois at Springfield, USA. Conflict Management in Plural Divided Societies"
2. William Lindeke, University of Namibia , "Politics of Peace and Development in Southern Africa"
3. Robert B. Sipe & Lara Roemer, University of Illinois at Springfield, USA "Conflict Resolution and Peace through Domination-Free Dialogue: New Applications of Habermas and the Social. Political and Economic Pre-conditions for Discursive Dialogue "

4. Habibul Haque Khondker, Zayed University of Abu Dhabi, UAE. "War, Peace and Development: Comparing South Asia with Southeast Asia

5. "Kumsa Alemayehu, Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic. The root causes of Political conflicts in Africa"

6. Iwan Gardono Sudjatmiko. University of Indonesia, West Java, Indonesia "From Peace-Making To Peace-Building (The Case Of Aceh)"

7. Nils Petter Gleditsch. Editor, Journal of Peace Research, Norway, Bethany Lacina, Bruce Russett „The Declining Risk of Death in Battle"

Session No. 11 "Conflict resolution for Building and Sustaining Peace II" Chair and discussant Bandana Purkayastha, Department of Sociology, University of Connecticut, USA

1. Marek Garztecki, Collegium Civitas, Warsaw, Poland. "The Spirit of the Dead—The Lost Cultural Dimension in African Conflict Resolution"

2. Darryn Snell, Monash University, Churchill, Australia, "Restorative Justice and Post-Conflict Reconstruction in the Fiji Islands "

3. Dan Dungaciu, University of Bucharest, Romania "The Role of Civil Society in Prevention and Resolution of Conflict--The Case of the Republic of Moldova"

4. Proshanta Nandi, University of Illinois USA, "Religiosity and Non-Violence: An Uncertain Nexus "

5. Dmitry Pozhidaev, Center for Political and Social Research, Pristina (Kosovo, Serbia and Montenegro), "Beating Swords into Plowshares: The Failure to Demilitarize in Kosovo"

6. Dr Feargal Cochrane, Lancaster University "Transforming ethno-national conflict through the use of 'Soft Power': Irish America's Role in Ending Political Conflict in Northern Ireland."

7. Shallal, Musa. United Arab Emirates University, "Nivasha Comprehensive Peace Agreement: The Dilemma of Sudan."

## **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:

In the address field type in majordomo@listserv.asanet.org; leave subject field blank;

In text of the message type subscribe peace\_war

Make sure there is nothing else in the message (no signature)

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-oah.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.