CALL FOR NOMINATIONS
Do you know someone who would make a good leader on the Peace & War Section Council? Send nominations to Amy Hubbard (Dept. of Sociology and Anthropology, Virginia Commonwealth University; 312 North Shafer St.; Richmond, VA 23284-2040).

ELISE M. BOULDING STUDENT AWARD
The Student Award honors Elise M. Boulding for her contributions to the sociology of peace an war. Undergraduate and graduate students may submit papers related to the sociology of peace and war. Papers must have been written within the past two years, typed, double spaced (25 pages maximum), and must adhere to ASR or other academic format guidelines. Submission deadline is in the spring. Send 5 copies by April 1, 1997 to: Lynn Woehrle (Dept. of Sociology, Syracuse University; Syracuse, NY 13244).

DISTINGUISHED CAREER AWARD
This award honors a career of substantial achievement in scholarship, service, or teaching in the area of war and peace. Send nominations to Jenny Turpin (Dept. of Sociology, University of San Francisco; 2130 Fulton St.; San Francisco, CA 94117-1080).

WEB PAGE HELP NEEDED
The ASA Web Page can be found at http://www.asanet.org. If anyone is interested in helping to construct a Peace and War Section Web Page, please contact Jenny Turpin.

LOOKING FORWARD TO TORONTO
The deadline for submissions for the 1997 meeting is January 10. Details, p. 2.
UPDATE: TORONTO

**Paper submission deadline is January 10! Send your paper to the most appropriate organizer. For submission requirements, see FOOTNOTES or the ASA Web page.**

The Toronto meeting promises to be a stimulating one. A number of co-sponsored panels should help foster dialogue between ours and other ASA sections. Members are encouraged to submit relevant papers for possible inclusion in the following sessions.

▲ "Women and War," (Cosponsored session with the Section on Sex and Gender) Organizers: Lynne Woehrl & Mady Segal. Contact Lynne Woehrl, Dept. of Sociology; Syracuse University; Syracuse, NY 13244; lwoehrl@mailbox.syr.edu.

▲ "Hate Crimes, Terrorism, and State-organized Violence" (Co-sponsored with Section on Law, Crime, and Deviance) Organizers: William Chambliss, The George Washington University; and Jenny Turpin, Dept. of Sociology; University of San Francisco; 2130 Fulton St.; San Francisco, CA 94117-1080; turpinj@usfca.edu.

▲ "Are Peace and War on the Sociological Agenda?" Organizers: Kai Erikson, Department of Sociology; Yale University; New Haven, CT 06520; Jenny Turpin, Dept. of Sociology; University of San Francisco; 2130 Fulton St.; San Francisco, CA 94117-1080; turpinj@usfca.edu.

▲ Roundtable Session "Contemporary issues in Peace and War" Organizer: Laura Miller (Harvard) and Morten Ender, Department of Sociology; University of North Dakota; Grand Forks, ND 58202-7136; ender@prairie.nodak.edu.

▲ Papers related to peace & war that do not clearly fit in any of these sessions can be sent to Jenny Turpin, Dept. of Sociology; University of San Francisco; 2130 Fulton St.; San Francisco, CA 94117-1080; turpinj@usfca.edu.

Name Change for Peace & War Section? John MacDougall, Chair, Name Change? Task Force

At the 1996 ASA meetings, the section on Peace and War decided to consider changing the name of our section. We need your input on whether and how to change our section's name to better meet our needs. What follows are my views on why and how to change our section's name. These aren't necessarily the views of the larger task force.

**The Problems:** 1) Our membership has for several years hovered around 200, the minimum acceptable to the ASA secretariat. Hence a constant feeling (at least in my bones) of impending doom for our section. In addition, the ASA Committee on Sections is considering raising the minimum section size to 250, which would of course exacerbate our crisis. 2) An additional problem is what I see as a relative lack of interaction between our members and important constituencies who are potential new members.

**My Proposed Solutions:** 1) Change our name to the Section on Peace, War and Violence or Peace, War and Conflict. I believe, however, that the term "violence" is preferable because while studying conflicts is an essential part of our work, violence is the more salient topic that makes our section unique. 2) Actively encourage new members whose main/important interests include violence, particularly at the micro/meso rather than international/global levels.

**Rationales** May I assume that violence, its forms, causes, and social constructions is a concern we all share --- as a research, policy, and teaching issue? In addition, I believe there are important connections between variables at the macro and the micro/meso levels, and recruiting new micro/meso-oriented members would enrich our section.

**Our Section's Current and Potential Constituencies:** Currently, my impression is the main areas of interest to section members are: 1) military institutions, 2) international conflicts and their resolution, 3) national level peacemaking (including political economy and peace
Name Change? (Continued)

movements); 4) nonviolence. We don't, I think, but should have many members whose main interests are 5) micro/meso level conflict resolution and 6) micro/meso conflicts in specific settings. Regarding constituency #6, these settings are very diverse--families, communities, genders, racial/ethnic groups, ages, religious institutions, etc. This looks like a large and exciting group of potential section members!

Task force members may be contacting you directly for your views on this matter. We also urge section members to consider the points raised here and to submit responses and name suggestions to task force members by e-mailing ASA_NAME@VMA.CC.ND.EDU (Your message will be forwarded to all task force members. If you prefer to use snail mail address to: John MacDougall, Sociology Dept. South Campus, University of Massachusetts, Lowell, MA 01854). Please respond by January 1, 1997.

I imagine that, whatever our disagreements about ideology, theoretical approaches, etc., we share a deep concern with the horrors of violence, be it in battlefields, communities, workplaces, homes, or wherever. given this, I believe we must do our best to reconsider who we are and who are our potential members. □

Peace...piece by piece

This fall witnessed the opening for signature of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. This historic event follows decades of peace work by countless individuals. Of course, much work remains to be done if the dangers posed by nuclear weapons are to be overcome. But we should take note of this significant achievement and make a point of informing our students about this treaty and the struggle that went into its realization.

Cultures of Conflict and of Resolution: A Review of John Paul Lederach's Preparing for Peace: Conflict Transformation Across Cultures (Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1995). John T. Crist, Program Officer, U.S. Institute of Peace. Editor's note: The opinions expressed in this review are those of the author alone and should not be construed as positions of the U.S. Institute of Peace.

When John Paul Lederach criticizes North American conflict resolution (NACR) techniques, people listen to what he has to say because he knows what he is talking about. Lederach has led scores of CR workshops in settings inside and outside North America, and he has become the most visible practitioner and theoretician of such events among those who conduct them. Specialists in conflict resolution among non-U.S. populations are a relatively small sub-set of the burgeoning conflict resolution movement in the U.S., so he enjoys a rare authority to critique the work of the two communities he straddles. As director of Eastern Mennonite University's Master's Program in Conflict Analysis and Transformation, one of a handful of such professional training programs, he shapes the agenda for a generation of future practitioners. And for anyone who has ever endured the specialized jargon and awkward role plays that characterize more than a few conflict resolution workshops, a book that begins by referring to skills-training exercises as the "packaging, presentation and selling of social knowledge" (p. 6) is more than a little appealing.

In Preparing for Peace: Conflict Transformation Across Cultures, Lederach sets out to demonstrate (and does so successfully) that what he calls "North American" techniques of conflict resolution (NACR) training are substantially confounding and ineffective when applied in settings outside their culture of origin. His critique emerged from his own experience employing the standard CR workshop technique--skills training through role plays--in mediation workshops for church leaders in
advocating one method or another. The workshop leader is more like a facilitator than an expert in this conception, or more like an ethnomethodologist than a survey researcher. He or she directs participants to come up with their own solutions to a conflict, based upon their best understanding of what means are locally available to them. Solutions, or at least strategies, are tested in the field by intervention with the parties involved, rather than in the artificial role plays employed in prescriptive approaches, and then reviewed by the group and facilitator soon after.

The relationship between conflict resolution training to the culture of those being trained is central to Lederach's understanding of effective training. Culture makes a difference in conflict transformation or resolution for very practical reasons. It influences "how participants see the role of third parties and conflictants; the pace, purpose and style of communication; and the purpose of the resolution process" (p. 66), among other things. This is not a difficult premise to accept. The problem here, though, is that the discussion of culture is less than satisfying. At various points throughout the text, conflict resolution culture is considered to be contiguous with citizenship when comparing styles across countries; with ethnic identity when examining conflict resolution in multi-cultural groups; and even with state residency (see the reference to "cultural assumptions common to a Virginia setting" on page 66). A more precise specification of culture and its origins is necessary in order to understand how and when training is appropriate to local culture. How does a trainer know when two people or groups subscribe to divergent cultures of conflict resolution? How does one know when their differences are significant or irrelevant to the impact of training?

Lederach's basic premise is that North American conflict resolution training is not appropriate outside North America because it is generally not sensitive to cultural variations in how conflict is understood and how resolution may be achieved. Without an argument to the contrary, this premise implies that conflict resolution training is appropriate for North American audiences because it has been developed from the "culture" of North
Perhaps for reasons of professional diplomacy, Lederach never takes his criticism of NACR to the next obvious conclusion--if the rigidity of the prescriptive approach undermines its effectiveness in "cultures" outside North America, what about "cultures" inside North America? Surely there is sub-national variation in the components of conflict resolution culture specified by Lederach, not just on individual items, but in entire cultural packages. There are presumably more than a few conflict resolution cultures in Canada, Mexico and the U.S., enough that any single approach (especially the prescriptive approach as outlined) would be hard pressed to accommodate them. In other words, there is a more serious critique of conflict resolution training embedded in Lederach's argument than the essay lets on.

... if the rigidity of the prescriptive approach undermines its effectiveness in "cultures" outside North America, what about "cultures" inside North America?

Curiously, Lederach never claims that the elicitive approach is more effective at resolving or transforming conflicts than the prescriptive approach. Rather, he argues that the elicitive approach is far better at making participants more cognizant of their cultural assumptions, and thus more likely to employ or innovate upon the means of resolution already available to them. His argument is very convincing along these lines. But I'm not convinced that process goals are a better measure of effectiveness than outcomes (pp. 21-22) in any training exercise, conflict resolution or otherwise, and there isn't much evidence gathered to make a judgement either way. Which approach is more effective at settling disputes? More importantly, why should we assume that raising the awareness of participants in a conflict is any more likely to lead to resolution than formally training them? Particularly in social conflicts, there is no reason to assume, a priori, that "indigenous" solutions are any better than external imports. Often it is the very embeddedness of conflictants in their situation that prevents them from envisioning peaceful alternatives.

In Lederach's conception there is little room for expertise, other than that which is created (through trial and error) by the participants themselves. Consequently, however one defines culture, there is no knowledge about conflict resolution that is transferable from one culture to another, even from one group to another. Though he allows that the accumulated knowledge of a workshop leader can be "an enormous resource for training" (p. 121), it isn't clear how that is exactly, as the trainer in his conception should refrain from judgements about how conflict should be resolved and focus only on making explicit the accumulated knowledge of participants. Similarly, resolution depends upon the unique circumstances of each "conflict in situ" (pp. 110-11), which taken to its extreme would disallow generalization even among multiple groups within the same culture fighting over similar issues.

Throughout his essay, there is an implicit argument against the notion of objective social conflict, that which arises from structural antagonisms and competition between groups and roles--an implication that is bound to rankle the sensibilities of a good number of sociologists. "[C]onflict does not just happen, it is created" (p. 41)--Lederach's model of the origins of conflict is built upon the disjunctures that occur between conflictants' expression, perception and interpretation of the behavior of others in the conflict (p. 42). If conflict is not systemic, then its resolution cannot be systematic. I suspect that Lederach does not personally subscribe to such an extreme, random view of social conflict, but the model does not leave much room for an alternative conception.

Thus we find a profound intellectual disagreement between the extremes of Lederach's prescriptive-elicitive continuum, so profound that it suggests a dichotomy, not a continuum, as the best description of their relationship. The prescriptive approach relies upon the notion that there are identifiable patterns of social conflict which then
allow observers to generalize about the ways in which conflict may be transformed or resolved. Lederach's view of social conflict is very much at odds with this conception and is essentially idiographic, i.e., there are no distinguishable patterns in conflict, only unique circumstances surrounding the ways in which parties come to perceive that they stand in conflict with each other.

Some nuances are inevitably and unfortunately sacrificed in a concise summary like this, and Lederach's book is worth reading for those nuances and for his sober and passionate devotion to helping communities resolve their disputes. Lederach's book puts me in mind of an old saying in the military, "it works in practice, can we get it to work in theory?" In my mind, Lederach's strategy for conflict resolution works better in practice than it does in theory—and outcomes do make a difference. His experiments in conflict resolution are still unfolding, however, and his work undoubtedly will continue to be worthy of attention and to push training toward more effective, creative and humane ends.

Readers are welcome to submit reviews of books that are likely to be of interest to section members. Please contact Jackie Smith with inquiries about possible reviews. (jgsmith@yma.cc.nd.edu).

A Response to the ASA Task Force Report on Genocide/
Politicide/Democide Jack Porter, The Spencer School, Newton Highlands, MA

I'd like to respond to Allen Grimshaw's report in the Summer '96 issue of this newsletter. Allen should be congratulated for his outstanding job in expanding consciousness in our discipline regarding genocide studies in sociology.

As one of the founders of the field -- having taught one of the first courses in the sociology of genocide and edited the first anthology in the field, Genocide and Human Rights in the late 1970s -- I'd like to make a few suggestions and add a few caveats to the Task Force report.

One thing is certain: we need much more discussion and debate on these complex issues. This newsletter is one place where such dialogue can take place. I'll preface my response to Allen's report with some personal background. I was born in Rovno, Ukraine during WWII. I received my Ph.D. from Northwestern University in 1971 under Janet Abu-Lughod, Allen Schnaiberg, Bernie Beck, Charlie Moskos, and Howie Becker. I am also a child of Holocaust survivors; my parents were active in the Jewish resistance. My experiences thus bring important biases to the comments that follow.

Sociology should concentrate on the Holocaust and the phenomenon of genocide; in short in "comparative genocide," but using the Holocaust as a unique touchstone and case history to compare the others. Politicide, democide, and nuclear omicide are secondary issues and often confuse the analysis. In contrast, the term "ethnicide" which describes the destruction of a culture without actual physical genocide, helps clarify dialogue.

The Holocaust is unique in history in bureaucratic and technological scope. There have been mass murders and deaths (native Americans, blacks in the Middle Passage) that have far exceeded the Holocaust in sheer numbers, but none before nor since have duplicated its ferocity, lethality, and sophistication in terms of modernity (a tripartite framework of ideology, technology and bureaucracy).

Sociologists are uncomfortable with unique events. Professor Grimshaw not once mentions the Holocaust in his report. It disappears under the rubric of "genocide, politicide, and democide." Of course, all historical events are unique, but the Holocaust was a "tremendum," one of the defining events of our civilization. Hiroshima was also unique. But because something is unique does not mean that it can not be comparable and generalizable to other genocides. We sociologists, unlike historians, are afraid of unique events such as that seen in the "uniquely unique" Holocaust.

Unlike scholars such as Steven Katz or Daniel Goldhagen, I do not take a strictly exclusivist view
of the Holocaust. Exclusivist scholars feel that the only real genocide was the Holocaust because it was the only state-sponsored genocide that had as its intent the destruction of an entire group of people. In their view, all the other so-called genocides (e.g., against Indians, blacks, witches, homosexuals, Armenians, Cambodians, and Gypsies) lacked an intent to kill every member of the targeted population.

There is a problem of Holocaust denial and Holocaust definitional abuse. Misapplying and abusing the term genocide is very common in sociology. To make everything genocide is to make nothing genocide. Massacres, mass murders, "oppression," nuclear attack are not examples of genocide. To overlook the uniqueness of the Holocaust is also a form of Holocaust denial, though a very subtle form.

To see the Holocaust as just another genocide is to deny its uniqueness and its profound ability to be used as the key case study of our era of universal comparability to other genocides. This is not to downplay other genocides; I do not believe in "comparative suffering." There is simply a need to restrict the use of the term genocide to a relatively small category of events.

With access to material, I believe we can persuade sociologists to teach courses in the Sociology of Genocide or to incorporate units focused on this topic in many of the courses discussed in the report. I have developed a curriculum guide that addresses questions on uniqueness and universality in addition to providing teaching resources and syllabi (The Sociology of Genocide and the Holocaust 1992, ASA Publication).

The key point is not to lock ourselves into rigid frameworks, definitions and parameters. There must be respect for a multi-paradigmatic approach. Mine could be called the "uniqueness-comparability" approach. It sees the Holocaust as unique yet comparable to others. And the term genocide must be used carefully, regardless. Human beings may, each day, find more creative ways to kill each other, but not every killing is a genocide.


Grimshaw's Response

... The newsletter report is not intended either to set an agenda for research on large-scale killings of human beings or to legislate concepts and definitions for such research. The Task Force on Genocide, Politicide and Democide has accepted two, more modest, charges: 1) to raise the awareness of our sociological colleagues about war, genocide, and human rights phenomena in the contemporary world, and 2) help those same colleagues to find ways of incorporating information on [these issues] into their "regular" courses. the report details past activities directed to those ends and hopes for continuing activities of the same sort.

While I am not completely agnostic on the matter, I find in the report no position on the uniqueness (or not) of the Nazi campaign against Jews. one paper in one of our three sessions addressed the uniqueness issue (David Stannard's at the Pacific meetings) and was vigorously discussed; the report also included mention of the 1996 ESS session (in which you participated) organized by Helen Fein which focused on the Holocaust. I should report to you that when we were organizing the sessions several colleagues told me that they saw little profit in continued argument over the uniqueness issue. I must confess that I think there is much to be learned about patterns in large-scale killings which may vary quite considerably in some characteristics.

PEACE! Allen Grimshaw
Recent Publications by Section Members:

Announcements
- The United States Institute of Peace invites applications for the 1997-98 Peace Scholar dissertation fellowship competition of the Jennings Randolph Program for International Peace. Dissertation research from a broad range of disciplines and interdisciplinary fields is eligible. Priority will be given to projects that contribute knowledge relevant to the formulation of policy on international peace and conflict issues. Applications must be received by 15 November 1996. For application form and eligibility requirements, contact U.S. Institute of Peace 202-429-3886; e-mail jrprogram@usip.org.

- Call for Essays: Peace Review, a transnational quarterly, is a multidisciplinary journal that publishes essays in peace studies, broadly defined. Relevant topics include war, violence, human rights, political economy, development, culture and consciousness, the environment and related issues. Upcoming themes/deadlines: "Democracy beyond national boundaries"/April 18, 1997; "Conflict Identities"/July 25; "Third World Perspectives"/October 27. Essays on and off themes should be 2500-3500 words, submitted on IBM or Mac disk to: Robert Elias, Editor, Peace Review; University of San Francisco; 2130 Fulton Street, San Francisco, CA 94117; eliasr@usfca.edu

Newsletter Submissions
Please send any announcements of yours or other relevant publications, resources, book reviews, events, or other information of interest to section members. The next newsletter deadline is January 10. Please submit material by e-mail to jgsmith@vma.cc.nd.edu or on disk to: Jackie Smith; Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies; P.O. Box 639; Notre Dame, IN 46556.

Peace and War Section Membership Application

Return form to: American Sociological Association
1722 N St. NW; Washington, D.C. 20036

Name

Address

Phone

E-mail

☐ I am an ASA member and wish to join the Section on Peace & War. Enclosed is my check for $10 ($7 student)
☐ I am not an ASA member, but I am interested in joining. Please send me information about membership in both the ASA and the Peace & War Section.