See You In Los Angeles

Message from the Chair:

Challenges Ahead

As you know from Bill Gamson’s article in the April issue of Footnotes, understanding and preventing genocide is both a theme of the ASA annual meeting and an interdisciplinary initiative, co-chaired by Bill Gamson and Ted Gurr, current president of the International Studies Association. The Peace and War section is challenged to expand an outstanding research, teaching and action agenda already undertaken. For an introduction to that work, see Helen Fein (ed) Genocide Watch (Yale, 1992) and Joyce Feldman-Apsel and Helen Fein (eds) Teaching About Genocide: Critical Essays, Syllabi and Assignments (Ottawa, Ontario: Human Rights Internet, 1992).

Allen Grimshaw’s 1984 report “Teaching War as a Social Problem,” sponsored by the Peace and War Section and distributed through the ASA Teaching Resources Center, helped open the sociology curriculum. He has since added the topic of genocide. I am delighted that Allen has agreed to chair a Peace and War Section task force to develop research and educational material on genocide, politicide, and their prevention. Volunteers from diverse specialties will be needed.

The ASA preliminary program presents an abundance of difficult choices. Our section day is full and our Section Conference on the 3rd and 4th of August (see listings within) demonstrate the breadth of the section and the intellectual challenges it faces.

Before turning over the chair to Kurt Lang, I would like to comment briefly on the section. Like most organizations, the Section seeks to grow in the light of members’ individual achievements. Still, some Section activities are, indeed, collective. The obstacles of geographic dispersion, full and complex schedules, and incompatible technologies were surmounted by the splendid combined

We encourage our members to submit articles on any subject that may be of interest to Section members. Deadline for submission to the next edition of the Newsletter is September, 15, 1994. Send material to Dana Eyre, Department of National Security Affairs, Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA, 93943; (408) 656-2831; or via e-mail to eyre@leland.stanford.edu.
Challenges Ahead  (cont’d from page 1)

work of these members and committees.

Boulding Student Paper Award James Hannon, Greg McLauchlan, David Rier, Mady Segal, chair
Distinguished Career Award Louis Kriesberg, Kurt Lang, Sam Marullo, Saul Mendlovitz, Ruth Searles, chair
Genocide Task Force - Allen Grimshaw
Membership - Jennifer Turpin
Nominations - Juanita Firestone, John Foran, David S. Meyer, Helen Raisz, Martin Patchen, chair
Public Relations Jen Hlavacek
Section Directory Ruth Searles
Section Sessions at Annual Meeting - James Burk, Lester Kurtz
Workshop Arrangements - Marty Gonzales, Hoda Mahmoudi, Ruth Searles, chair
Workshop Program - Joseph Elder, Sam Marullo, David Segal, Lester Kurtz, chair

to a Section activity, contact chair-elect Kurt Lang or other members of Council. Your legible name, address, telephone, and indication of interests/skills will help committee chairs find you. Contact Kurt Lang in any of the following ways:
LANG@MAX.U.WASHINGTON.EDU
FAX 206-543-2516
School of Communications DS-40
University of Washington
Seattle, WA 98195

The Workshop is still open. Please register promptly. Among other things, we need to know how much food to order for the Wednesday reception (with cash bar) and how many reservations to make in nearby restaurants for folks who want to continue conversations over dinner.

In addition to recent books by section members listed elsewhere in this newsletter, the following relate to the workshop:


- Ruth Searles
PATHS TO PEACE WORKSHOP

Partial List of Workshop Panelists and Roundtable Presenters, 8/3 and 8/4/94
Approximate Titles of Presentations

Schedule, Weds & Thurs, 3/4 August:
1-W, 4:00-6:00  2-Th, 8:30-10:15
3-Th, 10:30-12:15  4-Th, 2:00-3:45
5-Th, 4:00-5:45
Plenary (P) or Roundtable (R)

3R Robert Benford, Nebraska. Social Movement Theory & the Study of Peace and War.
2 Randall Collins, California-Riverside. Implications of Geopolitical Theory for Charting the Post-Soviet World Situation.
2 Mary Anna Colwell, California-Berkeley. Needed Research on How Citizens’ Groups Can Influence Foreign Policy.
4P Dana Eyre, Naval Postgraduate School. Cultural Awareness and Negotiating Skill in Peacekeeping.
3R Gordon Fellman, Brandeis. Peace Studies and Activism.
  William A. Gamson, Boston College. The ASA Initiative on Explaining and Preventing Genocide and Politicide.
2 J. William Gibson, California@ State-Long Beach. American Cultural Influences and the Resort to Force.
3R Amy Hubbard, Virginia Commonwealth. Oh Wow, a Bake Sale; Experiential Learning to Teach About Life and Social Movement Theory.
5 Martha K. Huggfus, Union College. State Use of Torture in Latin America.
4 Kenneth Ives, Contrast Between Military and Police Approaches to Peacekeeping and Missing Structures Whose Development Would Enable Transition to the Police Model.
2 Paul Joseph, Tufts. Prospects and Obstacles for Constructing a Progressive Peace Politics.
3P Douglas Kellner, Texas-Austin. Social Change and the Role of the Media.
3R Lester Kurtz, Texas-Austin. The Global Diffusion of Nonviolent Social Movements.
2 Kurt Lang, Washington. The Relationship Between the Media and Government in U.S. Foreign Policy.
4P David Last [invited], Canadian Armed Forces. Peacekeeping Operations.
2 John MacDougall, Massachusetts-Lowell. Building a Demilitarized Economy.
2P Sam Marullo, Georgetown. Constructing a New U.S. Foreign Policy.
2P Nancy Mary, Long Beach Area Citizen Concerned. Economic Conversion.
3R Edward J. McGlynn and Michael B. Johnson, Siena College. Integrating Activism and Academics in the Classroom.
1P Greg McLaughlan, Oregon. Sociology and Foreign Policy: Bridging the Gap with Research that Matters.
5R Patchen Martin, Purdue. Determinants of Hostility Toward Ethnic Outgroups.
5 Thomas J. Scheff, California-Santa Barbara. Causes of War.
1P,4 David R. Segal, Maryland. Military Roles and Perspectives on Peacekeeping and Peacebuilding.
4P Mady W. Segal, Maryland. The Impact of Peacekeeping on Military Families.
3P Jackie Smith, Notre Dame. Transnational Social Movements.
3R Lee Smithy. Texas-Austin. Studying Diffuse Conflicts.
5 Metta Spencer, U. of Toronto. The Ripple Effect in Nonviolent Actions.
3R Michael Webber, University of San Francisco. Challenges to International Social Movements.
5 Denise Elaine William, California-Santa Barbara. Measuring Peacekeeping Effectiveness.

SECTION ON PEACE AND WAR SESSIONS & ROUNDTABLES
SECTION DAY: Friday 5 August
8:30-10:15 Session # 21. Moving Into and Out Of Large Scale Deadly Conflicts. Jim Burk, Dana Eyre, Les Kurtz, Sharon E. Nepstad
8:30-12:15 Tour 1. Simon Wiesenthal Center and Beit Hashoa Museum
12:30-2:15 # 49. Conflict Resolution. James Schellenberg, Joseph Gitler
12:30-2:15 # 60. Political Sociology Refereeed Roundtables. #2 Democratization in South America - Denise Williams. #6 Political Violence and State Repression - Helen Fein.
12:30-1:30 Peace and War Council Meeting
1:30-2:15 Peace and War Business Meeting:
4:30-6:15 Thematic 78. Nonviolence and Democracy. Les Kurtz and Ron Pagnucco
Other sessions relating to genocide:
Saturday:
8:30-10:15 # 104. Teaching the Sociology of Genocide
10:30-12:15 # 115. The Holocaust: Challenges for Sociologists
2:30-4:15 # 154. Repression and Democratic Participation
Sunday
2:30-4:15 # 230 The Resurgence of Xenophobia and Nationalism in Europe

GENOCIDE TASK FORCE
Allen Grimshaw

"In genocide the victimized groups are defined by regimes primarily in terms of their communal characteristics, i.e., ethnicity, religion, or nationality; in politicides groups are victimized primarily because of their political opposition to a regime. More precisely, genocides is the promotion, execution and/or implied consent of sustained policies by governing elites or their agents or, in the case of civil war, one of the contending authorities, that result in the deaths of a substantial portion of a communal and/or politicized communal group." (Barbara Harff)

"Killing groups of people for political reasons has become the primary form of genocide (and mass killing) in our time. There is no reason to believe that the types of psychological and cultural influences differ in political and other group murders.... Genocide means an attempt to exterminate a racial, religious, cultural, or political group, either directly through murder or indirectly by creating conditions that lead to the group's destruction. Mass killing means killing members of a group without the intention to eliminate the whole group or killing large number of people without a precise definition of group membership. In a mass killing the number of people killed is usually smaller than in genocide." (Ervin Staub, The roots of evil: the origins of genocide and other group violence.)

Any sociologist who looks at a newspaper or views television is aware, on at least some level, of the facts of genocide and politicides-members of this Section may perhaps be expected to be more aware than some other sociologists and at least some sectors of the general literate public. Thanks to Bill Gamson's efforts foregrounding of genocide in his program other members of the ASA may have had their awareness of the ethnic and other genocidal slaughter going on in today's world heightened—again on at least some level and at least temporarily. We will see from attendance patterns at the Section's workshops and at the large number of relevant sessions at the meetings
in Los Angeles the extent to which this temporarily heightened awareness generates a concern to learn more about the phenomenon (and perhaps to even address possibilities of solutions). If we and our colleagues do attend more than usual to the problem while we are in Los Angeles, we may ask what sorts of evidence might indicate the beginnings of a movement toward taking the problem truly seriously (I find myself wondering at what point the anti-Vietnam War movement began to gain momentum and when we recognized that fact).

A number of members of our Section (and, more broadly, a number of colleagues across the social sciences and even a few policy folks) have been concerned about different dimensions of and issues arising from, the problem of genocide. Some have been thinking about the issue for some time. Helen Fein has been asking how instances of genocide can be identified and about measuring the phenomenon. Before his death Leo Kuper wrote extensively on the topic. I have for several years been teaching courses on "war and genocide as social problems." Joe Elder has gone to places where genocide is happening or threatening and made efforts to mediate peaceful settlements. Bill Gamson has not only made a frontal attack on ignorance about and indifference to genocide amongst our sociological colleagues; he has gone beyond our disciplinary boundaries and tried to initiate interdisciplinary research and response. Colleagues in other disciplines (and currently also in other countries) including those cited above have been studying these phenomena—a few for many years. Many of us have developed more personal or activist concerns, often focused on specific instances of current or pending policiide or genocide in geographic regions around the globe.

Seeing the moment as ripe, Peace and War Section Chair Ruth Searles has asked me to chair a Section Task Force on Understanding and Preventing Genocide and Politicide. I have agreed to accept what I consider as a very daunting responsibility; I will do my best to validate her selection. The Section Executive has identified several goals for the Task Force including, broadly:

1. integrate the study of genocide and politicide in central concerns of the discipline --
2. improve scholarly understanding of the development, prevention and denial of the phenomena. Include in this effort longitudinal and comparative studies, studies of the role of organizations, and so on;
3. foster popular understanding of the development, consequences, and possible prevention of genocide and politicide through dissemination of findings of both media reports and scholarly studies, support of teaching at all levels and of public information efforts, and support, of organization with similar goals.

In the rest of this note I'll say a bit about some of the things I have thought a Task Force might try to do—and solicit your guidance and suggestions for an agenda and a program.

I have a generally taxonomic perspective in my initial approach to problems. While I am aware that the categories I have in mind are fuzzy and ill-bounded, my sense is that we can profitably think about five or so arenas of possible activity and a similar number of types of activities in which we might become directly or supportively engaged. Arenas where there are things to be done, it seems to me, include (1) the academy (or wherever else we work), (2) the ASA and other professional organizations to which we belong, (3) relations with other professional disciplinary organizations (anthropology, area studies, international studies, journalism, political science) as well as research mounting and research supporting organizations (e.g., the National Research Council, the National Council on Foreign Relations, and the public and private foundations), (4) activist groups (e.g., Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, and organizations focused on specific trouble spots, e.g., Pierre Bordieu's Comité de Soutien aux Intellectuels Algériens, etc.), and (5) society at large (including the media). Among the activities which can be initiated or increased in these several venues are (1) scholarly and applied research or simply becoming informed, (2) teaching classes and providing bibliographic and other support for teaching in secondary schools and in courses not specifically focused on war and genocide, (3) informing the public, (4) generating policy proposals (and lobbying for them?), and (5)
engaging in direct action ranging from contributing (or raising) money, to participating in on-site monitoring of genocide or of agreements to end it), to writing letters and engaging in protest demonstrations. Not all of us are disposed to engage in all of the possible behaviors. If we are not able or don't want to be activists, perhaps we can at least prepare ourselves to respond intelligently to a question about how Frank McCloskey and Lee Hamilton can be on different sides of a vote on abolishing the embargo of arms to Bosnia and simultaneously both be principled and rational.

I can, drawing on Elise Boulding's use of the notion, "image" a world without war. Curiously, however, through all my years of worrying about the nuclear threat and teaching courses about it, I never saw clearly a route to ending it. My sense was that a host of thoughtful people as different as Jonathan Schell and Freeman Dyson were completely successful in depicting the nature of the threat and of possible outcomes of nuclear war—but that none of them had much of anything very persuasive to say when it came to solutions. I have much the same feeling about situations of politicide and genocide, i.e., that there are excellent and perceptive descriptions of the phenomena and quite persuasive explanations of their social structural and social psychological bases—but that nobody has discovered any solutions that seem to be very effective. Responses to state violence have ranged from gentle chiding, to public condemnation, to appeals to international law, to threats of employ of air power, to threats and application of a wide range of economic and other sanctions, to unilateral or regional or multi-national intervention of widely varying duration. As can be seen from recent and continuing events in Brazil, Cambodia, Ethiopia, Haiti, Iraq, Liberia, Nicaragua, the Peoples Republic of China, Rwanda, Somalia, several of the republics of the former Soviet Union, and Yugoslavia (a by no means exhaustive list to which some commentators would add the three countries in North America) the problems are widespread and apparently not very tractable. It is not clear how much comfort we can take from apparent improvements in, e.g., Argentina or Germany or South Africa—unsettling events continue to occur in most world locations.

There will be plenty for a Section Task Force on Understanding and Preventing Genocide and Politicide to do, our problem initially will be to define some sort of limits to our charge. I invite your suggestions about topics, approaches, organization, arenas of action, people (possible participants, possible consultants), bibliography, and whatever. Send me written messages (fax: 812-855-0781, internet: grimsha@indiana.edu, bitnet: grimsha@iubacs [Note: no "w" in email address], Department of Sociology, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN 47405) or talk with me in Los Angeles. If you are interested, ask me to send you copies of recent syllabi for the "war and genocide as social problems" courses.

- Allen D. Grimshaw

**RECENTLY PUBLISHED**


**JOB OPENING**

The Department of Politics at the University of San Francisco invites applications for a tenure-track position, beginning September, 1995, in International Peace Studies/Comparative Politics/Political Theory, subject to budgetary approval. Submit application to, or for further information contact: Professor Robert Elias, Chair, Peace Studies Search Committee, University of San Francisco, 2130 Fulton Street, San Francisco, CA 94117-1080. Application Deadline is October 14, 1995.
A Glimpse of Peace Research at the University of Notre Dame
by Ron Pagnucco and Jackie Smith

The Joan B. Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies at the University of Notre Dame is an interdisciplinary training and research program designed to focus on the problems of war, intergroup violence, human rights violations, environmental degradation, and other impediments to a peaceful and just world order. Its Masters program in peace studies, International Scholars Program, and Visiting Fellows program brings the Institute into contact with a range of international students and researchers who provide important perspectives that shape the work of those at the Kroc Institute. To date the Kroc Institute has hosted 170 international students and fellows. The major research programs of the Kroc Institute often focus in some way on international institutions and their effectiveness. These programs have focused on the role of multilateral economic sanctions in promoting peace; the enforcement of international law; the development of multilateral institutional mechanisms for conflict prevention and amelioration; and on the interactions between transnational social movement organizations and intergovernmental organizations (IGOs).

The Director of Undergraduate Studies, George Lopez, and Visiting Fellow David Cortright are co-directing the project on economic sanctions, which is looking specifically at the use of such sanctions in preventing nuclear proliferation. The project on enforcing international norms is in the developing stage and is a collaborative effort of several Institute scholars, including Institute Fellows Alan Dowty, Graduate Director Robert Johansen and Raimo Väyrynen, the Institute's director. These two projects should make important contributions to understandings of international institutions and the ways in which these influence the behavior of governments. Under the direction of Institute Fellow Gilbert Loescher, the Institute is also developing a research program on humanitarian security which focuses on refugee problems, other population movements and human rights.

Robert Johansen, Raimo Väyrynen and doctoral candidate Richard Conroy have recently received a grant from the U.S. Institute of Peace to study U.N. peacekeeping operations and their effectiveness. This project builds on their separate, ongoing research on various aspects of peacekeeping and multilateral security and is part of a broader project to develop understandings of how international agreements are enforced.

Janie Leatherman is conducting research on "The Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) and the Challenge of Ethnic Conflict," which is supported in part by the U.S. Institute of Peace and the Swedish Institute of International Affairs. Her project examines the work of newly developed CSCE mechanisms for identifying and intervening in emerging ethnic conflicts. With the dramatic proliferation of such intrastate conflicts in the wake of the Cold War, it is essential to understand how international institutions can be effective in diffusing or resolving conflicts before they escalate into violent confrontations. Leatherman's work involves extensive analyses of CSCE institutional innovation...
and organizational development, and it also examines the interface of CSCE conflict resolution mechanisms and citizens' organizations. One hypothesis Leatherman examines is whether nongovernmental actors may help to meet institutional needs and to overcome problems of inadequate information and material resources which have hindered the conflict resolution capacities of intergovernmental institutions.

Peace and War Section members, Ron Pagnucco and Jackie Smith have focused on transnational social movements and organizations (TSMOs) and their role in global political processes. In April, 1994 they organized with Janie Leatherman a Social Science Research Council–sponsored workshop which examined the ways in which TSMOs work within intergovernmental organizations to promote peace, human rights, environmental protection and other values. Pagnucco and Smith are also working with George Lopez to develop a project which includes a survey of transnational human rights organizations. The survey should help to identify the activities and structures of these organizations as well as their perceptions about how the newly established United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights can best further global human rights goals. A major aim of the project is to develop understandings of what enhances human rights organizations' effectiveness and how United Nations' and other IGO structures can be adapted to meet human rights needs. These two projects are among the few that seriously attempt to integrate sociological work with that in international relations.

In a complementary project, Institute personnel will work as part of a U.S. Institute of Peace–supported project of Catholic Relief Services (CRS) to examine the ways in which this agency can contribute to conflict prevention and resolution processes in the areas where it has projects. Increasingly, organizations designed primarily to provide services to distressed populations are forced to confront conflicts in the areas they serve if they are to carry out their missions. These organizations are struggling to identify ways in which they can address local conflicts while not compromising their organizational missions to provide aid in a non-partisan way. The topic of early warning of communal conflicts and humanitarian crises and the various roles of IGOs and nongovernmental organizations like CRS in early warning systems is a major area of interest at the Institute.

Conflict resolution in the schools is also a topic of interest. Another Peace and War Section member, Julie Hart, has been working for the past few years on developing peer mediation programs in elementary and junior high schools. Her dissertation research is a study of the efficacy of such programs in two South Bend schools. Hart has developed with the Krocs Institute a teacher training session in peer mediation for teachers, which is offered in the summer at the Institute. The research of other Institute fellows focuses on issues of development and ethics. A faculty working group was recently established to examine the ethical aspects of peace and war issues.

WHERE DOES SOCIOLOGY FIT IN?

Readers of this overview may be struck by the degree to which the work of the Krocs Institute (and probably most other peace research institutes) is dominated by political scientists and philosophers and their questions and methodologies. As
academics with a foot in both the international relations (IR) and sociology "camps," we are constantly frustrated by the failure of peace researchers to become truly inter-disciplinary. Although academic incentive structures create serious obstacles to interdisciplinary work, and the difficulties of collaboration with scholars from other disciplines should not be underestimated, it is clear that the complexity of the world's problems demands all the intellectual tools we can bring to our attempts to understand and solve them.

Working here, we have gained a much greater appreciation for the need to better understand how international organizations develop and function. Clearly the organizational work of sociologists has much to contribute to existing IR literature, but sociologists have yet to seriously engage questions about these macro–level institutions (and most political scientists are guilty of ignoring relevant sociological work). Sociologists need to contribute to the current research on the development of systems for early warning of conflict emergence, and on conflict prevention and resolution of intra-national, particularly ethnic conflicts. Increasingly scholars trained to think in terms of international conflict must attempt to understand the dynamics of sub-national conflicts, in which millions of people are being killed, and how these conflicts affect global security. It is clear that existing IR frameworks are inadequate for illuminating the sources and solutions to rapidly proliferating intra-national conflict. The rich sociological research on the emergence and dynamics of collective action and on ethnic and racial minorities is a much needed resource for peace research. Much IR literature uses the old relative deprivation or similar psycho-social models to explain intergroup and ethnic conflict and has not been enriched by the more recent sociological literature and quantitative research methodologies. Moreover, the conflict resolution theory upon which many IR scholars build emerges from game theoretic models and tends to ignore internal group processes, assuming a unitary group actor.

Sociologists would benefit from greater familiarity with current international relations/peace research, like J. David Singer's Correlates of War project, and Ted Robert Gurr's recent research on Minorities at Risk and early warning systems. Sometimes we sociologists are guilty of ignoring key literature because it is outside of our discipline. Sociologists have much to contribute to international relations/peace research as well, but this won't happen simply because it makes sense. Sociologists—particularly those in the Peace and War section—must work to engage more directly the questions which have long remained the domain of international relations work and to invite scholars in this field to participate in our Section panels, workshops and newsletter. We must think about multilateral institutions (including multilateral peacekeeping operations) and how these may be made more effective. We must also work to focus on the macro–level problems which serve as major stumbling blocks to a more peaceful world. Among these problems are gross violations of human rights, the internal and external displacement of populations, and sustainable and egalitarian development. As a section, we might consciously take on the challenge presented in recent conference themes and in the April Footnotes essay by ASA president William Gamson: we must use the tools of sociology to better understand the causes of and possible
responses to urgent global crises, particularly genocide.

Members of this section have much to contribute to important themes in peace research and education, and these strengths should be emphasized. Research and training in inter-group conflict is also essential as sub-national conflicts proliferate. We must struggle to enhance understandings of how (and when) to effectively intervene to de-escalate and resolve intergroup conflicts. Lou Kriesberg’s work in this area serves as an important start, but we must continue to push forward the boundaries of theory and to relate them more directly to practical needs. Military sociologists in particular can bring important insights into broader questions of the relationship of military institutions to society and how this relationship affects democratic prospects not only in the new and fragile democracies but also in presumably stable democracies (e.g. few anticipated the 1973 military coup against Uruguay’s long-standing democracy). They can also help to address questions about how multilateral peacekeeping operations can be made more effective. These questions, however, require a more comparative and less U.S.-centered perspective on military organizations. Many others in this section have expertise in inter-group and ethnic conflict, social movements, and organizations. If our experience at Notre Dame is any indicator, many students interested in peace and conflict studies frequently plan to work with non-governmental organizations at the community, national, or even transnational levels. Providing such students with courses on social movement dynamics — from the local to the transnational — and on organizational dynamics and project evaluation can be a valuable contribution to peace research and education—as well as to peace action.

Before closing, we should note that the ways of disseminating and applying research findings other than in the classroom is a topic of discussion at the Institute. Scholars here (and elsewhere) at times appear guilty of the intellectual’s over-confidence in the power of the written word alone. As organizers of the Peace and War Section’s upcoming workshop are especially aware, we need to make very conscious efforts to communicate research findings to appropriate publics and leaders. Another important question is that of for whom the research is conducted — the public at large? elite policymakers? peace activists? Here too the sociological experience and literature on applied social research is a valuable resource; for example, Ron Pagnucco has been working with the Catholic peace group, Pax Christi USA to establish a Peace Studies Committee to help the organization with its research, policy and education needs. Students of the peace movement and organizations would not find the dynamics of establishing such a Committee surprising. He has also developed a "Theory, Research and Praxis" course designed especially for students preparing to work on peace issues with nongovernmental organizations.

This brief account was intended to provide one example of a peace research agenda and hopefully to stimulate discussion among section members. For more detailed accounts of this and other work, or to be placed on the Institute mailing list, please write to: Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies; P.O. Box 639; University of Notre Dame; Notre Dame, IN 46556.
PATHS TO PEACE WORKSHOP

Registration. Both presenters and non-presenters, send information below and a check payable to ASA Peace and War Section, to Marty Gonzales, Paths to Peace Workshop, Sociology Department, Campus Box 327, University of Colorado, Boulder, Co 80309-0327. Phone (303) 492-2550; FAX 303-492-6388. E-mail: IPRA@CUBLDR.COLORADO.EDU

(Capacity = 100)

Name

Address

Phone
(work) __________________________ (home) __________________________

E-mail __________________________

Please mark the category which applies to you and enclose a check made payable to ASA Peace and War Section.

1994 ASA student member of Peace and War Section $35
1994 ASA member of Peace and War Section $45
Not a member of Peace and War Section $55

I cannot attend but enclose a tax deductible contribution

Room-Share Information Exchange for Workshop Registrants
If you want to share a room for the Workshop/ASA Annual Meeting and want to be listed on the E-mail information exchange to facilitate your finding a roommate, please add the following about yourself.

Staying

_Female _Non-smoker _Wed. 8/3 _Thurs. 8/4 _Fri. 8/7
_Male _Smoker _Sat. 8/6 _Sun. 8/7 _Mon. 8/8