Member's Forum

A Convergence of Military and Peace Research

By Dana Eyre, United States Military Academy, West Point

During the heady optimistic days of the spring of 1990, Nora Kinzer Stewart noted that, in view of the rapid changes ongoing in the Soviet Union, all writing on the subject of peace and war should be done in pencil. The world continues to change, and Nora's advice still holds true. Those of us who seek to understand the dynamics of peace and war find our work immediately and unfortunately relevant.

However, in spite of, or perhaps because of, the relevancy of our subject matter, our Section has frequently been marked by the unfortunate and lasting division between the sociologists of the military and the sociologists of peace. To say that we lack a coherent, common approach to the issue of war, peace, and military institutions is an understatement; it sometimes seems that we have two sections studying two separate concerns. An extremely productive session at the World Congress of Sociology (July 7-13 in Madrid), however, demonstrated both the need and potential for the integration of these two "sections."

The original challenge for the panel was laid down by Charles Moskos in his paper "Armed Forces in a Warless Society." Professor Moskos's continuing interest in the relationship between armed forces and society have been carried forward in this effort to understand the impact of the end of the cold war on the militaries of the superpowers and the major

Section Members Participate in Persian Gulf Crisis

By Abigail Fuller and Jen Hlavacek, University of Colorado at Boulder

Several Section members have participated in various ways in the Persian Gulf Crisis. Some of these include:

John Clark, University of Oregon, is involved in a letter-writing campaign with the midwest chapter of the National Peace Institute, writing letters to President Bush and congressional representatives in opposition to the war. He has also been doing petitioning locally. In his Deviance and Social Control class, he has
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Peace Activist-Academic: An Impossible Combination?

By Amy S. Hubbard, Syracuse University

Trying to integrate activism and scholarship while being pulled in two different directions is the focus of a study by the Social Movements Working Group at Syracuse University. The group, organized through SU's Program on the Analysis and Resolution of Conflicts, is soliciting feedback from activist-academics about their experiences.

The Social Movements Working Group meets regularly to discuss scholarly and activist
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ASA Endorsement of the Seville Statement on Violence

We are happy to announce that the ASA Council has officially endorsed the Seville Statement on Violence. The Peace and War Section had given its official endorsement to the Statement at the Section’s Council and Business meeting in August of last year. Consequently, the Section presented a resolution urging ASA Council endorsement at the ASA Business Meeting on August 14, where it was unanimously adopted. The ASA Council concurred with the resolution and voted to endorse it at their January meeting. If anyone needs more information or copies of the Seville Statement on Violence, write Jen Hlavacek, Editor, 930 Grant Place, Boulder, CO 80302.

Interim Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Awards Policy

This is an interim committee report, because this committee was appointed by then-chair John Loefland and then-chair elect Louis Kriesberg for a two-year term to consider the establishment of a second award to be granted by the Section on Peace and War. The members of the committee are David R. Segal, Department of Sociology, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20740; John Wattendorf, Department of Behavioral Sciences and Leadership, United States Military Academy, West Point, NY 10996; and Edward Sabin, Department of Sociology, Towson State University, Towson, MD 21204.

The committee has done its work primarily by telephone and mail, but its members have also strived to make themselves available to other members of the Section at ASA meetings, at meetings of regional associations, and at meetings of other organizations in which members of our Section participate. All committee members were available at the 1990 ASA meetings in Washington.

The committee was asked to address a range of questions with regard to the establishment of a second Section award. These are enumerated below, along with a statement on the progress we have made in approaching answers to them.

1. Should the Section have an award in addition to the Elise Boulding Award for an Outstanding Student Paper? The response seems to be unanimously affirmative. We have heard no dissent from the position that the Section and its members would be well served by the establishment of such an award.

2. What sorts of activities should the award recognize? There is somewhat less unanimity here, but the great majority of members to whom we have spoken—and the current position of the committee—is that the award should be for scholarly and professional contributions. This criterion is broadly defined, to include an outstanding scholarly career in the study of peace and war, a single outstanding work, outstanding contributions to teaching in the sociology of peace and war, or outstanding service to the Section on the Sociological

3. How often should the award be given? One concern raised early was that if we gave the award annually, we might quickly run out of recipients. An informal enumeration of potential recipients suggests that this is not a problem in the foreseeable future. We therefore recommend that the award be given annually. If at some time in the future an awards committee comes up barren of candidates in a given year, the Section has the right not to grant an award.

4. What should the award be called? A majority—not overwhelming—of the Section members to whom we have spoken feels that the award should honor a deceased scholar or scholars who have made a significant contribution to the sociology of peace and war. An exemplar of this approach is the Cooley-Mead Award of the Section on Social Psychology. The most frequent nominations for our award have been Quincy Wright, Harold D. Lasswell, Morris Janowitz, C. Wright Mills, and Robert C. Angell. Only the last three of these were actually sociologists, and there is considerable sentiment for naming the award for sociologists. A few people nominated living people, which deviates from the practice of other sections, and raises the interesting issue of whether people could be candidates for awards named for them. The committee is not in favor of such an approach. Other people nominated honorees best known for their activism rather than scholarship, including Martin Luther King, Jr., and Mohandas K. Gandhi. These are certainly worthy people, but the majority sentiment seems to be that if we are to name the award, we should be able to identify sociologists who have contributed significantly to our understanding of peace and war. Another possibility is simply to establish the award as the American Sociological Association Section on Peace and War Award for Distinguished Scholarship/Service/Teaching (that’s the standardized title required by ASA). This is perhaps an issue on which we should have a referendum or straw poll during the year.

The ad hoc committee on awards also recommended to the Section that we routinely give the recipient of the Elise Boulding Student Paper Award a plaque and a grant of $200 to help defray costs of attending the ASA meeting and have the winning paper presented at a Section session. With the institutionalization of refereed roundtable sessions, this should become easier to do.

Section Membership Drive

Sam Marullo, Georgetown University, Membership Chairman, sent out a mailing to over 300 prospective members. The mail-out contained a letter requesting them to join our Section and a copy of our last newsletter. DON’T FORGET TO PAY YOUR SECTION DUES AND TO RECRUIT A MEMBER. The current world situation should enhance our recruiting efforts.
The Section on Peace and War announces the 1990–91 Elise Boulding Award for Distinguished Student Paper. The contest, named in honor of Elise Boulding and her contributions to the sociology of peace and war, invites undergraduate and graduate students to submit a paper on any topic within the realm of the sociology of peace and war.

The award for first place is $200 toward the cost of travel to the ASA annual meeting in the year in which the award is made, or to help defray costs incurred during the writing of the paper. The award will be presented during the Peace and War Section’s Business Meeting at the 1991 ASA Annual Meeting in Cincinnati. At that time, the recipient will have the opportunity to present a summary of his/her paper.

Papers must have been written within the past two years. They must be typed, 25 pages maximum, and should adhere to ASR or other academic format guidelines. Submit THREE copies of the paper by May 1, 1991 to: Elton F. Jackson, Dept. of Sociology, Ballantine 744, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN 47405.
Call for Papers

Peace & Change publishes scholarly and interpretive articles related to the achieving of a peaceful, just, and humane society. It seeks to transcend national, disciplinary, and occupational boundaries. It builds bridges between peace research, education, and action. Seeking to maintain a standard of rigorous, clear thought, it welcomes articles of varied style on topics related to peace and war, social change, and justice. In order to provide a forum for communicating current thought and research, the journal welcomes review essays, responses to published articles, and informed controversy. Peace & Change also carries news of the Council on Peace Research in History, the Consortium on Peace Research, Education and Development, and other groups by arrangement.

Articles and correspondence should be directed to Jen Hlavacek, Managing Editor, Peace & Change, Department of Sociology, Campus Box 327, University of Colorado, Boulder, CO 80309-0327. Articles: Please send clean copy, on one side of the page only, in which all typing, including quotations, is double-spaced. Notes should be placed at the end of the article, also double-spaced, and in the humanities form used in the Chicago Manual of Style. Three copies of the article and a biographical statement of approximately 50 words should be sent in order to reduce delays in reviewing and editing. The author's name should appear only on a title page which can then be removed when reviewing the article.

Social Science Quarterly invites contributions for a planned extra-length issue on "The Military in American Society." Its preference is for articles of short to medium length (14–25 pages, including tables, references, and notes). Co-editors for this special issue include Peter Karsten and David R. Segal. Manuscripts will be considered for this issue until March 1, 1991, and should be submitted in quadruplicate to: Social Science Quarterly, Will C. Hogg Building, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX 78712.

Research in Social Movements, Conflicts and Change. Volume 14, published by JAI Press, will be devoted to the topic of the end of the cold war and the ongoing transformations, as well as continuities, of the global system which are challenges to sociological theory. The nature of those recent changes need to be understood. We should consider whether the societal and systemic changes reveal inadequacies in some sociological ideas and lend support to others. As members of the Section on the Sociology of Peace and War, we in particular should examine what insights sociological theory and research provide in explaining the continuities and discontinuities in the bases of international conflicts and the use of violence in waging them. Differing explanations support alternative future policies.

Send three copies of papers to be considered for this volume to one of the editors: Louis Kriesberg, Department of Sociology, Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York 13210-4400 or David Segal, Department of Sociology, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742-1315. Contributions should be submitted by June 30, 1991.

Call for Materials for Curriculum Guide

In collaboration with the ASA Teaching Resources Center, we are compiling a curriculum guide that will consist of the following:

a. sample syllabi of sociology courses in peace and war (to a limited extent we may print syllabi from related disciplines like anthropology);

b. modules on peace, war, and conflict from syllabi primarily on other topics;

c. short essays on curriculum, teaching techniques, and the like;

d. bibliographies; and

e. descriptions of movies and videos on peace, war, and conflict.

We plan to represent, as much as possible, major subfields of sociology and the main areas within peace studies. We will to some extent draw on Daniel C. Thomas and Michael T. Klare, eds., Peace and World Order Studies (Fifth ed., Westview 1989). In view of recent world events, we would welcome contributions on particular regions, such as the Middle East, Central America, Eastern Europe, Southern Africa, and so on.

We especially encourage modules, essays, etc., that would help sociologists incorporate material on peace, war, and conflict into courses on unrelated topics—such as courses on the family, community, gender, race, social change, and deviance. We welcome submissions from people who do not specialize in peace, war, and conflict—including non-members of our Section.

Anyone with syllabi/modules that are in the planning stages, or that need further revision after being taught only once, is encouraged to submit his or her materials. The deadline for submissions is April 7, 1991.

Send submissions or inquiries to one of us: John MacDougall, Dept. of Sociology, University of Lowell—South Campus, Lowell, MA 01854, (508) 692-3197; or Helen Raisz, Dept. of Sociology, Trinity College, 300 Summit St., Hartford, CT 06106, (203) 297-2344 (O), (203) 677-7403 (H).

Member News

Louis Kriesberg, Syracuse University, has been named the 1990 Lee-Founders Award recipient by the Society for the Study of Social Problems.


Sam Marullo, Georgetown University; Alexandra Chute, Georgetown University; and Mary Anna Colwell, San Francisco University, authored “Peaceful Groups in the U.S. Peace Movement in the Eighties,” which will be published in the July issue of Peace and Change.
A Convergence (Continued From Page 1)

European powers. His central argument is that “war probabilities shape relationships between armed forces and society.” He proposed a threefold typology of this relationship: “war readiness” societies are exemplified by most NATO and Warsaw Pact countries in the 50s and 60s. These societies are marked by large, conscripted, standing armed forces. In contrast, “war deterrence” societies (e.g. the U.S. and Britain in the 70s and 80s) feature a less manpower-intensive defense strategy, and place a greater emphasis on the development of small, professional, and highly technical forces. Finally, “warless” societies are characterized by a defense establishment based on a small cadre force backed by extensive reserve forces. Switzerland and Sweden best exemplify this relationship. Moskos argues that although the future “will not be absent of regional conflicts ... events rapidly developing ... between the two superpowers augur that some meaningful, even momentous, not illusionary change is occurring.” As the probability of superpower conflict in Western Europe and the North Atlantic declines, we evolve toward a “warless society” with substantial changes in the organization and doctrine of militaries within the region.

In the second paper, Wolfgang R. Vogt (German Armed Forces Command and Staff College), shared Moskos’s emphasis on the breakdown of the cold war block systems. Vogt, however, extending his “Incompatibility Paradigm,” argues that modern, complex, and urbanized social systems are “structurally unfit ... to conduct war.” Due to their specialization and complexity, such societies are highly sensitive to destruction, vulnerable to disruption, and burdened with risks. “The higher their degree of industrialization,” Vogt says, “the more developed is their inability to conduct war or defense.” As a result, Vogt argues that we are evolving towards “not merely a ‘warless’ society but an ‘armyless’ society.”

Subsequent papers in the session enriched the discussion with focused examinations of individual aspects of the Vogt and Moskos arguments. Hans Jorg Schweizer-Meyer presented a paper arguing that Switzerland is a “warless society.” Although he acknowledged the uniqueness of Swiss history and its security situation, he strongly suggested that the current Swiss debate on defense policy and the future of the Swiss Army “illustrates the basic accuracy of the ‘warless society’ argument.”

James Burk presented an examination of changing citizen beliefs about national sovereignty and obligatory military service. Burk argues that “a genuine change has taken place (since World War II). . . . Military service is no longer a defining characteristic of the ideal citizen . . . .” This radical change is due to three factors. The first, he suggests, is a shift in beliefs concerning the inevitability of war. War is now seen as an intentional, and therefore avoidable, occurrence. Second, the substantive meaning of citizenship has shifted, so that “as the number of things citizenship means increases . . . the particular importance of any single mode of expression (i.e. military service) . . . declines. Finally, Burk cites “the declining sovereignty of nation-states . . . which has led to a breakdown of consensus . . . about the moral justification for compulsory military service.” Thus, for Burk, fundamental changes in the meaning of the nation and citizenship have reconstructed the relationship between the individual and the state.

In my discussion comments, I emphasized the importance of paying greater attention to three fundamental dynamics which shaped the development of modern militaries. First, greater attention needs to be paid to the significant symbolic role played by militaries. Militaries are constitutive elements of the modern nation-state and play a critical role in the demonstration of sovereignty. Namibia’s independence celebrations featured, along with a flag and accredited diplomats, a newly formed Namibian Army. Second, we need to examine the destabilizing influence of (re)emerging ethnic and nationalist sentiments on the potential for war. Both the Moskos and Vogt papers emphasize the importance of superpower relationships but underestimate the significance of conflict rooted in these sentiments. Finally, both papers underestimated the ability of military organizations, as organizations and as political actors, to shape their force structures and procurement processes to serve their own ends.

My summary can only hint at the richness of the papers. The papers presented in the panel, however, clearly suggest a convergence of the concerns of previously separate sociologies of “peace” and “the military.” We cannot understand the internal dynamics of militaries, nor their relationships with their societies, without examining societal attitudes toward, and beliefs about war and citizenship. Similarly, understanding the dynamics of militaries is central to understanding the dynamics of peace and war; it is, after all, militaries which prosecute war, and they have a substantial influence on national understandings of security issues. The papers presented in the panel are powerful arguments that the traditional distinction between “military” sociologists and “peace” sociologists serves neither our understanding of militaries nor our efforts to foster peace.

Conference Announcement:

The Irish Peace Institute at the University of Limerick announces an international conference with the following theme: “Education, Research and Action for Peace” to be held October 2–5, 1991. The conference will be of interest to those concerned with the Irish conflict, and internal conflicts and their resolution generally, within the context of the European and global order. Special attention will be given at the conclusion of the conference to the role of peace education in primary and secondary schools. Conference Coordinator: Dr. James Skelly, Associate Director, Irish Peace Institute, University of Limerick, Limerick, Ireland. Telephone: 353-61-333644, ext. 2106 or 2141.
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devised lectures focusing on the war. The department has organized a teach-in.

Todd Gitlin, University of California, Berkeley, wrote "Jump-Start for the Peace Forces," which was published in The Nation, January 7, 1991.

Christine Griffin, Northeastern University, is part of a coalition of faculty and students that has organized rallies and scheduled speakers on campus during the regular Thursday activity hours. Special speakers included Allen Ginsberg, a representative from Rep. Joe Kennedy's office, and various faculty. Along with many others from Massachusetts, Griffin participated in the January 26 demonstration in Washington, D.C.

Louis Kriesberg, Syracuse University, wrote an article on forcing Iraq’s withdrawal from Kuwait which was published in the Syracuse Post Standard on October 10, 1990. Kriesberg also has been interviewed by regional television and radio stations and participated in a consultation on Gulf Alternatives organized by the Friends Service Committee on November 29, 1990.

Tom Mayer and Paul Wehr, University of Colorado at Boulder, helped organize a day-long teach-in on campus about the war, held on Martin Luther King, Jr., Day, which was attended by over 1,000 people. Mayer spoke on "Imperialism and the War" and Wehr spoke on "Alternatives to Military Defense." In addition, faculty arranged for an open mike during lunch hours at the student center.

Charles C. Moskos, Jr., Northwestern University, and John W. Wattendorf, colonel, U.S. Army, took a one-week trip to visit U.S. troops deployed as part of Operation Desert Shield. They did a series of in-depth interviews, primarily with soldiers and junior NCOs, focusing on soldier understanding of the goals of Desert Shield and their conceptions of a coalition victory. They found that soldier morale was generally high, although as Wattendorf put it, "fragile." Soldiers were concerned about U.S. public support of their actions; Vietnam was a memory even for young soldiers, for whom Vietnam was history rather than memory. Wattendorf also noted that soldiers evidenced a desire to "find a reason bigger than U.S. self interest" for the operation. The most common reason found was the establishment of a "new world order," and the action was seen as a chance to stop aggression and establish a more peaceful world.

Katherine O'Donnell, Hartwick College, invited speakers on repression in the Middle East to a January-term program on global community which she had previously organized. She has also participated in two sessions to talk with students about the war, and with the student group Praxis arranged for buses to travel to the anti-war demonstration in Washington, D.C., on January 26.

Ron Pagnucco, Catholic University, was vigilin front of the White House when the bombing of Iraq began on January 16. He has organized several forums on the war, one at which graduate students spoke and another at which local activists spoke. With Sam Marullo, Georgetown University, and others in the Capitol Area Peace Studies (CAPS) group, he has organized a teach-in at Georgetown University and is writing articles about the war for the CAPS Chronicle.

Paul Wehr, University of Colorado at Boulder, was interviewed by the British Broadcast Corporation, television channel 4, in London last fall regarding alternatives in the Persian Gulf Crisis. Wehr also served as a consultant to UNESCO Catalonia, Barcelona, Spain, regarding non-military resolution of the crisis. In addition, he has served on a panel for the Conflict Resolution Consortium, University of Colorado, and has participated in several teach-ins on the CU campus.

As the war continues, our Section members will be involved in research and other war-related activities. Please let us know what you are doing in this unfortunate, but lively, laboratory for the sociology of peace and war research. Write to the newsletter address or call Jen Hlavacek at (303) 492-6264 (O) or (303) 442-7325 (H).
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approaches to social movements and community organizing. As part of this work, a subcommittee began working on a paper last year about relationships between academics and activists and ways they could work together constructively. The study evolved into an analysis of the pressures faced by people who choose to work in both worlds. It was no longer a study about how academics and activists could work together, but how people who do both survive. "Rather than lead a dichotomized life, activist-academics are trying to lead an integrated life," explains Richard Kendrick, a member of the working group. "They don't put their academic life in one pot and their activism in another."

This is a difficult project for anyone, especially since activists and academics do such different kinds of work. For example, academics often work alone with complex information and write and think about abstract ideas. Academics are under enormous pressure to publish in scholarly journals in order to survive in academia. Activists, on the other hand, must simplify complex information, distribute it through newsletters and press releases, and work with groups of volunteers. Activists are under enormous pressure because of lack of resources and the tremendous urgency of the problems they face.

People who would participate in both worlds also face great difficulties in gaining acceptance from two different groups of peers. For example, action research which would be most useful to activists is not considered "serious" research in the university when academics come up for tenure and promotion. On the other hand, publishing highly abstract articles on social movements in a refereed journal (which would be most helpful to one's academic career) is not considered "serious" activism to social movement activists. It is the rare person who will have time to do both and have time left over for other "pursuits," such as raising a family, doing housework, and cutting the grass.

For more information about this research, contact Amy Hubbard and Richard Kendrick, the Program on the Analysis and Resolution of Conflicts, 712 Ostrom Ave., Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY 13244 or through BITNET at AHUBBARD@SUVM or KENDRICK@SUNRISE.