Social Problems Forum:
The SSSP Newsletter

A NOTE FROM THE EDITOR:

As the Dylan song goes, “The times, they are a’changin’.” Today, change is a given; but the direction of change is very much at stake. This is apparent by much of the content of this issue, which deals with what may be seen as pushback by the right following the election of Barack Obama to the presidency. Former SSSP President Frances Fox Piven responds to the attacks by Glenn Beck et al. accusing her and the late Richard Cloward for spearheading a plan to destroy capitalism. Dorothee Benz reflects on the attacks on Piven and Cloward’s work within the context of the Tea Party movement’s pursuit of its change agenda by undemocratic methods. On a related issue, two letters, one from the SSSP Board of Directors and one from the Consortium of Professional and Academic Associations, and a proposed SSSP resolution, advocate for the rescission of Arizona’s recent immigration law. Also, a letter from the Board of Directors urges Marquette University to reinstate the appointment of SSSP member Jodi O’Brien to a deanship position after her appointment was rescinded after her research was judged to be anti-marriage and family. Other Forum content includes a book review, by John Alessio, of Finley and Reynolds’ Beyond Burning Bras: Feminist Activism for Everyone.

Take a look for important information about the upcoming Annual Meeting in Atlanta; nominating members for SSSP offices; a call for applications for Editor for Social Problems Forum; and more.

We hope you are all having a restful and productive summer.

Stephen R. Couch and Anne E. Mercuri, Co-Editors

RESULTS OF THE 2010 GENERAL ELECTION

PRESIDENT ELECT (2010-2011)
President (2011-2012)
Wendy Simonds

VICE-PRESIDENT ELECT (2010-2011)
Vice-President (2011-2012)
Wendy Chapkis

SECRETARY (2010-2011)
Glenn W. Muschert

TREASURER (2010-2011)
Susan M. Carlson

BOARD OF DIRECTORS (2010-2013)
Valerie Leiter and Nancy Mezey

BOARD OF DIRECTORS: STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE (2010-2012)
Mandy Frake-Mistak

BUDGET, FINANCE, AND AUDIT COMMITTEE (2010-2013)
Patrick Donnelly

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES (2010-2013)
Matthew W. Hughey and Janet M. Rankin

EDITORIAL AND PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE (2010-2013)
David A. Smith and Suzanne Vaughan

MEMBERSHIP AND OUTREACH COMMITTEE (2010-2013)
Gina Petonito and Anna Maria Santiago

MEMBERSHIP AND OUTREACH COMMITTEE: STUDENT REPRESENTATIVE (2010-2013)
Mary Scherer

BYLAWS AMENDMENTS
Approved
FUTURE SSSP ANNUAL MEETINGS

August 12 – 14, 2011
The Blackstone, A Renaissance Hotel
Chicago, IL

August 16 – 18, 2012
The Grand Hyatt Denver
Denver, CO

August 9 – 11, 2013
The Westin New York at Times Square
New York, NY

*** VISIT THE SSSP WEBSITE – http://www.sssp1.org ***

Submission Information:

We welcome essays, commentaries, letters to the editor, book review proposals, photo essays, and announcements of interest to SSSP members. Submissions by email are preferred. For a list of books available for review, see http://www.sssp1.org/index.cfm/m/274. The deadline for submitting material for the next issue is Oct. 4, 2010.


Send Materials to:

Stephen Couch & Anne Mercuri, Co-Editors
Social Problems Forum: The SSSP Newsletter
Penn State Schuylkill
200 University Drive
Schuylkill Haven, PA 17972

Tel: (570) 385 6071
Email: src@psu.edu or aeml41@psu.edu

Society for the Study of Social Problems
University of Tennessee, Knoxville
901 McClung Tower
Knoxville, TN 37996-0490
Tel: (865) 689-1531
Fax: (865) 689-1534

Héctor L. Delgado, Executive Officer
Email: hector.delgado49@gmail.com

Michele Smith Koontz, Administrative Officer &
Meeting Manager
Email: mkoontz3@utk.edu

Sharon Shumaker, Administrative Assistant &
Webmaster
Email: sshumaker@utk.edu

Sarah Hendricks, Graduate Research Associate
Email: sssp@utk.edu
Call for Applications

Editor, Social Problems Forum
The Newsletter of SSSP

The Editorial and Publications Committee of the Society for the Study of Social Problems is seeking applications for the position of Editor of the Society’s newsletter, Social Problems Forum.

The Editor’s three-year term will begin following publication of the last issue of Volume 41 in the fall of 2010. Members of SSSP are encouraged to apply for the position and/or nominate colleagues who are (or will become) members.

The Newsletter has become a vital means of communication among SSSP members. Among other items, it includes official reports and announcements of the Society; exchanges between members; and special features, such as book reviews and debates. Beginning with Volume 42 in winter of 2011, the Newsletter is expected to be available in electronic format only. The Newsletter Editor will thus have the freedom to exercise considerable creativity in producing the Newsletter and may include video and audio clips in each issue. The Board of Directors of the Society wishes to ensure that the Newsletter remains an effective vehicle for generating interest and involvement in the Society, for facilitating communication across Divisions and among the membership, and for providing service to the Divisions and the members.

The Newsletter Editor is responsible for preparing three newsletters per year (winter, summer, and fall). The Society provides a stipend for the Editor and a budget to pay for preparation expenses and a student assistant. Additional support from the host institution, including office space, a computer and other equipment is expected; release time is desirable. Because the Editor must coordinate with the Administrative Office and with officers of the Society and Division chairs, she/he must be able to work well with others. Familiarity with the operation of the Society is highly desirable.

Individuals interested in applying for the editorship should submit their curriculum vitae with a cover letter detailing their relevant experience, the support their institution is willing to provide, and a proposed budget not to exceed $12,000 per calendar year. Letters from the applicant’s department chair, dean, or other authorized university administrator confirming specific institutional support should also be included.

Please direct all questions, nominations, expressions of interest, and application materials to: Claire Renzetti, Chair, SSSP Editorial and Publications Committee, Email: Claire.Renzetti@notes.udayton.edu. All applications should be submitted electronically.

Deadline for applications is July 1, 2010.
Society for the Study of Symbolic Interaction at Atlanta 2010
Workshop: Grounded Theory Methods for Social Justice Research

August 14th, 3:00-6:00, Kathy Charmaz, Presenter

In keeping with the conference theme, this workshop links symbolic interactionism and grounded theory methods with conducting research in area of social justice, as broadly defined. Thus, the workshop will be useful to participants who study such topics as those in which fairness and stigma are interactional issues as well as to participants who study larger social problems that researchers have readily construed as social justice questions. Kathy Charmaz will introduce basic grounded theory guidelines and show how symbolic interactionists can adopt and adapt them for developing social justice projects. You do not need extensive prior knowledge of grounded theory in order to attend; a familiarity with qualitative methods will suffice. In addition to our focus on social justice, common misunderstandings and misuses of grounded theory will be clarified. You will gain insights about how grounded theory has informed qualitative inquiry in general and how it has retained several unique characteristics that have untapped potential for advancing symbolic interactionism. We will use several grounded theory strategies that Barney Glaser developed. Yet how we will use these strategies will take into account Anselm Strauss’s symbolic interactionist legacy of studying action, process, and meaning.

This workshop is for you. Discussion is welcome throughout the session. We have planned a hefty amount of presentation material for the workshop but may be able to include your specific concerns. If you have qualitative data, bring a transcribed interview, set of field notes, or document for the hands-on exercises; otherwise we will supply data for you. The workshop is free to members of SSSI. Make sure your membership is current and come to the workshop! It will help us plan if you inform us that you will be attending. If you are not on the list but you find that you have time after you arrive in Atlanta, feel free to drop by and see if there is room. Your friends and colleagues from other professional associations are welcome to pay the registration fee and attend the workshop. Let them know that joining SSSI is less expensive than the workshop registration and that they will receive the benefits of membership as well. Non-members may register for the workshop at the following rates: Students --$40; PhD--Assistant Professor--$60; Associate and Full Professors--$80. To put your name on the workshop list or register as a non-member, contact Jennifer Dunn at Southern Illinois University, jldunn@siu.edu.
I had to scrap the first draft of my column because I sounded too much like Chicken Little. But while the sky is not falling on academic freedom and social justice, there is reason to be concerned. And it is on this that I would like to focus in this column. But first things first. Have you registered for and made plans to go to our annual meeting in Atlanta? If not, there is still time and space. You can peruse the program by going to our website (SSSP1.org) and clicking on 2010 Annual Meeting Bulletin. I’d like to express my personal thanks to Glenn Muschert, the chair of the program committee; the other members of the committee; our president JoAnn Miller; Michele Koontz; Sharon Shumaker; and Sarah Hendricks for all of their hard work. Please join us.

In the past two months the SSSP Board of Directors and Administrative Office have been very active on several fronts and issues. Let me begin with Arizona Senate Bill 1070, amended by SB 2162, which, in effect, gives the police the authority to enforce federal immigration laws through racial profiling, i.e., giving them the authority to ask someone who “looks illegal” to show proof of citizenship. The law will be challenged and most likely be struck down in the courts. The SSSP Board of Directors approved and sent a letter to the governor of Arizona, the Honorable Jan Brewer, condemning the law and urging her to have it rescinded. A copy of the letter appears in this newsletter, as does a resolution approved by the membership. We also sent a letter to the Commissioner of Baseball, Bud Selig, urging him to move next year’s All-Star game from Phoenix to another location, much as the National Football League did with the Super Bowl in 1993 when Arizona failed to recognize Martin Luther King’s Birthday. A portion of the letter to Mr. Selig reads,” Historically we have embraced people of color in this country when they are entertaining or generating revenue for us, but have been slow to accord them the security and respect to which they are entitled as human beings.” Mr. Selig, thus far, is holding firm.

But Arizona did not stop with immigrants. The state’s House Bill 2281, in effect, prohibits school districts from offering ethnic studies programs, because, according to proponents of the bill, these programs promote resentment toward a race or group of people, are designed for a specific ethnic group, and promote ethnic solidarity. The directors of four of UCLA’s ethnic studies programs issued a letter condemning the law, writing, “Efforts to mischaracterize and demonize ethnic studies constitute an assault on American society’s most deeply held principles: equal rights, educational opportunity, free speech, and academic freedom.” The letter to Governor Brewer did not include a reference to this bill, but Dr. Luis Fernandez, a member of the Board, represented the SSSP in a news conference on May 19 in Phoenix to express grave concerns about these laws. The SSSP was joined by a dozen or more other social justice organizations at the press conference. Jointly, these organizations drafted a public statement that also appears in this newsletter or can be accessed on our website. This joint effort has led to a very serious discussion about the formation of a consortium of organizations, with an eye toward combining our resources and speaking in one voice on a wide range of social justice issues in the future.

On the academic freedom front, there are two stories of special concern to us. The first is Marquette University’s decision to rescind an offer made to Dr. Jodi O’Brien to become one of its academic deans. A distinguished scholar and full professor at another Jesuit institution, Dr. O’Brien was offered a dean’s position at Marquette, but when the president of the institution learned of the nature of her scholarly work, and perhaps under pressure by members of his Board or donors, he rescinded the offer. Several organizations, including the ASA and the SSSP, wrote to the president asking him to reconsider his decision, principally on academic freedom grounds and the chilling effect this can have on scholars, and especially on untenured faculty. A copy of the letter appears in this newsletter or can be accessed on our website.
We have not received a response.

Finally, many of us are familiar with Glenn Beck, Rush Limbaugh, David Horowitz, et al. For some time now they and other conservative talking heads, commentators, and bloggers, have been attacking Frances Fox Piven and the late Richard Cloward on the basis of an article they co-authored in *The Nation* in 1966, entitled “A Strategy to End Poverty.” Beck accused Piven and Cloward of being the “people … fundamentally responsible for the unsustainability and possible collapse of our economic system.” In an excellent and recommended *Huffington Post* piece (3/23/10), Peter Dreier quotes Limbaugh as saying that the ultimate objective of the “Cloward-Piven strategy” was “to have everybody in the country on welfare, by destroying it.” I recommend as well an excellent piece in *The Nation* by Richard Kim, “The Mad Tea Party” (4/15/10). In this piece, Kim notes, correctly, that “the left’s gut reaction upon hearing of it – to laugh it off as a Scooby-Doo comic mystery – does nothing to blunt its appeal or limit its impact.”

In this newsletter, however, we are indeed lucky to include a piece by Frances Fox Piven, a former president of the SSSP (1979-80), on these attacks and an account of and her thoughts on a visit by a purported graduate student, who turned out to be a Michigan Republican Party official and right-wing activist. This piece is especially important because it warns us against complacency in the face of these relentless attacks against progressives (and even moderates) by the Far Right; attacks that accelerated after the election of Barack Obama. In an environment in which anti-intellectualism, and hate and fear of “the other,” thrive, we would be wise to listen to Frances Fox Piven when she writes, “What we should do instead of ducking is rally to the defense of the individuals and groups that are under assault, and we should do that aggressively, proudly, even joyfully …” The sky may not be falling, but it won’t hurt to make sure it does not.
2010 CALL FOR RESOLUTIONS FROM THE MEMBERSHIP

SSSP resolutions constitute an important opportunity for our scholar-activist membership to publicly declare their sentiments, thereby creating a channel for greater visibility and more direct influence upon a variety of “publics,” i.e., fellow activists, scholars, students, decision-makers, social action groups, voters, and others. Thus, as Vice-President this year, I am calling on the membership to submit resolutions for discussion, debate, and in some cases, passage. Keep in mind, that proposed resolutions serve as useful discussion points for SSSP members, helping to increase and enhance communication and activities during the long period between annual meetings. To submit a resolution, simply forward your resolution or your idea for a resolution to the Vice-President and the appropriate SSSP Division Chair(s) by July 1, 2010 in order to give members ample time to read and give serious consideration to your resolution. (If you submit your resolution to more than one chair, please inform all involved of this fact.) The only exception to the deadline is if the issue in question occurs after July 1st. Proposed resolutions will be available for review prior to the Annual Meeting via posting on the SSSP website in the “members-only” area and under “Annual Meeting,” and as an e-mail blast sent to members who want to receive announcements from the Administrative Office.

Resolutions submitted to Division Chairs should contain a concise position statement concerning a social problem of urgent concern to the Division. In most cases, the resolution should include some sort of call for viable action on the part of the SSSP. This typically has involved a letter from the Board directed to some public entity expressing concern, support, or protest. Feel free, however, to propose other forms of appropriate action. If the resolution is in support of or in opposition to a piece of legislation, a copy of the legislation or a place where members can access it must be provided.

It is the SSSP Vice-President’s responsibility to serve as the facilitator for resolutions being sponsored by the Divisions as well as from individual Society members, making the resolutions available to the membership prior to and at the annual business meeting. This year in Atlanta, the resolutions process will be organized in a manner that promotes wider discussion prior to formal consideration at the 2010 Annual Business Meeting. The process is as follows:

- On the first day of the meetings an open forum of discussion will be held, which is designed to encourage a political discussion of concerned members. At this meeting, each proposed resolution should be presented for membership discussion by the sponsoring Division’s Chairperson (or designated representative) and adequate time for discussion will be properly allotted to each. To facilitate this process, all proposed resolutions, as noted above, must be made available to the SSSP Vice-President and Division Chair(s) by July 1, such that the membership has ample time to consider resolutions and can be provided a print copy with their registration packet.

- Modifications and revisions will be considered during the open discussion forum that will meet in place of the annual meeting of the Resolutions Committee. Sponsors of resolutions or a surrogate must be present at this forum to present and respond to questions concerning their resolution. It is imperative that someone be present who can speak to the substance of the proposed resolution.

- During the 2010 Annual Business Meeting, the resolutions will be presented (including any modifications or revisions) by the Vice-President as a package for approval for action by the attending membership. The membership will vote on proposed resolutions that were discussed and revised on the first day of the meeting. Experience shows that the Annual Business Meeting fails to provide sufficient time for a detailed discussion of resolutions. If objections from the floor are raised to any specific resolution at this year’s Business Meeting, that resolution can, by majority vote of those present, be singled out from the package, and voted on separately. Those present can either support the resolution for approval as proposed or decide to table the resolution for further discussion at the subsequent year’s annual meeting.
• If the resolution requires letters or e-mails to be sent, the sponsor of the resolution must provide the addresses to the Administrative Office and, if necessary, be prepared to assist the Administrative Office in getting the resolution to the appropriate individuals or agencies. Furthermore, sponsors are apprised of developments pertaining to the issue(s) addressed in a resolution.

• We will attempt to make approved resolutions immediately available to the press. In addition, all approved resolutions will be submitted for publication in the fall issue of the Social Problems Forum: The SSSP Newsletter and posted on the SSSP website.

Members who wish to propose resolutions for consideration of the SSSP, should submit them to the appropriate Division Chairperson(s) (see [http://www.sssp1.org/index.cfm/m/21](http://www.sssp1.org/index.cfm/m/21) for current contact information) and directly to the SSSP Vice-President at pjmegann@umich.edu by July 1, 2010.

PJ McGann, SSSP Vice-President, 2009-2010

**SUGGESTIONS FOR THE SUBMISSION OF PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS:**

Here are some suggestions that may help enhance resolutions submitted for consideration by the Society:

• **Local awareness:** A resolution which addresses an issue of urgent concern for the city or region where the annual meeting is taking place is highly desirable. Thus, a more general or globally-oriented resolution can be strengthened if it makes the extra effort to cite any local aspect or manifestation of the problem which can help dovetail with the larger concern. Clearly, matters of local concern are more likely to be of interest to the local media.

• **Urgency:** Resolutions that embody some urgent or timely matter involving some current manifestation of a larger social problem are highly desirable. This can relate, for example, to pending legislation, policies and programs, a recently released report, and so on. Resolutions that address urgent matters are much more likely to be picked up by the press.

• **Action-oriented:** All resolutions should attempt to incorporate a call for action, be it on the part of the SSSP Board, or for concerned individuals. If action is requested on the part of the SSSP, it should be as specific as possible, e.g., to whom should a letter be directed, etc. In the past, other proposed actions have included calls for boycotts, participation in public demonstrations, collecting donations, and so on.

• **Resource pointer:** A resolution which is accompanied by a specific resource or resource list is extremely useful for those who wish to learn more about the issue at hand. The resource supplement can be a specific document or scholarly paper, website(s), or some other useful repository of information. This can be very helpful in increasing the impact of the resolution by assisting teachers, students, the press and others who wish to have further background information in engaging the issue for their own specific purposes.
#### WELCOME NEW MEMBERS

The Society for the Study of Social Problems would like to welcome the 421 members who joined since May 24, 2009 (prepared 5/28/10):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gordon Abner</th>
<th>Alison R. Buck</th>
<th>Beth A. Easterling</th>
<th>Barbara Gurr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taylan C. Acar</td>
<td>Grace Budrys</td>
<td>Brenda Eaton</td>
<td>Shobha Gurung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timothy J. Adkins</td>
<td>Michael Burawoy</td>
<td>Marianne Egger de Campo</td>
<td>Linda Gutierrez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachelle C. Adrian</td>
<td>Jean Burton</td>
<td>Emily Eisenhauer</td>
<td>Terrence Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Agnich</td>
<td>Melissa D. Busher</td>
<td>Debbie Entrek</td>
<td>Judith Harmony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ojo M. Agunbiade</td>
<td>Rachel Butts</td>
<td>Alexis B. Espinoza</td>
<td>Erin E. Hatton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Akinyemi</td>
<td>Rob Callaghan</td>
<td>Monica Evans</td>
<td>Raymond He</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Alaniz</td>
<td>Lori Ann Campbell</td>
<td>Rhea Evans</td>
<td>Melanie Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodrigo Alatríste-Díaz</td>
<td>Howard Caro-Lopez</td>
<td>William McKee Evans</td>
<td>Geraldine M. Hendrix-Sloan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Alba</td>
<td>Jennifer Carter</td>
<td>Daniel R. Faber</td>
<td>Wendy F. Hensel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel Allison</td>
<td>Marguerite F. Cashen</td>
<td>Ben Feldmeyer</td>
<td>Luisa Heredia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Alvarenga</td>
<td>Erin Ann Cech</td>
<td>Deborah Felker</td>
<td>Alan G. Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn Anderson</td>
<td>Samara Chapple</td>
<td>Barbara S. Fisher</td>
<td>Leslie Hinkson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Apel</td>
<td>Melinda Chateauvert</td>
<td>Tory Fisher</td>
<td>Tara L. Hobson-Prater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingalil Atala</td>
<td>Jia-shin Chen</td>
<td>David S. Fitzgerald</td>
<td>Christine L. Holman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristen Atkinson</td>
<td>Giuseppina Chiri</td>
<td>Kathleen J. Fitzgerald</td>
<td>Thomas P. Horjes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bette E. Avila</td>
<td>Emmie Cochran-Jackson</td>
<td>Jasmine J. Flederjohann</td>
<td>Inga Hornei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher A. Bail</td>
<td>Morella Coello</td>
<td>Sarah Flogen</td>
<td>Yu-ling Huang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chasity Bailey-Fakhoury</td>
<td>Julie Cohara</td>
<td>David Flores</td>
<td>Jessica Huffman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sasikumar Balasundaram</td>
<td>Erin Comartin</td>
<td>Louise Marie Folkmann</td>
<td>Pam M. Hunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendra H. Barber</td>
<td>Sonya Conner</td>
<td>Kathryn E. Forbes</td>
<td>Valerie Hunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina E. Barnon</td>
<td>Meredith Conover-Williams</td>
<td>Walter Forrest</td>
<td>Virginia Hustig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josephine Barnett</td>
<td>Jennifer Correa</td>
<td>John D. Foster</td>
<td>David J. Hutson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. J. Barrios</td>
<td>Marci Cottingham</td>
<td>John Fox</td>
<td>Hiroki Igarashi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pascal Barth</td>
<td>Jack Taft Crepeau</td>
<td>Jonathan Fox</td>
<td>Lanre Ikuteyijio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernadette Barton</td>
<td>Remy Cross</td>
<td>David E. Frank</td>
<td>Patrick Inglis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haram bastas</td>
<td>Angela Cryer</td>
<td>Ellen Frankenstein</td>
<td>Aubrey L. Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wenda Bauchspies</td>
<td>Elliott Currie</td>
<td>Rong Fu</td>
<td>Patricia Cowes Jacobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cesar E. Bautista</td>
<td>Anna Curtis</td>
<td>Yuko Fujino</td>
<td>Leah M. Janssen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Baxter-Jensen</td>
<td>Craig Dale</td>
<td>Mary Gallagher</td>
<td>Shauna L. Janz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Beaman</td>
<td>Gayle D’Andrea</td>
<td>Pedro Gallo</td>
<td>Kareem D. Jenkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo Ann Beine</td>
<td>Stephanie D’Auria</td>
<td>Ana Maria Garcia</td>
<td>Dorothy Penny Jennings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue E. Bell</td>
<td>Georgiann Davis</td>
<td>Kiara Garcia</td>
<td>Lindsey Marie Jerald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex S. Bennett</td>
<td>Natalie M. Delia</td>
<td>Lorena Garcia</td>
<td>Syeda S. Jesmin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremy Bennett</td>
<td>Deckard</td>
<td>Marco Z. Garrido</td>
<td>Xin Jiang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meredith Bergey</td>
<td>Amy Dellinger Page</td>
<td>Leslie C. Gates</td>
<td>Hortencia Jimenez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chase M. Billingham</td>
<td>Joshua DeLorme</td>
<td>Monnica Gavin</td>
<td>Emmitt H. Johnkin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jillian E. Birum</td>
<td>Meredith P. Denney</td>
<td>Robert Gebil</td>
<td>Samantha Jean Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura M. Bisaillon</td>
<td>Kristen A. Desjarlais-deKlerk</td>
<td></td>
<td>Carl C. Jorgensen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LisaRose Blanchette</td>
<td>Jason Oliver Dixon</td>
<td>Shaun Genter</td>
<td>Lauren Joseph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Bodnar</td>
<td>Regina Dixon-Reeves</td>
<td>Melissa Gesbeck Howell</td>
<td>Michael Kaune</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modoulamin Bojang</td>
<td>Cindy B. Dollar</td>
<td>Danielle Gifford</td>
<td>Emily Kazyak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Borchert</td>
<td>Mamyrah A. Douge-Proser</td>
<td>Tim Gill</td>
<td>Matthew Kearney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie Boydstun</td>
<td>Dawn M. Dow</td>
<td>Dawna M. Goens</td>
<td>Ronald C. Kessler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanya Golash Boza</td>
<td>Ebony Michelle Duncan</td>
<td>Julie-Ann Goodman</td>
<td>David A. Kinney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth K. Bozzelli</td>
<td>Mary Ellen Dunn</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>Kreg Kirkham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Brainer</td>
<td>Jennifer Earrings</td>
<td>Sonya Goshe</td>
<td>Lucas O. Kirkpatrick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avi Brisman</td>
<td>John M. Eason</td>
<td>Jennifer B. Green</td>
<td>Jana N. Knibb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magaly Brodeur</td>
<td>Michele Martha Easter</td>
<td>Sara Greene</td>
<td>John Koch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Brose</td>
<td></td>
<td>Elizabeth Griffiths</td>
<td>Stacia L. Kock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristi Brownfield</td>
<td></td>
<td>Diana Maritza Guclespe</td>
<td>Matt Bryan D. Kopas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer L. Buchan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kimberlee S. Guenther</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FILM EXHIBIT SCHEDULE

The film exhibit is scheduled for **Saturday, August 14** at the Sheraton Atlanta Hotel. It is organized by Program Committee Chair Glenn W. Muschert, Miami University.

**12:30pm – 2:10pm**

*AINT I A PERSON*

*with apologies to Sojourner Truth*

This is a screening of a film in progress. The filmmakers (both SSSP members) invite the SSSP members to view portions of the film, and then to offer critical comments. A part of the film will focus on how poverty has been seen at different times in U. S. history and examine current and historical social welfare policy. The core of the film will be stories from the poor (and near-poor) about how they manage their lives and families - finding decent housing, adequate jobs and pay, dealing with sick children and health problems, finding affordable and quality day care, dealing with the education of their children – which are problems that most of us face in this society. Many of the people in the film, like many of the poor, work more than one job out of necessity. They are the people we see as cashiers in stores, as receptionists and workers in offices. They are the people who clean buildings, who paint houses, who fix cars, drive school buses, etc. Our goals with this film project are two-fold: first, to dispel some of the myths that are now rampant about poverty; and, second, to bring a human face back to poverty.

The filmmakers would like to show about 30 - 45 minutes of the film. They would then invite attendees to comment on what they have seen and to offer comments that may be incorporated in the final product. People should feel free to comment on the films effectiveness, message, graphics, the role of documentaries in advocacy, etc.

**2:30pm – 4:10pm**

**EATING ALASKA**

What happens to a vegetarian who moves to Alaska and marries a commercial fisherman and deer hunter? Join her on a wry search for a sustainable, healthy and ethical meal. Women try to teach her to hunt, teens gather traditional foods, vegans give cooking lessons, she fishes for wild salmon, scrutinizes food labels with kids and finds toxic chemicals getting into wild foods. With humor and compassion, the documentary *Eating Alaska* shows natives and non-natives trying to balance buying industrial processed foods with growing their own and living off the land in the 21st century. Made by a former urban vegetarian now living on an island in Alaska, it is a journey into regional food traditions, our connection to where we live and what we put into our mouths.

Ellen Frankenstein, filmmaker, will introduce the film and answer questions following the screening.

**4:30pm – 6:10pm**

**THE YES MEN FIX THE WORLD**

*The Yes Men Fix the World* is a screwball true story that follows two daring and imaginative political activists - Andy Bichlbaum and Mike Bonanno - as they infiltrate the world of big business and pull off outrageous pranks that highlight how corporate greed is destroying the planet.

One day Andy, purporting to be a Dow Chemical spokesperson, gets on the biggest TV news program in the world (BBC World News) and announces that Dow will finally clean up the site of the largest industrial accident in history, the Bhopal catastrophe. The result: as people worldwide celebrate, Dow’s stock value loses two billion dollars. People want Dow to do the right thing, but the market decides that it can’t. The reality hits Andy and Mike like a ton of bricks: we have created a market system that makes doing the right thing impossible, and the people who appear to be leading are actually following its pathological dictates.

At conference after conference, the Yes Men try to wake up their corporate audiences to this frightening prospect, in the process taking on some of the world’s biggest corporations. On their journey, the Yes Men delve deep into the question of why we have given the market more power than any other institution to determine our direction as a society.

As they appear on the BBC before 300 million viewers, or before 1,000 New Orleans contractors alongside Mayor Ray Nagin, the layers of lies are peeled back to reveal the raw heart of truth - a truth that brings with it hope.

Directed by Andy Bichlbaum and Mike Bonanno
Produced by The Yes Men
Length: 87 minutes; US Release Date: 2009
ANNOUNCING THE

FINALISTS for the
2009 C. WRIGHT MILLS AWARD
(in alphabetical order)

Jennifer Jihye Chun, Organizing at the Margins: The Symbolic Politics of Labor in South Korea and the United States, Cornell University Press


Allison J. Pugh, Longing and Belonging: Parents, Children and Consumer Culture, University of California Press

Raka Ray and Seemin Qayum, Cultures of Servitude: Modernity, Domesticity, and Class in India, Stanford University Press


Mario Luis Small, Unanticipated Gains: Origins of Network Inequality in Everyday Life, Oxford University Press


The C. Wright Mills Award will be presented on Saturday, August 14 at the SSSP Awards Banquet.

C. WRIGHT MILLS AWARD COMMITTEE

Debra Street, Chair, University at Buffalo, SUNY
Gale E. Miller, Chair-Elect, Marquette University
Elizabeth A. Armstrong, University of Michigan
Stephanie Woodham Burge, University of Oklahoma
Danielle Antoinette Hidalgo, University of California at Santa Barbara
Leslie Hinkson, Georgetown University
Margaret Hunter, Mills College
Brian C. Kelly, Purdue University
YOU’RE CORDially INVITED TO ATTEND
A RECEPTION HONORING OUR PAST PRESIDENTS
and the
AWARDS BANQUET
at
The Sheraton Atlanta Hotel
165 Courtland Street NE
Saturday, August 14
Reception: 6:45pm - 7:45pm
Banquet: 8:00pm - 10:00pm

AWARDS TO BE PRESENTED

SSSP Division Awards: Winners of various student paper competitions and other division awards will be announced.

Beth B. Hess Memorial Scholarship: This $3,500 scholarship will be awarded to a new or continuing graduate student who began her or his study in a community college or technical school.

C. Wright Mills Award: For a distinguished book that exemplifies outstanding social science research and an understanding of the individual and society in the tradition of C. Wright Mills.

Joseph B. Gittler Award: For significant scholarly achievement that a SSSP member has made in contributing to the ethical resolution of social problems.

Lee Founders Award: For recognition of significant achievements that have demonstrated continuing devotion to the ideals of the founders of the Society and especially to the humanistic tradition of the Lee’s.

Racial/Ethnic Minority Graduate Scholarship: This $12,000 scholarship is given annually for support of graduate study and commitment to a career of scholar-activism.

Thomas C. Hood Social Action Award: This $1,000 award is given to a not-for-profit organization in the Atlanta area in recognition of challenging social inequalities, promoting social change, and/or working toward the empowerment of marginalized peoples.

Join us for a catered reception with a cash bar honoring our past presidents. The reception is complimentary to SSSP members and will be held in the Garden Courtyard. The awards banquet will be held in the Capital North Ballroom.

The buffet will feature Spinach and Arugula Salad with Choice of Dressing; Grilled Vegetable Salad; Grilled Chicken Breast; Vegetable Lasagna; Pan Seared Salmon with Lemon Thyme Butter; Mashed Sweet Potatoes; Oven Roasted Potatoes; Vegetable Rice Pilaf; Selection of Seasonal Vegetables; Freshly Baked Rolls and Butter; Chef’s Choice of Assorted Desserts, including Bread Pudding; Freshly Brewed Coffee and Iced Tea. A vegan dish will be available for those who request one. A cash bar will be available. Come celebrate with your friends and colleagues and enjoy the evening!

The reception is complimentary to SSSP members.
The cost of a banquet ticket is $60 per person.

A limited number of banquet tickets will be sold in the registration area.
Those with advance reservations will receive their tickets with their registration materials.
Dear Annual Meeting Presenters and Organizers:

The Society for the Study of Social Problems (SSSP) has arranged with The Scholar’s Choice to manage the book exhibit for our 60th Annual Meeting taking place August 13-15, 2010, at the Sheraton Atlanta Hotel in Atlanta, GA. It will be possible for your recently-published books to be included in their display. Please refer to the guidelines below:

Any members interested in having their book displayed at the upcoming SSSP meeting should contact their publisher as soon as possible. Please keep in mind that the publishers pay a fee to display with The Scholar’s Choice and may not have the marketing budget necessary to honor all requests, particularly for older titles. The Scholar’s Choice asks that books be appropriate to the meeting and published recently. Reservations from the publishers will be accepted on a first-come, first-served basis. ALL requests must come from the publishers, not the author. Debby Pitts is the contact at The Scholar’s Choice. Your publisher may reach her at djpitts@scholarschoice.com or (585) 262-2048 x.108.

The Scholar’s Choice has a long and successful history of managing academic book exhibits and we welcome them to our meeting.

Most sincerely,

JoAnn L. Miller, SSSP President

---

Call for SSSP Nominations

Nominations and elections for the following positions are conducted every year: President-Elect, a Vice-President Elect, regular and student members of the Board of Directors, members of the Budget, Finance, and Audit Committee, Committee on Committee, Editorial and Publications Committee, and the Membership and Outreach Committee. Please consider nominating a colleague or yourself for one of these offices. To complete an online nomination form for elected offices, go to http://www.sssp1.org/index.cfm/pageid/1082/.

Nominations should include a brief description of the nominee’s SSSP involvement and other relevant experiences. The Nominations Committee will meet at the Annual Meeting in Atlanta, GA. All nominations should be submitted prior to July 15, 2010. The Board of Directors will approve the slate of candidates for the 2011 General Election on August 15, 2010. If you have any questions, please contact Stephani Williams, Chairperson, Council of the Special Problems Divisions, stephani.williams@gmail.com.
Why should I stay at the SSSP convention hotel during the Annual Meeting?

This is a frequently asked question by our members. Another hotel may be cheaper or closer to the ASA hotel. A friend may offer to share a room at another hotel. Staying at the SSSP convention hotel saves the Society money. Please consider these reasons.

- In order to secure a favorable sleeping room rate and to avoid paying high meeting room rental costs, SSSP must guarantee with the hotel that our members will occupy a certain number of room nights. To honor our contract, we must utilize 650 sleeping room nights over our meeting dates (SSSP reservation deadline: July 21, 2010).

- In the event that we do not meet our sleeping room guarantee, the hotel will charge the Society an additional fee for using the meeting space in which we hold our sessions.

- The ‘room pick-up’ actual rooms occupied, during the days of our contract, by SSSP members has implications for the final hotel bill. Terms of the contract grant the Society a number of complimentary rooms used to house officers and other volunteers who give their time to the organization. In the event that our ‘room pick-up’ is low, we must pay for these rooms.

- Hotels review our ‘room pick-up’ history when we request a bid for holding a future annual meeting. A favorable record (meeting or exceeding our room block) helps the hotel feel assured of a certain level of income. Hotels make their money by having as full occupancy as possible. Saving rooms for convention goers who do not occupy them means that they may have an empty room that could have been sold to someone not attending the convention.

- Members attending the convention should reserve a room for the nights they will attend and honor their reservation. This action helps save the Society money and improves the experience.

- Staying at the convention hotel provides many advantages. The banquet takes place at the convention hotel, as do the receptions, most parties, and special events. You have the opportunity to renew acquaintances with other members and meet newcomers. Informal gatherings are easy to arrange because the largest proportion of our members will stay at the convention hotel.

So . . . please stay . . .

Héctor L. Delgado, Executive Officer
Michele Koontz, Administrative Officer & Meeting Manager
The Society for the Study of Social Problems  
60th Annual Meeting Registration  
August 13-15, 2010  
The Sheraton Atlanta Hotel, 165 Courtland Street NE, Atlanta, GA 30303  
(Program Participant Deadline: Program participants must preregister by May 31.)

Last Name: ___________________________________________ First/Middle Name: __________________________

Work Affiliation(s) for name badge: ________________________________________________________________

___ Check here if you would like to be identified as working outside academia so that you may meet other engaged non-academics.

Preferred Mailing Address: _______________________________________________________________________

Work #: ___________________ Home #: ___________________ Mobile #: ___________________

E-mail: _______________________________ Personal Website: _______________________________

**REGISTRATION FEES + (US DOLLARS): Check one**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Preregistration (until July 15)</th>
<th>On-Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member Registration Including Banquet*</td>
<td>$185</td>
<td>$210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member Registration</td>
<td>$125</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student/Unemployed/Emeritus Member Registration Including Banquet*</td>
<td>$90</td>
<td>$110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student/Unemployed/Emeritus Member Registration</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Member Registration (for non-exempt presenters who do not wish to become members)</td>
<td>$190</td>
<td>$215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Member Student Registration (for non-exempt student presenters who do not wish to become members)</td>
<td>$95</td>
<td>$115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GUEST REGISTRATION:** One guest registration is permitted with each full registration category above. Guest registration provides a name badge (name only, no affiliation). Any guest who wants full access to the program, including special events and a program packet, must register individually and pay the full registration fee and membership dues. Program participants are not eligible for the guest registration fee.

Guest (name badge only) $15 $20

Guest Badge: ___________________________________________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First/Middle Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ADDITIONAL BANQUET TICKET/S:** Saturday, August 14, 8:00pm - 10:00pm, tickets $60 each*  
Number of vegan entrees needed. ______________________________

**DONATE A BANQUET TICKET PROGRAM:**  
Donate a banquet ticket to a deserving graduate student, foreign scholar, or scholar-activist, tickets $60 each  
________________________

**AIDS FUNDRAISER RAFFLE TICKET/S:** tickets $5 each
There will be a raffle for a two-night hotel stay at The Sheraton Atlanta Hotel, the 2010 SSSP conference hotel. The voucher can be applied to your 2010 conference stay. The winner will be announced at the awards banquet. You do not have to be present to win.  
________________________

**MEMBERSHIP DUES:** You must be a current member to attend the Annual Meeting unless you pay non-member registration. **If you are already a 2010 member, skip this section.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Membership Dues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life Members, Emeriti</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>$30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>$30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired Member</td>
<td>$45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Time Professional Member</td>
<td>$45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$24,999 and under</td>
<td>$70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000-$34,999</td>
<td>$90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000-$44,999</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GRAND TOTAL**
Make check or money order payable, in US DOLLARS to SSSP or provide credit card authorization below.

Credit Card Type:  □ Visa  □ MasterCard  □ Discover  □ American Express

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credit Card Number</th>
<th>Expiration Date</th>
<th>Signature (mandatory)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**DEADLINE:** Forms and payments must be postmarked by/faxed no later than July 15 to be eligible for the preregistration discount. Preregistration ends on July 15. Any forms postmarked/faxed after July 15 will be processed at the on-site rate. All program participants must preregister by May 31 in order to have their names listed in the preliminary online and final programs.

**REFUND POLICY:** Registration fees will be refunded to persons who notify us prior to July 15. Once the final program is printed and participant packets have been prepared, the cost of processing the participant has occurred. Unfortunately, under no circumstances will SSSP issue refunds for no-shows.

**PERMISSION TO USE PHOTO POLICY:** By registering for the SSSP conference, attendees hereby agree to allow SSSP and affiliates to use any photos taken of them during the conference in news media, web site, publications, promotions, articles, marketing pieces, etc.

**ACCESSIBILITY SERVICES:** Registrants with disabilities may request accessibility services such as sign language interpreters, sighted guides, etc., to facilitate their full participation in the Annual Meeting. If you need accessible accommodations or other services, please alert us to your needs no later than July 15. The Administrative Officer will contact you about service arrangements.

□ Accessible Services Request:

**DONATE A BANQUET TICKET PROGRAM:** Some members purchase extra banquet tickets for graduate students, foreign scholars, and scholar-activists. Check the box below if you are interested in applying for a complimentary ticket. Donated tickets will be distributed on a first come/first served basis. SSSP will notify all recipients no later than July 15.

□ Consider me for a complimentary banquet ticket. Indicate your classification:  □ Graduate Student  □ Foreign Scholar  □ Scholar-Activist

**MENTORSHIP PROGRAM:** Would you like to participate in the annual meeting mentorship program? If yes, submit your mentoring request no later than June 30. The Lee Student Support Fund Committee will pair you with a mentor and provide you with his/her contact information no later than July 15.

□ Yes  □ No  If yes, list your areas of interest.

**WE NEED MENTORS.** Would you be willing to serve as a mentor for a graduate student or new faculty member?

□ Yes  □ No  If yes, list your areas of interest.

**ROOMMATE MATCHING SERVICE:** Would you like to participate in the roommate matching service? If yes, the Administrative Office will send you a list with contact information for those who are interested in sharing a room no later than June 30. Indicate your smoking preference.

□ Yes  □ No  □ Smoking  □ Non-smoking  □ No preference

**SSSP Saddened by Loss of Former President Clinard**

Former SSSP President Marshall Barron Clinard died at St. Vincent's Hospital in Santa Fe, NM on May 30, 2010, at age 98. He was born in Boston, MA on November 12, 1911, the son of Gladys Barron and Andrew Marshall Clinard. Marshall was educated at Governor Drummer Academy, Stanford University, and the University of Chicago.

Marshall taught at the University of Iowa, Vanderbilt University, and at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. He received many teaching awards and was a popular professor who attracted many students, including 17 Ph.D. students. He wrote over 40 articles and 11 books, including Sociology of Deviant Behavior, a major textbook now in its 14th edition, and Corporate Crime. Marshall received numerous awards and was an active member of his professional organizations, including the American Sociological Society and the Society for the Study of Social Problems, of which he served as President. He served in several United Nations Congresses and was awarded an honorary LL.D. from the University of Lausanne, the Donald Cressey Award, the Edwin H. Sutherland Award for Distinguished Contributions to Criminology, and the Gilbert Geis Lifetime Achievement Award.

Marshall is survived by his second wife, Arlen Runzler Westbrook, his children Marshall Clinard and Stephen Clinard, his grandchildren Eric Schacht, Marshall Schacht, Amy Clinard, and Andrew Clinard, and by his great-grandchildren Madison, Kayley, Noelle, Wade, and Tanner. His son Lawrence Clinard and his first wife, Ruth Clinard, preceded him in death.

**GENERAL INQUIRIES SHOULD BE SENT TO:**
Michele Koontz, Administrative Officer & Meeting Manager
W: 865-689-1531; F: 865-689-1534; E-mail: mkoontz2@utk.edu

+ Requests for exemption from meeting registration and membership dues must be approved by Program Committee Chair Glenn W. Muschert, muschewg@muohio.edu. When sending an e-mail, place SSSP in the subject line. Eligibility requirements for exemptions are posted on our website.
SSSP ANNUAL MEETING HOTEL RESERVATION INFORMATION

GROUP:    THE SOCIETY FOR THE SOCIAL STUDY OF SOCIAL PROBLEMS

DATE:    AUGUST 10-18, 2010

RATE:    $149 per night (standard single/double/triple/quadruple)
          Rate is exclusive of 15% tax and subject to change without notice

HOTEL:
Our 765 room property located in the heart of downtown amid the top cultural, entertainment, sports and tourist attractions is Atlanta’s 6th largest meeting and convention property. More than $50 million has recently been invested upgrading all its meeting and conference spaces and $20 million in guest room and architectural enhancements. This has propelled the Sheraton Atlanta’s evolution from an unpretentious property into a stylishly designed, energy efficient, environmentally responsible, 21st century hotel.

GUESTROOMS:
The Sheraton Atlanta is spending $20 million on a capital improvement and enhancement program encompassing all facets of the 760 guest room and conference center hotel. All rooms feature a spacious desk area with task lighting, telephones with data ports and plenty of personal comforts. And, to make your experience even more convenient, we added in-room video, bill review and check-out. But we didn’t forget the little things either, like making sure you have a complimentary weekday newspaper. You also will have access to high speed internet for only $9.95 per/day.

RESERVATIONS:
To book, modify or cancel a reservation go to: http://www.starwoodmeeting.com/Book/sssp2010. You can also call the hotel directly during the hours of 9:00am-5:30pm (EST) at 404-659-6500 or Central Reservations department at 800-833-8624 (24hrs). When you call to make your reservation please give the name of the group to ensure you are given the correct room rate. Each reservation must be guaranteed with a credit card and will be charged one night room and tax when you book your reservation. Check in is at 3:00pm and check-out is at noon. There must be a 72 hour notice for cancellation prior to arrival. Any cancellation made after this will forfeit one night room and tax.

CUT-OFF DATE:
Reservation must be confirmed by July 21, 2010 at 12:00am (EST) to guarantee a room rate of $149.00. Reservations made after July 21st or after the room block is filled are subject to non-availability and rate increase.
Questions that you may have about the SSSP Annual Meeting....
but are too embarrassed to ask.
(Original piece written by Deborah Thorne, 2007 Program Committee)

→ **Who chooses the “theme” of the SSSP annual meeting?**
The SSSP president selects the theme of the annual meeting—that’s one of the benefits of being president!

→ **What are all of the “divisions” within SSSP?**
Within the SSSP, there are twenty-two subgroups organized around specific topics and interests—these are called special problems divisions. For example, for folks interested in issues of race and ethnicity, there is the Racial and Ethnic Minorities division. If you are interested in environmental issues, you might want to join the Environment and Technology division. Are you a budding theorist (or any kind of theorist for that matter)? If so, you might want to check out the Social Problems Theory division. These divisions provide a great opportunity to meet others who share your academic interests.

→ **The program lists many different types of sessions: plenary, thematic, and special. What do all of these mean?**
**Plenary Sessions:** Essentially, “plenary” just means everyone. Thus, the plenary sessions are sessions to which everyone attending the meeting is invited. At SSSP, there are two plenary sessions: the business meeting and the Presidential Address. Typically, the business meeting is held on the second day and the Presidential Address immediately follows. The plenary sessions are so important that there are never any other sessions/committee meetings planned at the same time.

**Thematic Sessions:** Topics covered in the thematic sessions reflect the theme of the annual meeting.

**Special Sessions:** Topics for the special sessions are typically generated by members of the Program Committee (this is the committee that helps the president organize the program for the annual meeting). Sometimes the Program Committee members organize the sessions but arrange for others to be the discussants; other times, the Program Committee members lead the sessions themselves. Special sessions typically include things like talks with high-profile sociologists, meet-the-author events, teaching workshops, spotlight on the Thomas C. Hood Social Action Award winner, film exhibit, presentations of student award-winning papers, and panels on particularly timely topics.

→ **The program lists an entire page of “committee” and “divisional” meetings. Which ones can I attend?**
**All of them? Or are some just for the committee members?**
Committee Meetings are only open to members of that particular committee unless stated otherwise. However, Divisional Meetings are open to anyone who is interested. These are divisional meetings associated with all twenty-two special problems divisions— for example, Crime and Juvenile Delinquency, Disabilities, Drinking and Drugs, Law and Society, Poverty, Class and Inequality, Sport, Leisure, and the Body, and Teaching Social Problems (to name just a very few). If you want to get involved in one of these divisions, these are great meetings to attend!

→ **What if I want to serve on an “appointed committee”? How do I get appointed?**
When you pay your annual dues, the form asks if you want to serve on any of the appointed committees—if you do, just check the respective box! The Administrative Office will give your name to the Committee on Committees. In addition, it never hurts to make your desires known to a few folks on the committee!

→ **What if I want to serve on an “elected committee”? How do I get appointed?**
Nominations are open for candidates to run in the 2011 General Election (President-Elect, Vice-President Elect, regular and student members of the Board of Directors, members of the Budget, Finance, and Audit Committee, Committee on Committee, Editorial and Publications Committee, and the Membership and Outreach Committee). Please consider nominating a colleague or yourself for one of these offices by completing the [online nomination form](http://www.sssp1.org/index.cfm/pageid/1082/) by July 15, 2010. The Nominations Committee will meet at the Annual Meeting. The Board of Directors will approve the slate of candidates for the 2011 General Election on August 15, 2010.
May 5, 2010

The Honorable Jan Brewer
Governor of Arizona
1700 West Washington
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Dear Governor Brewer:

We are writing on behalf of the members of the Board of Directors of the Society for the Study of Social Problems (SSSP), whose names and affiliations appear on the letterhead, to express our deep concern with Senate Bill 1070 which you signed into law on April 23, 2010. By making it a state crime to be in Arizona without federal authorization, and also making it a punishable offense to live with or befriend someone without the appropriate documents to live or work in the United States, SB 1070 criminalizes over one-million decent human beings who live, work, pay taxes, and raise their families in Arizona. In addition, the enforcement of such a constitutionally questionable and procedurally vague law threatens everyone’s civil rights.

The SSSP is a non-partisan professional organization of scholars, educators and practitioners who study and seek solutions for the social problems afflicting our communities and country. As such, our membership is both knowledgeable about and concerned with the problems associated with immigration and with immigration enforcement. While immigration reform in the United States may be overdue, we also know that using this to justify state laws that usurp federal authority over immigration will create many more legal and social problems than it resolves.

Police officers are not immigration officers. Putting them in the position of enforcing federal immigration law will destroy the trust between police officers and communities that is necessary for effective law enforcement. It will also lead to unwarranted and prolonged detention of citizens and legal residents, increasing the likelihood of civil rights litigation against police departments, cities, and towns. Finally, despite language ostensibly prohibiting racial profiling, racial profiling will be the de facto reality of its implementation. Physical appearance, and in Arizona this means appearing to be of Hispanic background, will unavoidably remain the primary factor determining whether someone is or is not asked to prove her or his citizenship or residency status. For all these reasons law enforcement leaders across the country, as well as in Arizona, oppose this law. It
would be wise to heed the objections of the law enforcement leaders who are now faced with enforcing this bad law.

For some, the stated intent of SB 1070 unequivocally is to cleanse Arizona of its undocumented immigrants and their families, among them children and other relatives born in the United States, as evidenced by the fact that legislative supporters of this law have repeatedly and proudly described this as part of a strategy to make life so unbearable for undocumented residents and their families that they will leave the state. Any law whose goal and effect is to drive an ethnic population to leave its place of residence is a crime against humanity under current international law. SB 1070 risks making Arizona a pariah state on the international as well as national stage. Furthermore, whatever the intent, at minimum this law will create a climate of fear so intense as to make these workers even more vulnerable and therefore much easier to exploit by unscrupulous employers. Denying immigrant workers protections or otherwise making them more vulnerable does not stop them from coming. Rather, it simply drives them farther underground and makes them more appealing to employers.

The Board of the SSSP is now in the process of drafting a resolution to present to the membership, condemning SB 1070 and urging the Society and its members to avoid to the fullest extent possible visiting the state of Arizona and doing business with Arizona-based businesses until the law is rescinded or deemed unconstitutional by the courts. This would of course include not holding future annual meetings and other SSSP events in Arizona. We recognize the political pressure placed on you to sign the law, but we appeal to you to provide the leadership that makes public servants great public servants. Do you truly want this law to be your legacy? While many of your state’s citizens support the law, this can never be the sole measure of the justness of a law. The majority of southerners supported slavery, and later segregation. Both were wrong. Time will eventually show this law to be equally wrong. Please choose to be on the right side of history and work to rescind this law.

Sincerely,

JoAnn L. Miller, Purdue University
SSSP President, 2009-2010

Héctor L. Delgado, University of LaVerne
SSSP Executive Officer
A RESOLUTION OF THE SOCIETY FOR THE STUDY OF SOCIAL PROBLEMS (SSSP) URGING THE RESSION OF ARIZONA SENATE BILL 1070, “SUPPORT OUR LAW ENFORCEMENT AND SAFE NEIGHBORHOODS ACT.”

WHEREAS, the Society for the Study of Social Problems (SSSP), a social justice organization of scholars, educators, students, and practitioners, devoted to the study of social problems and the formulation of relevant social policies, is committed to the eradication of racial profiling and other forms of discrimination based on race, ethnicity, and national origin; and

WHEREAS, on April 23, 2010, Arizona Governor Jan Brewer signed Senate Bill 1070 (Support Our Law Enforcement and Safe Neighborhoods Act), requiring all local law enforcement officers to determine a person’s immigration status when there is a “reasonable suspicion” that the person is in the Country unlawfully, regardless of whether that person is suspected of a crime; and

WHEREAS, SB 1070 permits the arrest of a person, without a warrant, if there is probable cause to believe that the person has committed a public offense that would not normally lead to arrest such as a traffic violation or violation of a city ordinance; and

WHEREAS, the de facto reality of the implementation of SB 1070 will be the racial profiling of the Latina/o population, especially in light of the popular stereotype that all “illegals” are Mexican, despite the fact that a significant number of undocumented immigrants even in Arizona are not Latina/o, and that a racial profile does not exist for undocumented immigrants who are “white” (e.g. Irish, Greek, Canadian); and

WHEREAS, the demonization of immigrants by politicians and mass-media personalities emboldens white supremacist, anti-immigrant hate groups, militias, and armed vigilante organizations who now feel vindicated by SB 1070 to imperil the rights and even the lives of anyone who “looks illegal;” and

WHEREAS, the stated intent of SB 1070 is to drive undocumented immigrants and their families, among them children and other relatives born in the United States, out of the state, as evidenced by the fact that legislative proponents of this law have described it as a part of a strategy to make life so unbearable for undocumented residents and their families that they will leave the state, in violation of international law that considers attempts to drive an ethnic population out of its place of residence a crime against humanity; and

WHEREAS, SB 1070, even if it fails to cleanse Arizona of the targeted population, will create a climate of fear so intense that it will force immigrant workers farther underground and make them even more vulnerable to exploitation by unscrupulous employers, thereby increasing the demand for their labor, the principal reason for their presence in the state to begin with; and

WHEREAS, many constitutional scholars and legal experts have concluded that SB 1070 violates the Supremacy Clause of Article VI of the Constitution of the United States and the 14th Amendment guarantees of due process and equal protection for U.S. citizens, legal residents and visitors who are detained for suspicion of being in the Country unlawfully; and

WHEREAS, SB 1070 seriously undermines the U.S. Constitution, which grants Congress exclusive power over immigration legislation; and

WHEREAS, by requiring police officers to enforce federal immigration law, SB 1070 undermines the trust between police officers and communities essential for effective law enforcement; and

WHEREAS, the enforcement of SB 1070 will result in the unwarranted and prolonged detention of citizens and legal residents; and
NOW, THEREFORE,

BE IT RESOLVED, that until the SB 1070 is rescinded or determined to be unconstitutional by the courts, the SSSP will refrain from scheduling future annual meetings and other SSSP events in Arizona, and will urge its members, and their families and friends, and other organizations with which its members or the SSSP are affiliated, to avoid to the fullest extent possible visiting the state of Arizona or doing business with businesses based in Arizona; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the SSSP joins many other humanitarian, social justice, and anti-racism organizations and individuals in opposition to SB 1070, and urges the State of Arizona to repeal SB 1070, the “Support Our Law Enforcement and Safe Neighborhoods Act,” and directs the Administrative Office of the SSSP to send a copy of this resolution to the Governor of Arizona, the Honorable Jan Brewer, and to other public officials, organizations, and media that the Board and Administrative Office deem appropriate.

---

CALL FOR PAPERS

The Society for Applied Anthropology (SfAA) invites abstracts (sessions, papers and posters) for the Program of the 71st Annual Meeting in Seattle, WA, March 29-April 2, 2011. The theme of the Program is “Expanding the Influence of Applied Social Science.”

The Society is a multi-disciplinary association that focuses on problem definition and resolution. We welcome papers from all disciplines. The deadline for abstract submission is October 15, 2010. For additional information on the theme, abstract size/format, and the meeting, please visit our web page (www.sfaa.net, click on “Annual Meeting”).
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MEDIA CONTACTS:

Luis Fernandez, Ph.D., luis.fernandez@nau.edu, 928-523-5673
Randall Amster, J.D., Ph.D., ramster@prescott.edu, 928-350-2238

CONSORTIUM OF PROFESSIONAL AND ACADEMIC ASSOCIATIONS CONDEMNS ARIZONA IMMIGRATION LAW AND RELATED STATE POLICIES

A working group comprised of representatives from over a dozen leading professional and academic associations has issued a joint statement condemning Arizona’s immigration law (SB 1070) and related state policies such as the prohibition against Ethnic Studies programs (HB 2281), calling for these laws to be rescinded. We, the Consortium of Professional and Academic Associations, believe that these laws are inherently unjust, and that their application threatens to inflame anti-immigrant sentiments and undermine constructive solutions to the challenges faced by communities in Arizona and across the nation. We call upon the governor, legislators, and people of Arizona to work diligently and swiftly to repeal these laws.

Our organizations include members from fields including sociology, criminology, political science, peace studies, psychology, anthropology, environmental studies, Chicano/a studies, and a multitude of related areas of study. Our collective membership numbers more than 10,000 scholars, educators, and activists, with many residing in Arizona. The decision to join together in issuing the open letter below represents an unprecedented and historical moment of collaboration. As academics and professionals concerned about social and environmental justice, human rights, and due process, we add our collective voices to those of many others from across the country calling for the immediate rescission of SB 1070 (and, as amended, HB 2162) and HB 2281 in the name of equity, compassion, integrity, constitutionality, and sound public policy.

Signatories to the joint statement include representatives from the following professional organizations and academic associations, all of which have issued individual statements or otherwise indicated their opposition to and condemnation of SB 1070 and related policies (additional signatories may be added to this growing list as organizations finalize their support):

American Studies Association (ASA)
Association of Asian American Studies (AAAS)
Chicano/Latino Faculty and Staff Association, ASU (CLFSA)
Justice Studies Association (JSA)
Mujeres Activas en Letras y Cambio Social (MALCS)
National Association for Chicano and Chicana Studies (NACCS)
Native American and Indigenous Studies Association (NAISA)
Peace and Justice Studies Association (PISA)
Psychologists for Social Responsibility (PsySR)
Society for Advancement of Chicanos/Hispanics and Native Americans in Science (SACNAS)
Society for Community Research and Action (SCRA)
Society for Applied Anthropology (SfAA)
Society for the Study of Social Problems (SSSP)
Sociologists Without Borders (Sociologos Sin Fronteras) (SSF)
May 17, 2010

To Governor Brewer, the State Legislature, and the People of Arizona:

We wish to express our deep concern with and unequivocal condemnation of Senate Bill 1070, which you signed into law on April 23, 2010. By making it a state crime to be in Arizona without federal authorization, and also making it a punishable offense to support someone without the appropriate documents, SB 1070 criminalizes countless decent human beings who live, work, pay taxes, and raise their families in Arizona. In addition, the enforcement of such a constitutionally problematic law threatens everyone’s civil rights in the process, and undermines the potential for fostering an environment based on peace and social justice. We unanimously denounce this law and strenuously urge that you rescind it in the name of compassion and human dignity.

We are all non-partisan professional organizations of scholars, educators, and practitioners, with thousands of members from across the country and abroad, committed to and knowledgeable about a wide range of social justice and environmental issues. We count among our members numerous scholars and other professionals who are among the most knowledgeable in the country on the subjects of immigration, including undocumented immigration, and our legal and political systems. While immigration reform in the United States may be overdue, we also know that using this to justify state laws that usurp federal authority over immigration will create many more legal and social problems than it resolves.

Finally, by way of background and context, the following member organizations have issued specific statements condemning SB 1070, which can be found at these online locations:

SSF: http://www.petitiononline.com/ssfbyctt/petition.html
PsySR: http://www.pysr.org/about/programs/wellbeing/immigrationreform.php
NAISA: http://naisa.org/node/189
JSA: http://justicestudies.org/Print/JSAletter-arizona.pdf

A press conference featuring delegates from these organizations will be held on Wednesday, May 19, 2010, at 1PM on the Senate Lawn at the Arizona State Capitol. Representatives will each issue short statements, and then be available for questions and follow-up discussion. Confirmed participants and representatives at the press conference include:

Randall Amster, J.D., Ph.D., Executive Director, PJSA
Paul Espinosa, Ph.D., President, CLFSA
Luis Fernandez, Ph.D., Board Member, SSSP
Zoe Hammer, Ph.D., Program Committee Member, ASA
Manuel de Jesus Hernandez G., Ph.D., Former National Chair, NACCS
Marie Keta Miranda, Ph.D., Chair, MALCS
Devon Pena, Ph.D., President, NACCS
Michelle Tellez, Ph.D., Board Member, NACCS
Merrill Eisenberg, Ph.D., President Elect, SfAA

May 17, 2010
Moreover, we note that the combined effect of SB 1070 with the prohibition on Ethnic Studies contained in HB 2281 creates an atmosphere of legislated intolerance and racialized politicking that is simply untenable, unwise, and unjust. Indeed, the simple fact that SB 1070 had to be amended, under pressure following its passage, by HB 2162 (which sought to qualify the conditions for officer contact) demonstrates quite clearly the inherently flawed and potentially racist implications of this piece of legislation. We note here as well that the purported “remedy” of requiring a “stop” before officers can inquire further about legal status based a “reasonable suspicion” is equally expansive in its application, and thus equally problematic. These alterations, again adopted in haste following public pressure, will not provide sufficient protection against racial profiling.

Police officers are not immigration officers. Putting them in the position of enforcing federal immigration law will destroy the trust between police officers and communities so essential for effective law enforcement. It will also lead to unwarranted and prolonged detention of citizens and legal residents, increasing the likelihood of civil rights litigation against police departments, cities, and towns, and potentially damaging family units across the state. Despite language ostensibly prohibiting racial profiling, this will be the de facto reality of the law’s implementation. Physical appearance, particularly being of Hispanic background, will unavoidably remain the primary factor determining whether someone is or is not asked to prove her or his citizenship or residency status. For all these reasons, many law enforcement leaders across the country, as well as in Arizona, oppose this law. It would be wise to heed the objections of the law enforcement officers who are now faced with enforcing this unjust law.

For some, the stated intent of SB 1070 unequivocally is to cleanse Arizona of its undocumented immigrants and their families, among them children and other relatives born in the United States, as evidenced by the fact that legislative supporters of this law have repeatedly and proudly described this as part of a strategy to make life so unbearable for undocumented residents and their families that they will leave the state. Any law whose goal and effect is to drive an ethnic population to leave its place of residence is a crime against humanity under current international law. The law will also have the effect of separating cohesive family units, leading to increased marginalization and immiseration among communities already facing grave challenges. In this manner, SB 1070 risks making Arizona a pariah state on the national and international stages.

Furthermore, whatever the intent, at minimum this law will create a climate of fear so intense as to make low-wage workers even more vulnerable and therefore much easier to exploit by unscrupulous employers. Denying immigrant workers protections or otherwise making them more vulnerable does not stop them from coming. Rather, it simply drives them further underground and makes them more exploitable. Finally, the climate of fear and hostility that this law will create is antithetical to the aims of promoting a more just and peaceful world. By institutionalizing chauvinism and magnifying differences of race and ethnicity, SB 1070 promises to enlarge the gulf between diverse communities and pit groups against one another, rather than encouraging people to work together to find mutually-beneficial solutions to challenging issues. Ironically, and sadly, the net effect of SB 1070 will be precisely what is sought to be prohibited under HB 2281, namely that it will in practice and principle serve to “promote resentment toward a certain ethnic group.”
Opposition to this law has been rapid and strong, and is likely to become even stronger, as more and more groups and individuals boycott the state of Arizona and businesses based in Arizona. We are aware as well of the ostensible support in the state for the law, and therefore recognize the political pressures that have led you to pass this law. But widespread support for a law does not make it just; not long ago the majority of southerners supported segregation laws. As Martin Luther King, Jr. wrote in his landmark essay *Letter from a Birmingham Jail*, following the teachings of St. Augustine: “‘An unjust law is no law at all.’… Any law that degrades human personality is unjust.” It is especially in instances such as these that strong moral leadership is needed, and we are appealing to the governor, state legislators, and all concerned Arizonans to provide it. Please choose to be on the right side of history and work to overturn this patently unjust law. We thank you for your time and attention in this important matter.

Sincerely,

The Consortium of Professional and Academic Associations, including the following:

American Studies Association (ASA)
Association of Asian American Studies (AAAS)
Chicano/Latino Faculty and Staff Association, ASU (CLFSA)
Justice Studies Association (JSA)
Mujeres Activas en Letras y Cambio Social (MALCS)
Native American and Indigenous Studies Association (NAISA)
Peace and Justice Studies Association (PJSA)
Psychologists for Social Responsibility (PsySR)
Society for Advancement of Chicanos/Hispanics and Native Americans in Science (SACNAS)
Society for Community Research and Action (SCRA)
Society for the Study of Social Problems (SSSP)
Sociologists Without Borders (Sociologos Sin Fronteras) (SSF)
LETTER FROM SSSP BOARD OF DIRECTORS TO MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT OPPOSING DECISION TO RESCIND OFFER OF DEANSHIP TO DR. JODI O’BRIEN

May 10, 2010

Rev. Robert A. Wild, S.J.
Office of the President
Zilber Hall
Marquette University
Milwaukee, WI 53233

Dear President Father Wild:

We are writing on behalf of the members of the Board of Directors of the Society for the Study of Social Problems (SSSP), a professional organization of scholars, educators and practitioners who study and seek solutions for the social problems afflicting our communities and country; and, we are, as the Society for Jesus is, an organization committed to social justice. We count among our nearly 2000 members, members of your faculty who have made and continue to make enormous contributions to the SSSP. We are writing to express our deep concern with your decision to rescind Dr. Jodi O’Brien’s offer of a deanship, and especially for the reason you gave. According to a New York Times story, the reason for the rescission of the offer was that you found “some strongly negative statements about marriage and family” in her published work and, according to a story in the Milwaukee-Wisconsin Journal Sentinel, a university spokeswoman explained that the university withdrew the offer because of some of Dr. O’Brien’s scholarly work “relating to Catholic mission and identity.”

Marquette University is a respected research institution, whose reputation can be easily tarnished, perhaps irreversibly, by punishing scholars for either the nature or findings of their scholarship. Your mission statement includes the following:

**OUR MISSION is the search for truth, the discovery and sharing of knowledge, the fostering of personal and professional excellence, the promotion of a life of faith, and the development of leadership expressed in service to others.**

How can you “search for truth” and promote “professional excellence” if faculty are not free to go where their research takes them? As you know, the principal reason that academicians are among the few professions with tenure is precisely for this reason; that is, scholars must be able to discover and share knowledge, as your mission statement so eloquently states, free from fear of retribution. Your decision to rescind a respected scholar’s deanship on the basis of her research
findings not only is unjust to Dr. O'Brien, but, even worse, has a chilling effect on other scholars and thereby threatens to diminish substantially Marquette’s reputation as an institution devoted to the most cherished principles of academic scholarship.

Dr. O’Brien clearly was qualified for the position since you made her the offer in the first place. If her scholarship was subpar, she would not have been granted tenure and a full professorship by Seattle University, another Jesuit institution. We urge you, in the name of academic freedom and social justice, to reconsider your decision and appoint Dr. Jodi O’Brien as Dean, as you originally did.

Sincerely,

JoAnn L. Miller, Purdue University
SSSP President, 2009-2010

Héctor L. Delgado, University of LaVerne
SSSP Executive Officer

SSSP Executive Officer Dr. Héctor L. Delgado (right) and his son Evan participating in the May 1, 2010 march against Arizona Senate Bill 1070 in Los Angeles.

Other participants joining the Los Angeles march against Arizona Senate Bill 1070.
My Tea Party Story
Frances Fox Piven

Early this year I received a call from someone who claimed he was a student at Western Michigan State University. His class had been assigned my book *Challenging Authority*, and to fulfill his term assignment he wanted to interview me. This didn’t seem strange to me. I’m used to students who try to fill assignments with as little reading as possible. Still, since I was recovering from an auto accident, I suggested we do the interview at my apartment and thought little of it. A couple of weeks later clips from the interview showed up on the internet. I googled and discovered that the “student” was in fact an official of the Michigan Republican party and the director of a right-wing organization devoted to attacking the teachers union. Prompted by this startling discovery, I googled some more and discovered that I and my partner, Richard Cloward, were the central figures in a plan to foment crises that had led to the creation of the National Welfare Rights Organization, ACORN, were somehow connected to George Soros, had brought Barack Obama to the presidency, created the financial crisis, and much more. This Cloward Piven crisis strategy had been featured on the Glenn Beck show, complete with diagrams and connecting arrows, some 30-odd times, was also the subject of numerous right-wing blogs, and had even been the subject of a major address at the Tea Party convention.

Naturally, my students were on to this before I was, and they were delighted to have such a notorious professor. So, in a way, was I delighted. It was funny, just because it was so preposterous. The diagrams hinged on crazy connections, and the blogs were riddled with errors. But there is also something serious going on here. There are lots of Americans who are ready to believe this and similar stories that highlight a palpable villain, and make that villain the center of a narrative that explains vast political, cultural and economic changes in American society. What isn’t funny is that a lot of people discomfited by these changes find the stories convincing.

The story that Glenn beck and others tell begins oddly enough with an article that Richard and I published in *The Nation* in 1966 with the title “A Strategy to End Poverty.” The article proposed a campaign to enroll eligible people in the welfare program. We knew from out work with Mobilization for Youth on the Lower East Side in New York City that the welfare department was turning many eligible people away, sometimes giving them bus tickets to go back south. We also knew from our research that this was a widespread practice, with the consequence that less than half of those who were eligible for welfare benefits were receiving them. So we tried to think through the consequences of a campaign for full coverage, including the fiscal and political troubles it would cause in the cities, and the policy responses of a Democratic federal government that depended on its big city base, including the increasingly militant poor minorities in its urban base. We thought there was a good chance that such a welfare “crisis” would prompt a Democratic administration to federalize the program, and improve it. In fact some of the categorical assistance programs were federalized with the creation of the Supplemental Security Income program in 1974. Moreover, there was no downside to the strategy because along the way desperately poor people got welfare, food stamp and Medicaid benefits. Of course, this was a considerably more modest strategy, and a strategy for reform rather than revolution, than Glenn Beck and his ilk perceive.

Lest readers simply dismiss this sort of thing with a chuckle, I want to emphasize that slander campaigns of this sort can have serious consequences, and I don’t mean personal consequences for me. Of course, misleading people is of itself serious. But ACORN, the largest and most effective organization of poor and minority people in the country, was destroyed by this sort of campaign. One of the things that ACORN did was to register poor people to vote. A massive voter registration effort by ACORN in 2005 in the state of Florida succeeded in winning a big hike in the state minimum wage. That victory sparked a relentless series of attacks on ACORN as a criminal conspiracy to fraudulently register voters, attacks that were mindlessly echoed by the mainstream media, with the result that ACORN’s funding dried up.

I think the impulse to dismiss lunatic charges by the right in the hopes they will go away is a mistake. They aren’t going away because the attacks are effective. What we should do instead of ducking is rally to the defense of the individuals and groups that are under assault, and we should do that aggressively, proudly, even joyfully because we are standing with what is best in American politics, and especially with the social movements from below that have sometimes humanized our society. That is what drives the right crazy, and it is also what should make us proud.
True patriots are not afraid of democracy: Responding to the Tea Party assault on American politics
Dorothee Benz

A few weeks ago over dinner with Frances Fox Piven and a few other friends I was introduced to the alternate universe that is Glenn Beck’s worldview. You know, the universe in which the health care reform bill is ushering in a socialist dystopia and churches that preach “social justice” are fronts for communism and Nazism. I learned that Piven and her late co-author and partner Richard Cloward are at the center of the Tea Party right’s conspiracy theory connecting everyone from Saul Alinsky to George Soros to ACORN to Bill Ayers to MoveOn to Barack Obama in a plan to “hasten the fall of capitalism,” in David Horowitz’s words. Beck has described Piven and Cloward as the people “fundamentally responsible for the unsustainability and possible collapse of our economic system.” He has warned his audiences about the so-called “Cloward-Piven strategy” at least 32 times in the last year. Beck is regurgitating what Horowiz and James Simpson have said before him, and alarm about the Marxist plot is regularly rebroadcast throughout the right-wing blogosphere.

All of it is based on a single article Piven and Cloward wrote 44 years ago in The Nation, titled “A Strategy to End Poverty.” In an interview in January, Piven aptly summed up the absurdity of the conspiracy theory centering on her and Cloward. "Can you think of anything sillier than to attribute the financial crisis to an article in a low-circulation magazine in 1966?" she told Kyle Olson, who had told her he was a college student from Michigan when he asked for the interview.

But if we’ve learned one thing in the last two years in American politics it is that the factual basis – or lack thereof – of a statement is no indicator of its political traction. No matter how untrue or how far-fetched the claim, the political damage done by orchestrated right-wing narratives is real and substantial, and we ignore them at our peril. We need look no further than ACORN. The right combined false accusations of voter fraud, distortions and exaggerations with the highly edited secret videotaping of ACORN employees in a relentless attack against a cornerstone of poor people’s organizing in the United States in a successful campaign to destroy it.

Bypassing the marketplace of ideas for brownshirt thuggishness

The real Piven and Cloward – and anyone with even passing familiarity with their work knows that they are referred to as Piven and Cloward and never as Cloward and Piven – are renown scholars widely recognized for their work on welfare policy, social movements and voting rights. They have authored not just one article in 1966, but countless articles and essays in scholarly and popular media, along with six jointly authored books, among others (all published after 1966, by the way). Since Cloward’s death in 2001, Piven has gone on to publish The War at Home: The Domestic Costs of Bush’s Militarism (2004), Challenging Authority: How Ordinary People Change America (2006) and with new co-authors Lorraine Minnite and Margaret Groarke, Keeping Down the Black Vote: Race and the Mobilization of American Voters (2009). The couple were (and Piven remains) the very model of scholar activists. They were never too self-important to eschew work in political movements nor too self-delusional to believe the academic myth that political science is somehow above politics. My favorite picture of Cloward will always be of him at a demonstration with a picket sign that says “The rich are eating everything.”

Piven is a distinguished professor at the City University of New York Graduate Center, where she is an extraordinarily dedicated mentor to her graduate students. One former student recently reflected, “it's hard to find a scholar of her rank who works harder than she does for her students, writing endless letters of recommendation, running a dissertation workshop out of her apartment for 20 years for no faculty credit with her university…serving on dissertation committees at her home institution and at many other schools. She gives so much of herself to students and the educational ideal and she does this with enormous generosity, humor and warmth.” So when I learned
that Kyle Olson, the supposed student from Michigan, sat at that same sturdy oak table where I spent three years with my dissertating cohort, interviewing Piven under false pretenses, I was outraged. It turns out Olson is a right-wing operative who lied his way into Piven’s home, took advantage of her characteristic desire to help out a student and then broadcast excerpts of his interview on the conservative news site Big Government, the same site that published the secret ACORN recordings.

But this story isn’t really about Frances Fox Piven or Piven and Cloward, vicious *ad hominem* attacks notwithstanding (comments on the Big Government site called Piven everything from a “pinko witch” to a “pig,” and one even asked, “anyone know where she lives?”). Peter Dreier in the *Huffington Post* (“The Right’s Conspiracy Theory Attack on Frances Fox Piven”) and Richard Kim in *The Nation* (“The Mad Tea Party”) have both described the attacks on Piven and Cloward at greater length and explained their role in the right’s agenda. The larger story here, though, is about the right’s pursuit of its political goals through fundamentally undemocratic means. The attacks on Piven epitomize an entire arsenal of political weapons that is increasingly aimed at any number of targets: scare tactics, smear campaigns, scapegoating, distortions, deception, lies and raw intimidation. These are not new, of course, as Dreier points out, but their lack of originality doesn’t make them any less dangerous.

The essential point is that rather than engage in the marketplace of ideas — debating health care policy, the minimum wage or housing policy, for instance — and rather than participating in democratic politics — legislative activism in city councils, state legislatures or Congress, electoral politics or mass demonstrations, to take the most obvious examples — the Tea Party moment we find ourselves in is defined largely by fear, smear and quasi-brownshirt thuggishness. To the extent that these tactics go unchallenged and to the extent that they succeed in their political objectives, our democratic political institutions are weakened. And *that*, rather than the specifics of any one attack, is the reason that small-d democrats must respond to the right’s assault.

**From death panels to death threats**

Voter fraud is a particular fixation of the right’s and commentators wax apoplectic at the mention of reforms meant to enlarge the franchise and reverse historical patterns of disenfranchisement (such as the 1993 Motor Voter bill that Piven and Cloward helped to pass). This is not merely another political or even ideological disagreement with the left: it is the flip side of the anti-democratic political means the Tea Party right has chosen to employ in pursuit of its goals. The right’s intent, writes Kim, is to “cast doubt” on the possibility “that the democratic process could elect Obama, or that democratic majorities would endorse the agenda Obama has proposed....In its obsession with voter fraud and the potential illegitimacy of the 2008 election — and the democratic process itself — the conspiracy suggests a tit-for-tat strategy for victory: if the left is going to cynically manipulate the system to produce tyranny, then so will we.”

The Tea Party right, in other words, refuses to acknowledge the possibility that Obama’s election is the outcome of a democratic process and thus has turned to a “fight fire with fire” strategy, deliberately employing anti-democratic politics in response. A less psychoanalytic and more cynical analysis is that they know full well that democratic politics gave us a Black president and a mandate for health care reform and they’ve sized up the situation to understand that their politics cannot prevail in a democratic contest.

This picture would be incomplete without taking note of the demographics factors at work here as well — less euphemistically, racism. Frank Rich (“The Rage is Not about Health Care,” *New York Times*) noted that if Obama’s first legislative priority had been immigration reform or financial reform, the response would have been the same. “The conjunction of a black president and a female speaker of the House — topped off by a wise Latina on the Supreme Court and a powerful gay Congressional committee chairman — would sow fears of disenfranchisement among a dwindling and threatened minority in the country no matter what policies were in play.” The obvious needs to be stated: the Tea Party right is virtually all white, and the Republican Party is only marginally more diverse. “The Republicans haven’t had a single African-American in the Senate or the House since 2003 and have had only three in total since 1935. Their anxieties about a rapidly changing America are well-grounded,” Rich writes.

The passage of health care reform — despite the best efforts of the right to defeat it by any means possible — has served to escalate the resort to undemocratic political means. Last summer’s instructions to go to town hall meetings and shout
down Congress people has turned into this spring’s instructions to “break their windows. Break them NOW,” as one blogger exhorted. “These windows are not far away from where you are reading this right now. In virtually every city and county in this land, there is a local headquarters of Pelosi’s party -- the Democrat party [sic]. These headquarters invariably have windows.” On the weekend of the health care bill’s vote, protesters hurled racist and homophobic slurs at Congressmen John Lewis and Barney Frank, and Rep. Emanuel Cleaver was literally spat on by a protester. Since the vote, windows have been broken in Congressional and Democratic Party offices in Arizona, New York, Ohio, Kansas and Alaska (and in one Republican Party office in Virginia). Pictures of nooses have been faxed to Rep. James Clyburn and Rep. Bart Stupak. A gas line was severed at the home of Rep. Tom Perriello’s brother after his address was listed on a Tea Party Web site as the Congressman’s. Threatening phone calls, faxes and e-mails, ranging from “Better hope I don’t run into you in a dark alley with a knife, a club or a gun” (as reported by Rep. Betsy Markey) to outright death threats, have been received by at least nine members of Congress. One Congressional staffer (for Rep. Steve Kagen) has taken a leave of absence due to stress after answering many of the threatening calls.

Defend democratic politics by living it

Notwithstanding that the mouthpieces of the right, like Glenn Beck, almost certainly don’t believe the elaborate conspiracy theory they are promoting to rank-and-file Tea Partiers to whip them up, I still thought it curious when I first heard all this that the “Cloward-Piven strategy” should end up at the very center of the plot to “hasten the fall of capitalism.” Surely there are more promising targets than a soft-spoken elderly academic, I thought.

But upon further reflection, the obsession with discrediting Piven and Cloward’s 44-year old reflections makes a certain amount of sense (indeed, in some ways it’s the only thing that makes sense in this nonsensical ‘analysis’ of American politics…). Piven has devoted a lifetime of scholarship to studying how ordinary people, particularly poor people, can and do fight for social change to improve their lot in life. Case studies she has researched over several decades on the Revolutionary era, the abolitionist movement, the labor movement, the unemployed workers’ movement in the 30s, the welfare rights movement and the civil rights movement all underscore a basic truth: people can redress the imbalance of power and wealth in our society when they organize and disrupt business as usual. That’s the last thing that Glenn Beck wants Americans to realize and it helps explain why he and others are working overtime to offer a counter-narrative. Piven and Cloward’s diagnosis and prescription are more relevant today than ever. As Dreier put it, “[M]ost [people] would be hard-pressed to disagree with her [Piven’s] basic analysis of America’s current condition. Big corporations have too much power. The concentration of wealth has gotten out of hand. Only an outraged and organized movement for change among the poor and the middle class is likely to bring about the reforms we need.”

The Tea Party right is invested in obscuring this analysis at any cost. They want to capitalize on the anger and resentment that millions of people feel in the wake of crippling economic circumstances and bank bailouts; but more importantly, they are scared to death of people correctly analyzing their circumstances and directing their wrath and their energy at the real causes and culprits: unbridled corporate power, aided and abetted by the political class that has deregulated almost everything, stacked labor laws and trade laws in favor of capital and against workers and thus has increased social inequality and insecurity. Their goal is to immobilize or demobilize or better yet misdirect people to attack the right’s perennial targets – like progressive taxation, social safety net programs or a widened franchise – rather than the real causes of our social and economic ills.

Herein lies the answer, too, to how we should respond. We need to relearn the lessons that Piven and Cloward taught us (and if you’re not familiar with their work, go pick up Piven’s Challenging Authority for a primer). We need to lay claim to protest politics, to the power of democratic mobilization to create change and win “redress of grievances” from our government. We need to lay the blame for the sorry state of our nation squarely where it belongs and then we need to organize like hell to make it better.

The best antidote for the Tea Party’s assault on democratic politics is to redouble our own commitment to it.
The possibility that this review will be published is an indication of how much things have changed over the last 40 years in the area of feminism. I never identified myself as a feminist because as someone educated and active within the second wave of feminism I did not think it appropriate to do so. From a second wave standpoint, as a man, others could call you a feminist but it was not a label you claimed for yourself without appearing to be pretentious. Reading Finley and Stringer’s work on feminism one learns why this and many other feminist cultural norms are different today than they were 35-40 years ago.

Finley and Stringer present an excellent review of the three waves of feminism. Third wave feminism is individualistic with a focus on living out the dreams and accomplishments of the first two waves: employment opportunities that previously didn’t exist, opportunities for involvement in the political system, wealth accumulation and other amenities resulting from the radical activism of the 1960’s and 1970’s. While projecting assertiveness and confidence that will be passed down through their daughters, third wave feminists, many of whom denounce the feminist label, are perhaps best known for their interest in blurring the lines between “us” and “them” and truly treating all people as if they are equal. Men are not the enemy and seem not to be a problem for women in any particular sense. Working with men, relationships with men, having children with men, are all a natural part of life. To third wave feminists it is all right to wear high heels and make-up – even if they destroy your legs and skin (my editorial). It is alright to call other women “bitch” -- even if men still do it as well. Anything women want to do is alright – there are no barriers now. Right?

The problem with the above described third wave cultural pattern is the lack of third wave realization that their freedom is socially and media constructed – and much of social discourse and media are still controlled by men who are not fully liberated in their own thinking. Men have dreams and aspirations of their own, and women still often fit into those dreams and aspirations in fairly specific and objectified ways. Women are also seen as competition for the “men’s” jobs and opportunities. The general result, as stated by Finley and Stringer, is a brand of feminism that is not only absent a movement, but almost counter-movement in nature. This is not a problem if equality between men and women now exists and a movement is no longer necessary. Finley and Stringer are quick to point out however, that equality is far from achieved. Yes, there have been many advancements as a result of the first two waves, with women having opportunities in occupational fields previously not available to them. But those opportunities are not equal opportunities. Women must still work harder than men to get to the same place as men, and far fewer women than men are successful in achieving the most prestigious, powerful, and financially lucrative positions. Furthermore, violence against women, oppression, and attacks against women’s reproductive rights continue unabated.

Third wavers find themselves in a very difficult situation – a situation quite similar to second and third generation immigrant group members. The surest way to legitimize the hard work and success of my immigrant parents is to be successful myself. Yet, I know first hand that stereotypes of Italians have not disappeared. I struggle to continue to work against those stereotypes, but as anyone who watches the movies or television can readily see, there is a long way to go before they disappear. The danger of second generation immigrants fighting the good fight too hard is the realization of how delicate success can be for marginalized groups. That awareness is less for third generation immigrants, but it probably shouldn’t be.

Third wave feminists, as described by Finley and Stringer, are very similar to third generation immigrants. The more they can distance themselves
from the revolutionary second wavers, the more they can live the life that that second wave feminists fought to create. Unlike many of the immigrant groups, however, women cannot hide in a nice suit and a mainstream looking house/car. Most women are unmistakable as women. Discrimination lives on in a variety of important ways and activism, whether in the form of a movement or localized actions, is still badly needed. This is where the rest of Beyond Burning Bras becomes still more helpful. The authors take the reader through a series of forms of activism that women have and can engage for the purpose of continuing the goal of liberating women from oppressive circumstances. Short but well stated testimonies are provided that show ways in which women have found greater control over their bodies and greater peace within themselves and within their communities. Through music, art, and continued critical writing, contemporary feminists are making a difference one brick at a time. They are working on making the world a better place for themselves, their children, and their friends’ children through creativity and the usual hard work that has always characterized the lives of women. 

Imbedded in this third wave individualized approach to feminism are the threads of a rejection of the whole sale purchase of male “rat-race” cultural ideology. While this comment contradicts (somewhat) earlier statements about the third wave belief that a woman can be whatever she wants, that belief is much broader than the typical roles and goals available in a strictly male world. My daughter represents an example. After attaining a good education and a secure position in state government, she rejected that life to study and teach healing dance forms. Finley and Stringer open up this alternative world to the reader as a way of letting us know that the absence of a current singular movement does not mean the absence of activism and progress toward a better life.

I found especially reassuring the concluding seven principles the authors recommend for guiding feminism into the future. While the book itself did not deal much with the relationship between sexism and corporate capitalism, the proposed principles speak clearly to that issue. I was very pleased to also see a focus on environmental sustainability. I highly recommend this book for anyone interested in learning about the three waves of feminism and examples of the many ways women continue to work toward making the world a better place.