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For sociologists and most everyone else, the time spanning academic year 2001-2002 was lived in the shadows of the terrible attacks against New York City and Washington, D.C. as well as by the open-ended US war against Afghanistan and what our nation’s security apparatus defines as terrorism on a global scale. The response in our classrooms and on campus was far-reaching. On September 11th itself, several hundred members of the Boston College community gathered for a moving noontime commemorative service, while the university encouraged all teachers to meet with their classes and to provide space for students to communicate their feelings, thoughts, fears, and concerns.

I was enormously impressed by the thoughtfulness and serious manner in which the students gathered for my large “Deviance and Social Control” class and were engaged with the tragic matters at hand. In our previous class, several days before September 11th, we had been discussing the varying historical and political contexts in which the label “terrorism” has been used to depict a particularly hideous form of collective violence. One example discussed involved events that took place during the 1980s as an aspect of the foreign policy of the Reagan-Bush administration. First publicly, then secretly, the government headed by Reagan and Bush channeled funds, supplies and military advise to the Nicaraguan Contras, a terrorist group supported by US tax dollars. The Contras were bent on overthrowing the democratically elected government of Nicaragua. Nicaragua was then governed by the Sandinista Party, whose vision of justice was inspired, in large measure, by a complex geopolitical and spiritual mixture of socialism and Catholic liberation theology. The World Court had declared the US government guilty of twenty-four charges of state-sponsored terrorism for its unlawful support of the Contras. At the time of the World Court's ruling against the US there was already a good deal of scholarly-informed activism within the BC Sociology Department in solidarity with those struggling for social justice and peace in Central America. Refusing the World Court's jurisdiction and judgment, the Reagan-Bush administration defended its support for the Contra terrorists, calling them “freedom fighters.” In the attacks on New York and...
Washington the contested terms, “terrorism” and “freedom,” would acquire different, if no less troubled, meanings.

In class on September 11th, students voiced a wide range of expressive viewpoints and, at times, astute sociological imaginings and analysis. Nearly everyone registered horror. Some students were particularly anxious about the safety of their families and friends. Indeed, members of the Boston College community lost relatives in the attacks, while BC alumni died in the collapsed World Trade Center towers. One student, overwhelmed and somewhat unnerved, said she was afraid to ever again ride public transportation. While outraged by the attacks, other students spoke of more complex historical matters. Several pointed to earlier US support for the same “Afghan Arabs” already rumored to be behind the attacks. These Muslim militants had once found favor in Washington during their struggles against the “godless communism” of the Soviet Union. Other students mentioned widespread anger against the US within much of the Muslim world as a possible factor. While connected to a complex and contradictory history of US interventions within the Middle East, a great deal of this anger was said to be connected to the more than 500,000 Iraqi deaths resulting from US imposed sanctions in the years following the 1991 Gulf War. Several students registered enormous surprise, shock, and incredulity when hearing of such matters. Where did those who spoke about such things get their information? In response, students who had raised these concerns cited specific websites and talked about what they had learned by participating in BC’s Global Justice Project.

After expressing opposition to terrorism in all of its forms, another student commented on the effects of US support for the sometimes terrorist actions of Israel against the stateless people of Palestine. Policies such as this were said to nurture resentment against the US in much of the Third World. How could the US feign innocence of the structural consequences of its own historical actions? Yet another student told a story of how she had visited El Salvador in the previous summer. There, a Roman Catholic nun had taken her and other North American students to a mass gravesite where peasants had been massacred by right-wing death squads supported by the US. The nun explained that this site was a monument to US-sponsored terrorism and that such terrorism was well known to the Salvadorian people, if seldom acknowledged within the US itself. Several other students asked whether the attacks against the World Trade Center and Pentagon should be viewed as acts of war or criminal actions to be prosecuted by some sort of international criminal court. Others worried that a simple military response to the attacks, even if justified, would only raise the odds of future attacks if root causes were not also dealt with.

Everything that was said, sometimes at the edge of tears, was listened to carefully by the whole class, as each of us struggled to make sociological and historical sense of the awful events that enveloped our day. Although enormously troubled, I found hope in what was shared in the sociology classroom that afternoon. This made me thankful both for the kinds of questions asked by sociology and for the fact that Boston College had encouraged our conversation, rather than canceling classes and abandoning us to the anxious eye of television and the isolating clamor of cell phones signaling.

Throughout the ensuing school year Boston College hosted a series of events geared toward helping its students, faculty and staff gain in-depth understanding of the social and historical contexts in which the attacks had occurred. These events invited ethical reflection on strategies for both dealing with the threat of terrorism and for securing peace and justice in a global framework. The events themselves included a number of well attended “teach-ins” and sponsored lectures, workshops aimed at facilitating classroom discussion of the issues by faculty and Graduate Teaching Fellows, and the emergence on campus of a new interdisciplinary group, Faculty for Social Justice and a Humane Foreign Policy. Members of the Sociology Department participated
in all of these events. We also organized a large and highly successful luncheon seminar on “How to Talk with Family and Friends about the Events of September 11th and the War in Afghanistan” before students returned home for semester break. Although sparked by the terrorist attacks and resulting war, for many of us, participation in these events underscored the importance of applying a sociological imagination to troubles that range from the global to the local, and from the structural to that which touches the most intimate aspects of our lives.

With September 11th and its aftermath as a shadowy background, a great deal of other exciting developments took place in the Sociology Department this past year. Many of these are recounted in this edition of our Sociology Speaks newsletter. In addition to a continued high level of scholarly productivity and an ongoing commitment to excellence in teaching, of particular importance this year was the integration of three new full-time faculty (Juliet Schor, Kerry Ann Rockquemore and Robert Kunovich) and the hiring of Lisa Dodson as a new Research Professor. Professor Dodson will join the BC faculty following a previous appointment at the Radcliffe Institute of Harvard University. This represents a major initiative by the Sociology Department, in so much as Lisa is a recognized scholar in the areas of urban poverty, social welfare, gender, and qualitative methods. Professor Dodson has also recently completed an in-depth three-city study of the experiences of poor urban women receiving public assistance that was funded by the Ford Foundation. It is anticipated that once arriving at Boston College Lisa will expand her program of externally funded research and provide funded research training opportunities for graduate students. Lisa also arrives at BC with a reputation as an outstanding university-level instructor and will teach two courses per year to graduate and advanced undergraduate students.

Academic Year 2001-02 was also notable as the second year of the Sociology Department’s newly instituted Visiting Distinguished Scholars Seminar Series. This series, which brings leading sociological thinkers to our campus each spring, is already an important aspect of sociological scholarship at Boston College. During their visits, each invited scholar delivers a major public lecture and conducts two specialized faculty/graduate student seminars. Each is also available for several days of informal discussion with students and faculty. In its inaugural year the series was entitled Black Social Thought in the Early Twenty-first Century and brought Paul Gilroy (Yale University), Aldon Morris (Northwestern University) and M. Jacqui Alexander (Connecticut College) to the BC campus. This year the theme was Feminist Thought in the Early Twenty-first Century. Participating scholars included Patricia Hill Collins (University of Cincinnati), Sandra Harding (UCLA), and Dorothy Smith (University of Toronto).

Each of this year’s Visiting Scholars delivered thought-provoking lectures on topics ranging from race, gender and sexuality to feminist standpoint epistemology and the production of feminist research within organizational contexts governed by relations of ruling. Each also organized seminars that were both intellectually challenging and deeply moving. The presence of Hill Collins, Harding and Smith on campus also attracted participants from a wide range of BC departments and from other local universities and colleges. This has made the Visiting Scholars Series an occasion for genuine interdisciplinary exchange and dialogue. Also indicative of the success of the series to date is the fact that the Sociology Department has already been approached by publishers concerning the possible production of an edited volume of the lectures given by our visiting scholars. Already a major success in its first two years, the series is likely to play an increasingly important role in the scholarly life of our department in years to come. The theme for next year’s Visiting Distinguished Scholars Seminar Series will be Social Class and Inequality in the Early Twenty-First Century.

Other key events occurring over the last year included the sponsorship of a major conference on social movements theory and activism by the department's Media Research Action Project. Poetically entitled, When Hope and History Rhyme, the MRAP conference brought together leading social movements scholars and activists and included a dinner celebrating the career contributions of BC faculty, William Gamson. Also of note this past year was the work of an editorial collective of BC faculty and graduate students invited to edit a special issue of the journal, Criti-
The theme for the special issue is “Culture, History and Power.”

Over the past year Sociology Department faculty and students continued to receive major honors and awards. Bill Gamson was elected as a Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. Sharlene Hesse-Biber was named 2002 Professor of the Year by the New England Sociological Association. Mike Malec served as 2001-02 President of the North American Society for the Sociological Study of Sports. Kerry Ann Rockquemore was awarded a highly competitive BC Research Incentive Grant. Jeanne Guillemin was named as a Fellow in Security Studies at MIT. Among graduate students, Tay McNamara was 2002 recipient of the Outstanding Graduate Student Paper Award of the Massachusetts Gerontological Association, while Matthew Gregory and Aimee Van Wagenen were named as 2002 recipients of BC’s Donald J. White Award for Teaching Excellence. Leah Schmalzbauer, Patricia Leavy, Amy Marlow, Anders Hayden, William Wood, Adria Goodson, and Delario Lindsey were all recipients of competitive graduate fellowships, while sociology majors, Mikaela Boyd, Kathleen McManus, and Jenna Nobles each received prestigious undergraduate awards during commencement ceremonies last May.

In conclusion, while engaging with the complexities of terrorism and war, as these global concerns impacted our classrooms, research and everyday days, the last academic year was a time for both great reflection and scholarly community-building for the Boston College Sociology Department. The next academic year promises much of the same. During the upcoming academic year, we will conduct an important search for a tenure-track faculty appointment in the area of Global Sociology, while moving ahead with new initiatives in the areas of Ph.D. job preparation and placement and post-tenure faculty development. The department will also undertake a study of the aims and programmatic resources associated with both our undergraduate major and Master’s program, while hosting another exciting group of Visiting Distinguished Scholars. The often troubling times in which we live make the study of sociology and the development of

what C. Wright Mills once called the “sociological imagination” as important as ever. Guided by our graduate program’s thematic commitment to “Social Economy and Social Justice: Gender, Race and Class in a Global Context,” as Department Chairperson, I look forward to continue working with my fellow colleagues and students to enhance the vitality of our teaching, scholarship, and ethical-political commitments, as we seek to build the kind of sociology that contributes both to academic excellence and the construction of a more just society.

- Stephen Pfohl
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Miguel Segovia (M.A. 2001) has written the following articles, which are in the works to be published in the very near future:

“Forms of Life,” in Bilingual Games, edited by Doris Sommer from Harvard (Palgrave 2002).


In addition, Miguel has written the following entries to appear in the Mexico-U.S. Border Relations Encyclopedia, edited by Lee Stacy (Marshall Cavendish 2002):
Cantinflas, Chicano Life, Chicano Theater, Chicano Writers, Sandra Cisneros, El Teatro Campesino, Nestor Garcia Canclini, Dolores Huerta, Jorge Ramos, Selena, and Latina/o and Mexican Literature.

Among other accomplishments, in February 2002, Miguel was elected to a three-year term for the Editorial Advisory Board of The Harvard Journal of Hispanic Policy, housed at the John F. Kennedy School of Government, and also as presented a paper at Haverford College entitled: “Religion and Literature.”

In March 2002, he was named a “Kraft and Nabisco/Hispanic Scholarship Fund Scholar” and presented with a $2,500 cash award from the Hispanic Scholarship Fund.

Sadie Fischesser (M.A. 1999) presented her paper, “Bodies That Sport: The Materiality of Gender and Female Athletes.” Sadie is now finishing her Ph.D. at Syracuse University.
Patricia Arend:
Patricia authored a document called “Workshop Report: Participants’ Evaluations” for the Graduate Consortium in Women’s Studies at Radcliffe as follow-up to the Workshop on Teaching Methodology and Research in Interdisciplinary Gender Studies held at Fudan University, Shanghai, People’s Republic of China, July 2001.

Abigail Brooks:
At the Popular Culture Conference of April 2002, Abigail Brooks presented her paper, “Cosmetic Surgery as Modern/ Postmodern Product and Practice: Social/ Historical Construction, Social Control, and the Technological Body.”

Patricia Leavy:
Patricia has an upcoming book publication: Approaches to Qualitative Research: A Reader on Theory and Practice, co-edited with Sharlene Hesse-Biber, published by Oxford University Press. December 2002 is the expected release date.


Patricia also had a Poster Presentation at the 2001 Social Science History Association Conference in Chicago, entitled “Memory-History in the Virtual Age: Resistive Possibilities.”

Patricia recently accepted a full-time job as Assistant Professor of Sociology (tenure track) at Stonehill College in Easton, MA. to begin August 2002. Congratulations, Patricia!

Tay McNamara:
The Massachusetts Gerontological Association has selected Tay’s paper, “The Role of Couple-Level Adaptive Strategies in the Joint Retirement Decision,” for receipt of MGA’s 2002 Outstanding Graduate Student Paper Award. The award was presented as part of MGA’s annual meeting, which was held on Thursday, April 11, 2002 at Brandeis University in Waltham, MA.

Aimee Van Wagenen:
At the August 2001 SSSP conference in Anaheim, CA, Aimee presented “The Construction of School Violence and At Risk Youth: Lessons Learned from Arthur Miller’s The Crucible & My Wife or a DOJ Research Consultant.”

In May 2002, Aimee presented her paper “A Hybrid Method: Exploring the Ethnographic Possibilities of Digital Audio Production” at the Buffalo, NY conference Technology in the Age of Intelligent Machines.

Grad Awards 2001-2002

Benedict Alper Graduate Fellowship: Patricia Arend
Boston College Graduate Presidential Fellowship: Anders Hayden, William Wood
Boston College Graduate Minority Fellowship: Adria Goodson, Delario Lindsey
Boston College Dissertation Fellowship: Leah Schmalzbauer
Donald J. White Award for Teaching Excellence: Mathew Gregory, Aimee Van Wagenen
 Severyn T. Bruyn Award for Outstanding Scholarship in Social Economy and Social Justice: Charles Sarno
"After class, I sat around the grad student lounge staring at the television, my mind moving from shock to anger—anger at the terrorists for their attacks, at the media for their racist coverage of the events, and the US government for bringing this on us through their imperialism."

I certainly did not anticipate the magnitude of the patriotic nationalistic response to 9-11

"On the morning of 9/11/01 I had my first of two lectures scheduled for the interdisciplinary War, Aggression, and Conflict Resolution class at noon. Before I left for BC and on the way in I watched and listened to as much as I could so that I could respond to student concerns and reactions. About half the class showed up. It was obvious that they were in a state of shock and disbelief. I began by telling them of my own reactions and experiences on December 7, 1941, and in the Navy during World War II and how important it was to keep some historical perspective at this moment. As terrible as the attacks of 9/11 were, the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor was far more serious and threatening to our country. We had just lost most of the defensive capability of our Pacific fleet and the Japanese probably could have taken the Hawaiian Islands and conducted strikes on the U.S. West Coast with relative ease. I also warned against the excesses of WWII such as the racism against “Japs” and the unconstitutional arrest and “relocation” of thousands of Japanese-American families. I cautioned against using war terminology and rhetoric until we had a better sense of what was going on.

At the second lecture on Thursday, the full class was there and they obviously wanted some answers — How did this happen? How can people do such a thing? What did we do to deserve such a thing? I relied on two main sources. Quincy Wright’s A Study of War and Emile Durkheim’s study of Suicide. Durkheim’s concept of altruistic suicide is helpful in understanding what appear to be fanatically insane acts. I drew a comparison to the Japanese Kamikazes in WWII. Wright’s concept of total and absolute war in WWII (where every citizen is involved in a war effort and there is no longer a distinction between combatant and noncombatant) changed the entire character of modern warfare. Older subjective and objective controls no longer existed, as they did during periods of primitive and historic warfare. We also talked about how every nation and political entity in the modern world has targeted civilians in order to topple a state or political regime. Therefore, the real problem lay in the nature of modern conflict and the absence of effective means for conflict resolution.

What moved me most was the number of students who came up after the second class and shook my hand and thanked me. I hope I helped them deal with their own conflicting emotions and rely on the best human motivations within themselves."
"On September 11, I arrived at my office around 9:40 a.m. for a 10 a.m. introductory course. Jess Geier’s greeting that morning was the frantically-asked question, “Have you heard what happened?!” While glued to ongoing radio reports she explained that planes had apparently flown into the World Trade Center and that it was no accident. I can only liken the surrealistic feeling of unreality and shock to two other events in my life, the assassination of John Kennedy and the explosion of the Challenger. Since that day we have all repeatedly reviewed the looks of bewilderment etched on the faces of New Yorkers in particular. It is a look that says, “Something unspeakably awful has happened and I can’t make sense of it. It’s too big to understand.” That was the feeling that I carried with me to Carney 005 just before ten.

As the students filed into the room it was clear that many had not yet heard of the horror. There was the usual chatter and laughter. Some students were, though, beginning to spread the word as the room filled. When all fell silent, I broke the news of the attacks to many of the students, prompting wide-eyed, jaw-dropping confusion. A barrage of questions followed: “What have you heard? Who is responsible? How many people have died?” Ten or fifteen minutes of talk were enough to absorb that terror had reached America.

Of course, there was no other plausible topic for conversation that day. I always see it as my professional and sociological obligation to discuss life-altering news in my classes, whatever might otherwise have been on my agenda. But, just what should be the tone of such discussions? Here again, my memory is slightly dim about how the conversation took form. My best remembrance is that we first simply shared whatever factual information we had. Then I recall thinking, “the morning’s events likely constitute the first fundamental rupture in my students’ sense of America’s (and their own) invulnerability.” Life in the U.S. during their 18 years or so had been relatively tranquil. While they surely experienced the usual private difficulties of young adults, the public moments that have most shaped my consciousness – the explosions of the sixties and the agony of Vietnam – were only historical tales to them. I think I spoke a bit about how these events had shaken my faith in America and asked whether the day’s news created a sense of fragility that was totally new to them.

In retrospect, the rest of that day’s discussion makes me wonder about how precisely sociological we ought to be in the face of appalling tragedy. I say this because I do remember raising questions like, “What would cause persons to so hate America that they would fly planes into buildings? What ‘vocabulary of motives’ explains their willingness to die as they did?” I also offered thoughts about America’s role in an age of globalization, the often disgraceful conduct of corporations in poor countries, our unrestrained militarism in the service of “national interests,” and so on. Like much sociological conversation it was at least slightly blamey about America’s and capitalism’s unappealing sides. Even as I raised these questions and asked the students to respond I felt a certain discomfort. It seemed overly academic to be offering such analyses just as we had been attacked. We remained together for the whole 75 minutes, soberly discussing these matters and I left the class feeling that I might have crossed over a kind of common-sense humanity line. I was especially upset at my insensitivity in having failed to ask if anyone had reason to worry about family members.

"I found out about the 9-11 attacks from David Karp right before his Introductory Sociology class, which I was TAing. Although still in a state of shock, I attempted to help the students understand what might motivate someone to engage in such attacks and the geopolitical context within which they occurred. Although I didn’t agree with everything the students said, it was generally more intelligent than any commentary I heard on the television news. After class, I sat around the grad student lounge staring at the television, my mind moving from shock to anger—anger at the terrorists for their attacks, at the media for their racist coverage of the events, and the US government for bringing this on us through their imperialism. If one has to be somewhere when such things happen, I was glad I was in graduate school. If I had still been temping (as I had been the year before), I would have had to keep my opinions to myself; in the grad student lounge I felt free to vent my outrage and political thoughts. As a wise man who once lived in the Middle East said, “Those who live by the sword, die by the sword”—and we have been a nation living by the sword. In the following weeks and months, I attended numerous peace vigils and rallies. I covered many of them for the Boston Independent Media Center (IMC) (http://boston.indymedia.org) to help spread the word that not all Americans support responding to this violence with more violence. Despite the horror of the situation, I was somewhat gladdened to see many people at these rallies who had apparently not been politically active before (I certainly didn’t recognize large numbers of them and I’d done peace activism in Boston for several years). I also took part in the Sociology Department’s "How to Talk to Friends and Family About 9-11" workshop for undergraduates. I continue to cover peace rallies and the like for the Boston IMC."
"For my own mental health, I had to stop watching the news several days after 9/11. After the initial shock, disbelief, and sadness, I became very frustrated with the media, especially in its coverage of anthrax. More people died from gun violence, pneumonia, falling down the stairs, etc. than from anthrax. However, the media was fanning the flames of mass hysteria by focusing so much attention on such rare events.

I am teaching a course on global ethnic conflict and many of the topics that we are discussing in class are very relevant for recent events within and outside of the US - for example, conflict and in-group/ out-group polarization, persistent dilemmas in intervention, the role of morality in international politics, conflict between creating/ maintaining peace and attaining justice, etc."

"I talked about 9/11 in my courses last fall. I found students mostly confused and in shock. Many of them believed that the United States must have done something very grave to have "deserved" the attacks. My own view is that it is much easier to find fault with American policy toward Arab states and poor countries, generally, than it is to look for the roots of religious extremism in the inability of Arab leaders to respond to the legitimate demands of their own people. I am most sympathetic to the needs of the Palestinians for their own state, but my honest belief is that 9/11 would have happened whether Israel existed or not.

In these courses I have explored the roots of Islamicist fundamentalism as well as the search for a more balanced American policy (not so pro-Israel). An excellent book which I have assigned is Taliban, by Ahmed Rashid."

How can people with different opinions about the war engage in meaningful dialogue?
How can critical perspective be expressed without shutting down communication?
How can we get past the "soundbites" in order to engage in constructive conversations?

Talking About the War
http://www2.bc.edu/~rockquem/lets_talk.htm

How to Talk to Friends and Family about the War in Afghanistan: A Hugely Successful Seminar

After September 11th, 2001, some students felt that barriers had been erected in their friendships because they couldn't talk about the war. Others felt that they just didn't know enough to talk about why they might be for (or against) military intervention in Afghanistan and so they avoided conversation and felt frustrated.

As a result, the Scholarly Events Committee at BC organized a seminar to respond to these students' concerns. The seminar was held on Dec. 6th, 2001, in the Heights Room on Lower Campus, from 12-1:15 PM. You can find more info on Kerry Ann Rocquemore's website, "Talking About the War." (http://www2.bc.edu/~rockquem/lets_talk.htm)

The seminar featured comments by Charlotte Ryan (BC Sociology Department, MRAP) followed by break-out groups with sociology faculty and grad students to discuss important questions around improving interpersonal communication regarding the war.

Although scheduled for only an hour and fifteen minutes, the seminar was so successful that people, including students and faculty, were still engaging in discussion around the tables an hour after it had "officially" ended. During the days following the seminar, many people indicated that they found the seminar to be very helpful and hoped additional seminars of this nature might be scheduled.
Our 3rd Annual Visiting Scholars Series is underway!
Please welcome our Spring 2003 Distinguished Visiting Scholars:

**bell hooks**
"Class Matters"
  March 12  public lecture 6-8pm
"When Women Talk About Class"
  March 12  seminar 12-2 pm

**Mary C. Waters**
*Harvard University*
"Immigration and American Class and Inequality"
  March 24  public lecture 6-8pm
“Immigration and American Inequality”
  March 25  seminar 12-2 pm
  March 26  seminar 12-2pm

**Michael Burawoy**
*University of California-Berkeley*
"Marxism after Communism"
  April 7  public lecture 6-8pm
  April 8  seminar 12-2pm
  April 9  seminar 12-2pm

For more information on last year’s (Spring 2002) Series, please see pages 12-18.
The Boston College Sociology Department’s Visiting Scholars Seminar Series presents Feminist Thought in the Early 21st Century

During the spring 2002 term, the Sociology Department hosted the second year of our 3-year Distinguished Visiting Scholars Series. The theme of this year’s series was: “Feminist Thought in the Early 21st Century.” Patricia Hill Collins, Sandra Harding, and Dorothy Smith each spent three days on campus, giving a public lecture, two seminars and meeting informally with faculty and graduate students. The series was highly successful, drawing standing-room only crowds in auditoriums across campus. It also brought together feminist scholars from Harvard, Wellesley, Boston University and Boston College to engage in a dialogue on the sociology of knowledge and the past, present and future of standpoint theory. Below, our graduate students reflect on each of the three scholars visit to Boston College.

Patricia Hill-Collins  
“Black Sexual Politics”

Sandra Harding  
“Feminist Standpoint Theory as a Site of Political and Intellectual Struggle”

Dorothy Smith  
“Voice, Standpoint, and Power”

Spring 2002
Women of color, and especially iconic representatives to the mainstream, become vessels upon which to project modern Western fantasies of untamed sexuality and, unwittingly, perform the task of justifying colonial-racist practices in the minds of these men (and some women).
collaborative subjectivities.

Collins also led two seminars, one on each of the two days following her lecture. The first of these seminars focused on ‘prison consciousness,’ both literally, in the effect of an expanding and increasingly racialized prison-industrial complex, and as a metaphor for the confinement of individual subjectivities through their location in relation to structural forces. Issues addressed include the role of unconditional love in healing the wounds of oppression, the need to take back the language of family from conservative ideologues, and the (further) development of “agency laden institutions” as spaces of healing, reflection, and resistance.

The second seminar centered on the development of a new black praxis that incorporates anti-oppressive theories addressing the complexities of intersectional locations while simultaneously pointing to effective strategies of resistance and motivating people of all races to work against systems of racial, sexual, and class oppression. Collins encouraged an animated and productive discussion by calling on seminar participants to devise a strategy for bringing into affect such a manner of praxis. At the end of this seminar Collins encouraged participants to continue working toward theories that can inform collective resistance to oppression. Since her visit to Boston College, those who experienced the brilliance of Patricia Hill Collins have taken her appeal to heart.

Sandra Harding:

Feminist Standpoint Theory: Theory as a Site of Political and Intellectual Struggle

by Deborah Piattelli & Denise Leckenby

On February 25, 26, and 27, Sandra Harding visited Boston College as part of the Spring 2002 Visiting Scholar Series. Harding is Professor of Social Sciences and Comparative Education at UCLA and author of several prominent books including: Is Science Multicultural?: Postcolonialisms, Feminisms, and Epistemologies; The Science Question in Feminism; Whose Science? Whose Knowledge?: Thinking from Women’s Lives; Decentering the Center: Philosophy for a Multicultural, Postcolonial and Feminist World; and Feminism and Methodology. Harding’s work has raised profound questions about scientific objectivity including: From where should our research questions be generated? What ‘truth’ are we seeking? How should we conduct our research? Who benefits from this research? The following is a brief reflection on Harding’s public lecture and seminars, all of which were rooted in her interpretations of feminist standpoint theory as epistemology and methodology, and the controversies surrounding it.

Harding’s public lecture discussed feminist standpoint theory as a site of ongoing intellectual debate. Her argument relies on an interpretation of standpoint as an achievement rather than an inscription. Standpoint, when viewed as an achievement, is rooted in its practices and its implications as a methodology. Working within such a framework, knowledge can be understood as a system of practices as opposed to a system of representations. Harding asked, what can we see from this alternative practice as opposed to rooting ourselves in the dominant representations? Engaging a feminist standpoint epistemology raises the questions, not the answers. It can provide new angles of vision for raising new questions, engaging in new kinds of dialogue and discus-
sion on new topics, and organizing new kinds of social relations.

Harding also delved directly into issues of objectivity. She stated that standpoint theory can open the way to stronger standards of both objectivity and reflexivity. For Harding, the ability to define objectivity as value neutrality is severed by standpoint practices. Standpoint practices engage the constructive/destructive potential of knowledge building. Is objectivity attainable? Is it desirable? These two questions have been, and continue to be, at the center of the feminist debate with objectivity. The first question concerns a critique of an objective, external, fixed social reality; the other involves a critique of objectivity in terms of a detached relationship between the researcher and the participants as well as a critique of the very goal of value-neutral social science research.

In the two seminars that followed Harding’s public lecture, we continued the conversation about the current state of standpoint theory and future directions. Harding argued that the scientific model of objectivity needs to be replaced and that a feminist standpoint epistemology questions the proposition that the social world is one fixed reality, external to individuals’ consciousness. Feminist standpoint epistemology suggests that the social world is socially constructed, consisting of multiple perspectives and realities. But standpoint theory is not relativism. Starting research from the standpoint of the subjugated leads not to an objective truth but to a less false, less partial, less distorted view. If we sever the ties of value neutrality when speaking of objectivity, we are able to seek objectives of responsibility and accountability. Harding believes that it should be our goal as researchers, not to justify truth claims, but to enable different forms of knowledge to emerge that challenge power. Our aim should be to uncover social processes that consist of a diversity of historically, locatable, subjugated perspectives and standpoints.

Harding argued that the relationship between researcher and participant should not be detached, but engaged. Strong objectivity cannot be achieved by removing oneself from the world, but by acknowledging our situated location and being reflexive of our position within it. She argues that the purpose of research should be not to construct grand generalizations, but to work closely with people and enhance their understanding and ability to control their own reality. We must engage in the intellectual and political struggle necessary to see social life from the point of view of that which is subjugated instead of from the perspective of the ruling order. Students raised the question of bias. Harding stressed the importance of reflexivity in our research and asked that researchers be critically self-reflexive of their own personal and cultural biases in the formation of their theoretical perspectives of the social world. Her sense of reflexivity is rooted in the researcher’s positionality and therefore not accomplished by a confessional, ego-centric representation of one’s biography. Confession leaves the reader to delineate the perspective of the researcher, but not the standpoint. Reflexivity is a process and practice — a verb for Harding. Harding challenged us to further conceptualize reflexivity, arguing that more work needs to be done.

Central to each of Harding’s seminars was her conviction that culture, power, and politics can be knowledge creative and knowledge destructive. She leaves us with this question: For whom do we conduct our research?
Dorothy E. Smith:

Voice, Standpoint and Power

by Abigail Brooks

The Boston College Sociology Department had the honor of hosting Professor Dorothy E. Smith from March 12-14 of 2002, as part of its second annual Visiting Scholar Series. Smith, who received her doctorate from the University of California at Berkeley in 1963, is currently professor emerita in the Department of Sociology and Equity Studies in Education at the University of Toronto. Smith’s scholarship, inclusive of numerous books and articles, has been extremely influential, even groundbreaking within and across several disciplines. Her work continues to profoundly impact many sub-fields of sociology including feminist theory and methodology, sociology of knowledge, ethnography, organizational studies, and family studies and finds relevance in such disciplines as women’s studies, psychology, and educational studies. Several, among many, of Smith’s critical works include Writing the Social: Critique, Theory, and Investigations (1999); The Conceptual Practices of Power: A Feminist Sociology of Knowledge (1990); Texts, Facts, and Femininity: Exploring the Relations of Ruling (1990); The Everyday World is Problematic: A Feminist Sociology (1990) and Feminism and Marxism: A Place to Begin, A Way to Go (1977). Smith’s scholarship, particularly in light of its vital contribution to the discipline of sociology, has earned her numerous honors and awards including the American Sociological Association’s Career of Distinguished Scholarship Award (1999), the Jessie Bernard Award for Feminist Sociology (1993), and two awards from the Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association; the Outstanding Contribution Award (1990) and the John Porter Award for The Everyday is Problematic (1990). Graduate students and faculty alike, from Boston College and several surrounding area institutions, enjoyed the intellectual benefits of three sessions with Smith, including an evening lecture and two intensive seminars.

Professor Smith’s public lecture focused on knowledge formulation processes. It could easily be argued that Smith pioneered the critique of so-called “objective,” abstract, universal sociological knowledge and the so-called “objective” methodologies that accompany it. Beginning with her own lived experience as a woman, Smith illuminates the non-universality, the non-neutrality, of so-called “objective” sociological knowledge and the conceptual and methodological models of “objective” knowledge building. She draws upon her bifurcated consciousness, her awareness of the disconnect and contradiction between her lived experience as a woman and these so-called objective, abstract methods, theories, and findings, to reveal gaping holes and blatant omissions within the objective knowledge canon. In short, Smith exposes the governance of the “abstract conceptual mode” as stemming not from its objectivity, from its universality, but from its location within a specific set of historical, material, and social (patriarchal) relations. For Smith, knowledge is practice, both situated, relational, and embedded within specific historical material systems of power.

Smith’s articulation of bifurcated consciousness, or an “uneasiness” that results as women attempt to negotiate two mismatched worlds (dominant knowledge concepts verses lived experience), represents a unique standpoint of women, of the oppressed. This unique standpoint, or perspective, holds the potential for viewing a more inclusive, or complete, picture of what is going on from the position below, an awareness of both worlds, not limited to one. It is here that we begin to perceive Smith’s affinity with Marx and her influence on the development of feminist standpoint theory.

Smith’s utilization and expansion of Marxist theory is also evident in her discussion of the process by which women become “alienated from their experience,” an alienation which stems from the disconnect between how women experience, understand, and “think” their worlds and the (male-created) concepts and terms that are imposed upon them (Smith 1987: 86). Smith’s work on women’s alienation, an alienation that promotes a loss of language, a deprivation of the “authority to speak,” has been foundational to the work of much feminist theory and research across disciplinary boundaries. One is reminded, for example, of Majorie Devault’s (1990) methodology of collaboration between researcher and respondent, a methodology dedicated to overcoming women’s “muted language” through the co-creation of new words, or of Dana Jack’s (1991) work to help women suffering from depression develop their own, more accurately descriptive, language to articulate their feelings, a
language outside of the dominant “dependency” discourse, a discourse representative of traditional, largely male-driven, models of psychology.

Smith rejects the viability (or desirability for that matter) of Vide Bierstedt’s ideal sociology, one that “liberates the mind from time and space themselves and removes it to a new and transcendental realm…” (Bierstedt, 1966 cited in Smith 1987: 89). Instead, Smith calls upon the sociologist to begin where she is “actually situated” and to make her direct experience of the everyday world the “primary ground of her knowledge” (Smith, 1987). The lived, everyday experience of the researcher is not a contaminant, or barrier to knowledge, but instead a window into it, a “point of entry,” and a way of grounding that knowledge, of holding it accountable.

It follows then, that the situatedness of the researcher should be incorporated into the very process of sociological knowledge building itself: “If sociology cannot avoid being situated, then sociology should take that as its beginning and build it into its methodological and theoretical strategies” (Smith 1990: 22).

Here Smith’s profound influence on sociological theory and methods is evident, particularly in the realm of qualitative research and feminist theory and research methods. We are reminded of Kathy Charmaz’s (1995) reworking of grounded theory to include a more collaborative, active role for the researcher, DeVault’s (1990) call for active collaboration between researcher and respondent, Helen Longino’s (1999) articulation of the embodied location of the researcher as a potential “cognitive resource,” and Donna Haraway’s (1991) call for the building of new knowledges through cyborg fusions, and finally, bell hooks’ (1990) call for cultural studies as a space in which to safely engage in “troubled speech” while “patiently awaiting revelation.”

Thus, as Smith instructs us, we must begin with our everyday, lived knowledge and experience, but not end there. In problematizing it, in beginning to understand how our everyday world is mediated to us, we will begin to understand that not all of its determinates are observable in the “scope of direct experience.” (Smith, 1987) It is here that the link between larger social and material structures of capitalism and our own everyday experience is illuminated.

In so doing, we will be engaging in what Smith calls “institutional ethnography,” a process of knowledge building which strives to fuse the micro-social and the macro-social levels of inquiry. We begin with the everyday world, with the standpoint of the actor in everyday life, and seek to elucidate the relationship between every-
day world activities and experiences and larger institutional imperatives, in other words, to examine the broader social relations in which local sites of activity are embedded.

Knowledge building, knowledge as situated and relational, and links between knowledge formulation and specific social, historical and material settings, served as central themes throughout Smith’s lecture and seminar series. In her lecture, Smith addressed knowledge formulation processes in several contexts, including the recent discrediting of Rigoberta Menchu’s oral history/autobiography and a loss of autonomy among intellectuals and teachers within university and public school settings. In the case of Rigoberta Menchu, her story (I, Rigoberta Menchu: An Indian Woman in Guatemala published in 1983), is retold, re-written, by Anglo-American sociologist David Stoll who, after years of “fact-checking” research, was able to publish a revised account of Menchu’s story in 1999 which served to falsify primary elements of her own original telling. As Smith highlighted, crucial knowledge and the potential for knowledge building and increased understandings was lost as Menchu’s autobiography was pushed aside in favor of Stoll’s telling. Stoll’s measurements of accuracy, of truthfulness, were white, western ones, as were his concepts of time and space: chronological, linear, and bounded. It is easy then, to understand how Stoll’s application of these western measurements left no room for Menchu’s knowledge, such as her use of the term “I” as simultaneously representative and protective of her community and “brothers and sisters” as indicative of affection for the entirety of her community. Smith also articulated a loss of intellectual autonomy within universities and public schools, or what she termed “an undermining of the intelligentsia,” in the context of the “reshaping of a new hegemony” which began in the Reagan era and continues in rampant form today. This “reshaping of a new hegemony” involves the “unmaking” of traditional institutional forms, forms that were sustained by stronger nation states, in favor of neo-liberal, business models. It is the infiltration of these business models into the field of education and academia that leads to such trends as time-efficient “performance standards”, teachers as “managers”, and students as “customers.” This loss of freedom and autonomy in academia, combined with Rigoberta Menchu’s lost narrative, risks less knowledge, less potential for interchange across perspectives, and hence a loss of new knowledge.

Smith’s seminars, each involving lively intellectual interchange, focused more specifically on the relationship between texts and knowledge building. Topics of discussion, inclusive of Smith’s own work entitled “Writing the Social: Critique, Theory, and Investigations” (1999), centered on an examination of texts which “organize and regulate”, such as prescribed textbooks in introductory courses and grade sheets and evaluations which produce people as “graded” and “graded people” respectively. The regulatory power of texts was also discussed in the context of funding allocations, police reportage, and the labeling of domestic abuse. Finally, texts were also identified as coordinators of social action.

Professor Smith’s lecture and seminar series offered a rich opportunity for the discussion of profound sociological questions and topics: how we know what we know, links between knowledge and power, knowledge and lived experience, the relationship between knowledge building, theory, methodology, and texts. Smith’s accessibility outside of the lecture hall and classroom setting, her willingness to engage in continuous dialogue with students and faculty throughout her three-day stay at Boston College, was also greatly appreciated. All in all, Smith’s visit proved energizing and rigorous, a significant contribution to an expanding climate of intellectual interchange in the Boston College Sociology Department.
The refereed journal, Critical Sociology (previously The Insurgent Sociologist) has a long history of combining scholarly research and theory with a commitment to social and economic justice. Given the tradition of critical scholarship associated with many of our students, alumni and faculty, a match between the journal and Boston College’s Sociology Department might seem natural. As such, it should come as no surprise when David Fasenfest, editor of Critical Sociology, extended an invitation for faculty and graduate students at BC to guest edit a special issue of the journal. Fasenfast had for several years been deeply impressed by the work of the many BC graduate students and alumni participating in a series of conference sessions on the “future of critical sociology” organized by the journal during the annual meetings of the Society for the Study of Social Problems.

Accepting the invitation to edit a special issue, over the last year an editorial collective of Sociology Department faculty and graduate students has been active in developing an issue of Critical Sociology around the theme, “Culture, Power and History.” The editorial collective working on the special issue includes Professors Juliet Schor, William Gamson and Stephen Pfohl, as well as Ph.D. students and recent Ph.D. alumni, Patricia Arend, Abigail Brooks, Jeff Littenberg, Idolina Hernandez, Kelly Joyce, Denise Leckenby, William Wood, and Aimee Van Wagenen. The work involved is both labor-intensive and creative, as each manuscript considered for publication is discussed in-depth by small editorial groups and the collective as a whole. Thereafter, a detailed set of review comments are prepared, collectively discussed and modified, before being sent to all prospective authors, including guidelines for recommended revisions for those whose work is invited for resubmission. The thoroughness of this review process has enabled the editorial collective to both select and foster the development of a set of very high quality manuscripts. The special issue will highlight the scholarship of recent BC graduate students and faculty and is scheduled for publication in 2003. In addition to highlighting critical scholarship produced at Boston College, this project is also introducing our graduate students to the scholarly rigors and practical exigencies of professional refereed journal publication.

**Critical Sociology Editorial Collective:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professors</th>
<th>Ph.D. Students</th>
<th>Recent Ph.D. Alumnus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William Gamson</td>
<td>Patricia Arend</td>
<td>Kelly Joyce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Pfohl</td>
<td>Abigail Brooks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juliet Schor</td>
<td>Idolina Hernandez</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Denise Leckenby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jeff Littenberg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Wood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aimee Van Wagenen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Critical Sociology
Undergraduate Accomplishments

Mikaela M. Boyd (class of 2001) was awarded the Jane Addams-Andrew Carnegie Fellowship to continue her philanthropy work and research. During 2001, she also received the Edward H. Finnegan, S.J. Memorial Award; the Scholar of the College; and Marshall for the Order of Cross and Crown. Over the course of her years at BC, she has also received the Presidential Scholar, Dean’s Scholar, and Sophomore Scholar. She was on the National Dean’s List and was a member of Alpha Sigma Nu, Alpha Kappa Delta, the Golden Key Honors Society, and the National Society of Collegiate Scholars.

Timothy J. Dube was initiated into the Environmental Scholars Program through the Urban Ecology Institute.


David McGowan was awarded the St. Ignatius Award for Personal Development from the Office of the Dean for Student Development.

Miroslava Tixi was awarded the Queen of Ecuadorian Community in New Jersey for the volunteer work she did for the benefit of the community.

The John D. Donovan Award is given each year in honor of Professor Emeritus John D. Donovan to the undergraduate student “who submits the best paper written for a course in sociology.” The 2002 Donovan Award recipient is Kathleen McManus, a member of the graduating class. Kathleen’s award-winning paper is titled “The Experience of Black Women Students at Boston College.”

The William A. Gamson Award was established by the Sociology Department in 2002 in honor of William Gamson. It is to be given each year to a graduating senior for outstanding academic achievement in sociology. The first recipient of this newly instituted award is Jenna Nobles. Following her graduation from Boston College, Ms. Nobles will accept a graduate fellowship to pursue Ph.D. studies in Sociology at UCLA.

Alpha Kappa Delta

Undergraduates initiated into Alpha Kappa Delta, the international sociology honor society:

Rachel Carney Cummings
Timothy Dube
Susan C. Evans
Melissa Heekin Farrel
Elizabeth A. Guiney
Anne Veronica Happel
Stephanie A. Howling
Catherine Kohlmann
Lindsay Lathinghouse
Lauren Angela Mallen
Michelle Lee Martini
Kate McMahon
Kathleen McManus
Yesenia Amalfis Mejia
Ashley Kristin Pierce
Meghan Marjorie
Shineman
Ilyitch Nahiely Tabora
Melissa Thibodeau
Albert H. Wang

continued on page 29
Tahmeena Faryal
from the Revolutionary Association of the Women of Afghanistan (RAWA)
The "War on Terrorism" and Liberation for Afghani Women

During the fall semester, the Boston College community hosted an event featuring Tahmeena Faryal, a member of the Revolutionary Association of the Women of Afghanistan (RAWA). Thanks to the organizing of Professor Kalpana Seshadri-Crooks and the co-sponsorship of the Sociology Department as well as many other departments, organizations, and individuals, faculty, staff, students and local community members were able to hear a critique of the War on Terrorism from a group based in the country bearing the brunt of the US attack.

Faryal dealt with a variety of issues concerning the War on Terrorism and its effects on Afghanistan. One of the points she most emphasized was that the Northern Alliance (NA), a group that the United States continues to back as the leader of the new government of the country, was in no way preferable to those formerly in control, the Taliban. Though the American media showed US and NA forces fighting side by side, Faryal was clear that the Northern Alliance is an extremely violent group whose members, during their rule of Afghanistan from 1992-1996, were the perpetrators of countless human rights violations. Replacing the Taliban with the Northern Alliance was in no way a victory for the people of Afghanistan in general, nor for women in particular. She insisted that liberation for the women of a country saturated in fundamentalism and patriarchy was not a simple removal of the veil, but a lengthy dialogue. Those in attendance took full advantage of the rare opportunity to speak in person to a member of RAWA.

If you would like to learn more about the Revolutionary Association of the Women of Afghanistan, their web page is: www.rawa.org. If you have any further questions about the content or planning of the RAWA event at Boston College, contact Professor Kalpana Seshadri-Crooks at kalpana.seshadri-crooks.1@bc.edu.

"Liberation for the women of a country saturated in fundamentalism and patriarchy... [is] not a simple removal of the veil, as the American media might have the world believe.”

Luke Elliot (A&S '04)
One of the very early and critical participants in helping build the Sociology Department to where it is today will be retiring at the end of this academic year. Seymour Leventman joined the Sociology Department at Boston College in 1968. Before that time, he had taught at Macalester College, Pennsylvania State University, Bryn Mawr, and the University of Pennsylvania, where he received his Ph.D. in 1958. He is the author, co-author and co-editor of books and articles on Vietnam veterans, sociological theory, ethnic communities, and race relations. Over the years, Sy has organized, chaired, and presented papers at dozens of sessions of professional organizations, including the Society for the Study of Social Problems, American Pop Culture Association, American Sociological Association, and Eastern Sociological Society. Among others, he has received grants from the Mellon Foundation, American Legion, Siegel Foundation of Philadelphia, and Anti-Defamation League. He has given invited lectures and taught at the University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands.

Here are some of Sy’s thoughts on his career and view of sociology:

How did you become a sociologist?

“Perversity! I was doing undergraduate work at Washington State in the late ‘40s and early ‘50s – liberal arts major with a focus on the history of ideas. I found that Sociology went beneath the façade of manufactured reality. Marxists at that time seemed to be the only ones interested in inequality, racism, and the like. Sociology turned society upside down and made the invisible visible.”

What are some of your memories of BC?

“The day I moved in, the Chicago Convention took place. This seemed to be the beginning of a new era. It took a few years for BC to catch up. But soon we had a Radical Collective in the Sociology Department. They wanted to teach a course, so the Department asked them to prepare a bibliography. Everett Hughes and I were in the committee to review the bibliography. Everett’s first comment was, ‘You call this radical? I write this every day!’

“In 1970, a student strike over tuition increases closed down the university. Student radicals were stationed at the gates to the campus. When I drove in that morning, the student at the gate said, ‘Pardon me, sir, but the campus is closed.’ Certainly a lot different than aggressive student demonstrations at other campuses.”
“Everett came the same year I did. We co-taught a course on race relations. His wisdom in sociology was exceptional and he had no pretenses. His interest was in special ethnic, racial and gender tensions – the first woman in a man’s field or vice versa – the first man in a nursing school. How Jackie Robinson changed the entire strategy of baseball in terms of speed and power, not just integration changes. Everett was furious about Watergate and Vietnam.” (note: at that time Everett updated his classic article on “Good People and Dirty Work” by applying the theory to the Vietnam war.)

“What I liked about the Department at BC was that there was no back-stabbing and there was a respect for collegiality (unlike Penn).”

“The one Jesuit I remember most well? Bob Drinan’s campaign for Congress and stint in the House. We became very close to him.” (note: Sy and his wife co-authored an article on “Congressman Drinan, S.J. and His Jewish Constituency” for the American Jewish Historical Quarterly.)

What have been your areas of interest?

“My first interest in ethnicity arose almost by accident. Don Martindale was my thesis advisor. I was interested in the history of ideas and the history of sociology, but Martindale felt that a thesis should be empirical. So I focused on ethnic community studies and analyzed the Jewish Community of Minneapolis.”

“I developed an interest in war after Vietnam when we had a number of Vietnam vets as students, particularly in our graduate programs. Also, Howard Becker was a visiting distinguished lecturer in our Department (in honor of Everett Hughes) and he gave a presentation on ‘spoiled identity.’ How the vets left as heroes and returned as deviants. This seemed to characterize the unusual and often perverse view of our students. I was particularly interested in the views of Paul Camacho, who while in Vietnam took notes in the foxhole on the ‘Gook Syndrome.’ And as a result, I became interested in ‘manufactured deviancy.’”

How about continuing interests after “retirement?”

“One is the sociology of music. For example, did you ever notice that the string part of a symphony orchestra in Europe and the U.S. is Jewish? I’d like to go to Europe and study the ethnic factor in opera singing and opera careers in Germany, Italy, and other countries.”

“A related interest is the sociology of films. This developed during my BC days. Unlike other departments like Penn where it took 10 years of politics to introduce a new course, I was able to go to the chair and ask that a new course on ‘Sociology Through Film’ be added. In that course we looked at films as they reflected key sociological concepts. My interest began with the study of Vietnam War movies.”

Combining these two interests is film and music; for example, the scores of Hitchcock films.

Interviewer’s note: Last but by no means least, very missed will be Sy’s turkey and special eggnog come Christmas holidays.

For more news regarding Sociology Faculty, please see our “Faculty Pages,” beginning on page 38.
Visiting Scholar Rob Kroes and BC Sociology Professor Sy Leventman Discuss Civilization on Both Sides of the Atlantic

Dr. Rob Kroes is a prominent scholar in American Studies. He teaches at the University of Amsterdam and spent the fall 2001 semester teaching in the Sociology Department at Boston College.

Leventman: This is Sy Leventman, I’m introducing Professor Rob Kroes from the University of Amsterdam who has been teaching here with us in Sociology the fall semester [2001]. Professor Kroes has been here previously, back in the fall of 1996. He is a sociologist, having received his Ph.D. in Sociology from the University of Leiden in the Netherlands, but beginning in 1978, he became head and Dean of the American Studies Institute at the University of Amsterdam in the Netherlands. And since then, he’s worked more or less, mostly more, in the American studies field, so that you might say he is an Americanist. And I might say, as a side personal comment since I myself know him for about seven or eight years, Rob is one of the most informed and insightful student scholars of American culture that I know. He has published three books in the field, one called The Persistence of Ethnicity; the other, If You’ve Seen One, You’ve Seen Them All; and – what’s the third?

Kroes: Them and Us

Leventman: Them and Us


Leventman: Questions of Citizenship in a Globalizing World. This fall semester, then, he has taught two courses for us in the Sociology department, and one has to do with his longstanding research on the American cultural presence in Europe, and the other on these issues that he is exploring now of citizenship, the sociology and culture of citizenship, you might say. So, I’d like to begin by asking Professor Kroes, since he was here last - since you were here last in 1996, have you noticed any changes, developments, things that caught your attention or did not? How would you respond to that?

Kroes: When I came here in early September, times had not really changed, nor did I notice major changes or had noticed over the last five years, looking at the U.S. from my European vantage point. ’96, of course, was the middle of the Clinton era, with affluence economically, a sort of retrenchment of Americans in their pursuit of, well, private happiness, the pursuit of happiness but seen as a private undertaking more than a collective undertaking as in previous periods in American history: the Roosevelt years, what have you, probably the Kennedy/Johnson years. And, well, coming the second time, after having observed the changes with the new Bush administration and, of course, the soap opera, the unending saga of the elections that caught, of course, the attention of Europeans and, well, caused more than a ripple here and there of amusement. And then it seemed - so briefly now, looking back, so briefly - it seemed as if America was retrenching from whatever worldwide undertaking the Clinton administration had assumed and taken upon itself in trying to intervene and negotiate in the Middle East - all that seemed an absolute no-no for the new administration. It was this retrenchment and you saw words, well, in the European press as much as in the American press, of a new isolationism, a new unilateralism, and all, of course, all of that changed on September 11th. What had seemed for its first eight months in office as a lackluster new administration without any other ideas than government retrenchment, taking the government off the backs of the people, all of a sudden responded in ways that I found quite remarkable, finding a role for itself in that sense, since September 11th may have well been the opening shot of the 21st century in the way that Sarajevo truly in 1914 was the birth pang of the 20th century. And well, there’s so many aspects now that have triggered, let’s say political life in America back into life. There is much more debate, public discussion on how to respond to this terrible day in your life and history, how to respond to it, how to reach out to allies and friendly nations, how to
find support elsewhere in the world, where just a year ago the Bush administration wasn’t particularly anxious or eager to do so. So all those changes, I now follow eagerly on a sort of daily basis - the whole discussion coming up, pro and con, what is taking place in terms of an intervention and a retaliation, a response, and that, in general, is followed closely and eagerly by Europeans. Let’s say one of the first amazing responses to what happened on September 11th, for instance, in a French daily newspaper, Le Monde, was an editorial which said - and it’s quite remarkable for a Frenchman to say - that we are all Americans. It is that revived sense of a shared situation, and a shared, well, civilization on both sides of the Atlantic, which seemed on the verge of extinction just several months ago. So it’s all those things that I see as remarkable changes and may well create new patterns and, let’s say, affiliations with other nations - also may create new patterns in Europe, where Europe is now much more seen as a possible partner for the future.

Leventman: Right.

Kroes: And it’s always America that takes the leading role in these changes. But Europeans may well be willing to follow in America’s steps this time.

Leventman: Yeah, thank you. You know, it seems to me that even, based on what I know of your previous research of American cultural presence in Europe, that most of the time, when we these days talk about American cultural presence, we’re talking so much about pop culture rather than, you might say, high culture or deeper levels of cultural values, assumptions, and so on. But it seems from what you have just said that the September 11th events brought out a deeper level of awareness, of deeper levels of American culture, not just pop culture. I remember so well, for example after Pearl Harbor, almost, it seems to me, my recollection is, the very next day there were popular songs about December 7, 1941, “a day which will live in infamy” and so on. Those were different times, but it seems this time, pop culture created a kind of emergency situation, that is, how far can we go with this? Can we sing about it? Can we kid about it? Can we even talk about it? And the American ability to deny things, sort of, came out, among other things. So, I mean there are no norms for this. Something like this has never happened. Even December 7th, 1941 was more of a traditional attack in the history of warfare than this.

Kroes: You may be right that certainly September 11 re-awakened this dormant layer of a deep sense of affiliation and affinity between western nation states in Europe and the United States itself, which is also under that larger heading of a western nation. Yet at the same time you, you cannot separate the two. There must have been a few chuckles in Europe when George Bush, in his first response, used, let’s say Texas popular cultural rhetoric like “Wanted - Dead or Alive,” things like that. Americans chuckled about this and saw it not necessarily as the best response to a serious event. Yet there he was, drawing on a reservoir of popular culture and things that would ring in people’s ears as, “Ah yes, this is the way to go” or, as others saw it, not to go. So there was that blend of something typically American about the way he handled the situation, which Europeans unfailingly recognized as typically American and maybe over-doing it. Yet at the same time, as I said a moment ago, there was that much deeper and wider response that drew on much deeper reservoirs of a sense of a shared culture, shared cultural values, and a long standing sense of affiliation with the American democracy and the American republic.

All that sort of – it’s always there, but it’s sort of dormant, it’s a given, as Daniel Boorstin would have called it. It’s a given. People know that there is this long line of descent and shared civilization and therefore it’s easy to, on a daily basis, to forget about this; not to mobilize it, and then to focus on just smaller aspects of American culture, mass culture in particular, popular culture penetrating into Europe and forming a world that Europeans grow up in. That is one of the things that I always found fascinating, particularly after the Second World War, or the second half of what you might call the American Century. Much of history, of their own individual history
growing up in Europe, as Europeans now remember it, is filled with American ingredients: American popular culture, films they saw, songs they sang, and which they can now use amongst themselves to go back in history collectively. That is one of the amazing things, the way that American culture works as an existential fact in European collective life.

Leventman: To shift to another, though not unrelated issue, your relations to and reactions to our students here at Boston College. This is now your second contact in the last five years. What has been your reaction, any changes since last time? I know we are aware that most of your students are more or less advanced, or seniors, and quite a few soc majors and so on. What’s been your reaction to the students?

Kroes: I must say first that, on both occasions, I was very pleased with the caliber, the quality of students I had. And I didn’t really see much of a drastic difference between the kind of students that I teach in Europe and the ones I teach here and taught in ’96. They’re equally eager, equally open, they do their homework, they read what you ask them to read, they have an intelligent response to it. If there is a change over these last five years – and it may well apply to my own situation in Amsterdam as much as here – it is an increasing sense of an internationalization of the student, of the student’s mind and their view of life. Many students I teach this time have been to Europe, have spent a year there at one or another of the American universities, European universities, quite a few in Amsterdam among them. And the same happened in Amsterdam, where increasingly the student body that I teach is international in its composition: exchange students from all over Europe, and always a sprinkling, or more than a sprinkling, of American students who come to Europe. And that really, I think, adds to the pleasure of teaching and having conversations with these students. They know more, they have acquired through personal experience a sense of the comparativeness, the comparative dimension to any topic that you talk about, whether it’s American culture in Europe or whether it’s problems of citizenship and changes. When I now ask them to reflect on problems of, let’s say multiculturalism, the opening up of the American mind to, let’s say the many cultures that make up American culture as an end result of that, they now are able, more easily perhaps than even five years ago, to then switch to Europe and get a sense, through the reading and through the conversations and through their own private histories, of similar discussions and reflections in Europe, with the European Union trying to find its identity with the many cultures, national cultures that make up the new Europe, the problem of immigrants coming to Europe, the problem of immigrants coming to the U.S. or coming to Canada. So it’s easier now, is my sense, to talk about those things in a comparative perspective since they, quite a few of them, have been there or plan to go there. They have this wider sense of the world than just Boston College, or Boston, or New England, or the United States.

Leventman: Professor Kroes, you were – after all, we are, here, the Sociology Department - originally trained as a sociologist but then have spent quite a few years now as an American studies person and so on. Do you still - your own self image as a professional - do you still see yourself as a sociologist doing this research, or what is your self/professional image or conception: historian, culturologist, sociologist?

Kroes: Well, I definitely moved away and wanted to move away from the, let’s say ambition of the social sciences in general - and sociology in particular in the fifties and sixties - to become more scientific, to see itself as truly working in a methodology and view of the world where you could, on the basis of an hypothesis, prove a point. Sociology itself has moved away from that, has probably become more informed by the intellectual views of historians. There has been a historicizing of the questions that sociologists now ask themselves, which affects the language, which affects their discourse, to use one of these contempo-
rary terms, and I myself definitely wanted to follow in those trends, along those trends. And, of course, when you move from sociology into a field like American studies - which is not a discipline, American studies by its very nature is multidisciplinary - you can ask questions that you can approach in a sociological vein, or more in the way that historians would, or more recently, since the 1980s, in a way that cultural historians would, trying to fathom the way in which people, individuals and collectivities, structure their worlds. That whole idea of reality as a constructed thing is, of course, a quasi-novel insight to cultural studies people...

You and I, as sociologists, would have a little laugh about this since, of course, particularly in American sociology and the history of American sociology, this has been a long line, precisely exploring the symbolic interactionism, the way that people do construct reality. But, let’s say in the 1950s, with Parsonianism and all that, it seemed as if American sociology and in its wake, following in its steps, European Sociology was moving away from that old inspiration, let’s say that of the classic Chicago school sociology. It’s coming back as a mental attitude. Although remarkably, you see very little attention explicitly paid or tribute paid to the old Chicago sociologists. It’s time, maybe, for a rediscovery of that reservoir of wisdom. But certainly I see myself as a sort of blend, a fusion, of certainly someone trained as a sociologist but then, having trained myself to become, let’s say more of a historian than I was - and you can’t study American culture or do American studies without seeing the historical dimension of everything that you are trying to analyze and understand. And then, of course, let’s say the cultural studies kind of questions that have been raised over the last 20 years, I now fully share and make my own, I hope.

**Leventman:** That’s interesting you say that, because of your own movement away from sociology. Today, right now, a lot of people, a lot of sociologists are expressing concern over the return to a kind of neo-positivism. I know I received communications from my own alma mater, the University of Minnesota, which, when I was there as a student in the late ’50s, was certainly a very multidisciplinary, cross-disciplinary field. We had to study different fields within soc, and then we had to have a minor, and many of us then minored then in the Philosophy of Science since that program was so outstanding there. ... to quote or paraphrase Pitirim Sorokin, American sociology has always suffered from what he used to call the “discoverer’s complex.” That is, you discover certain things that are quite obvious, like the wheel, and then you claim some great advance, you know, so you may be right. The rediscovery of the importance of previous approaches like the Chicago school, represented fieldwork, so-called soft methods, case studies, this kind of thing is, you know, is going to happen here. But [what] I still believe, my own personal opinion - you and I can carry this forward some other time - is that European sociologists, as indeed European scholars, are still much more broadly trained and educated than are, more or less typical American scholars, professors you find around American universities. I think American academic life has taken professionalism much further and really takes it quite seriously, so that when you specialize, you specialize. And specialization means you exclude certain fields of study. And I think that is my own experience teaching at your institute and your students, and talking to some of your colleagues at the University of Amsterdam; I found them much more broadly educated. Not inherently more brilliant, but much more broadly educated, frankly, than equivalent people here in the U.S. Well, any parting shots? Closing comments?

**Kroes:** Let’s see, I think we’ve got enough.

**Leventman:** Alright. Well, it’s been a pleasure and we hope we can enjoy each other’s presence once again in the future. And now that we’re into - truly, the next century, but the century for Europeans of globalization - after all, the Euro economy and the Euro dollar and so on is about to happen - that will be very interesting thing for us to observe too. Anyway, thank you, Professor Kroes.
The Sociology Department is pleased to announce the hiring of Research Professor Lisa Dodson. A recognized scholar in the area of urban poverty, social welfare, gender, and qualitative methods, Lisa will join the Boston College faculty in the Fall of 2002 following a previous appointment at the Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study at Harvard University. Lisa received her Ph.D. from the Florence Heller School at Brandeis University in 1992 and, among other publications, is the author of the acclaimed book, Don’t Call Us Out of Name: The Untold Lives of Women and Girls in Poor America (Beacon Press, 1998). In the words of Harvard sociologist, William Julius Wilson, “The powerful stories of the poor women in this book brilliantly convey the experiences and challenges of living in and coping with poverty.” Lisa was also the Principal Investigator of a Ford Foundation funded, three-city study of the experiences of poor urban women receiving public assistance. Professor Dodson will begin her work at Boston College with additional funding from the Ford Foundation to facilitate the publication of materials pertaining to this recently completed research.

During her first year at BC Lisa Dodson will also develop plans to extend her investigation of welfare reform and its impact on the everyday lives of the working poor and their families. As a member of the Boston College faculty it is anticipated that Lisa will expand her established program of externally funded research. In addition to its substantive importance, Professor Dodson work is also likely to provide funding opportunities and in-depth research training for BC graduate students. She will also arrive at BC with a reputation as an outstanding university-level instructor and will teach two courses per year to graduate students and advanced undergraduate scholars. In Spring 2003 she will offer a seminar entitled, “Coming from the Field: Acts of Fieldwork.” This course is intended to assist students who are conducting in-depth, qualitative research. In Academic Year 2003-04, Lisa will offer two courses, “From Poor Laws to Working Poor: The World of Low-income America” and “Women, Families and Communities in Low-Income America.”
As in past years, the Sociology Department hosted “Book Openings” to mark the publication of new books by faculty members and/or graduate students. While varying in format, each “book opening” event involves presentations by authors, followed by a discussion of issues raised by their newly published works. In March 2002, a book opening was held to celebrate the publication of David Karp’s *Burden of Sympathy: Mental Illness, Family Life, and Moral Responsibility*. Published in 2001 by Oxford University Press, *Burden of Sympathy* is based on the analysis of sixty in-depth interviews with the family members of persons suffering from severe mental illness, and on three years of sustained fieldwork observing a weekly Family and Friends support group. This important book is an engaging follow-up to Professor Karp’s critically acclaimed 1996 work, *Speaking of Sadness: An Exploration of the Meaning and Consequences of Experiencing a Pronounced Mental Disorder*. Karp’s new book expands his earlier inquiry by examining the impact that involvement with other’s suffering has for those closest to persons plagued by depression, manic-depression, and schizophrenia.

2002 also saw the publication of *Beyond Black: Biracial Identity in America*, by Kerry Ann Rockquemore and David L. Brunsma. Published by Sage in 2002, the book reflects the debate over the potential addition of a multiracial category to the 2000 census, which forced the nation to reflect upon important questions concerning the possibility of multiracialism and the reality of racial categories. At the heart of this controversy was the question of what it means to be multiracial in the United States. How do individuals with one black and one white parent understand their racial identity? What social and psychological factors influence their racial identity construction and maintenance? This book answers these important questions by presenting findings from the largest existing data set of black/white biracial individuals. Using both in-depth interviews and survey data, the authors document how biracial people develop a number of different racial identities and how these self-understandings are rooted in intriguing social, psychological, and cultural processes. The findings from this groundbreaking study provide a new and complex empirical foundation for future debates about the efficacy of multiracialism, and the future of racial categorization in America.

**Sociology Honors Program**

**Senior Majors:**
Sarah Ames, Keri Bayly, Mikaela Boyd, Alex Cheney, Timothy Cube, Ralia Malakidis, Shannon McDermott, Jared McLaughlin, Jenna Nobles

**Junior Majors:**
David Buckley, Robert Cristiano, Rachel Cummings, Melissa Farrell, Stephanie Howling, Kelly Iwanaga, Catherine Kholmann, Marion Redding, Sara Rosen, Holly Unger

New Filipino immigrants—who came to the United States in the early 1970s—cling to their religious practices for the survival of their ethnic identity in a society that is highly differentiated. They interact with the “secularized” society in their everyday life. Are they more secularized when they immigrate to the United States? The aim of this study is to show how the Catholic Filipino immigrants transform and maintain their religious practices as well as assimilate some mainstream American religious practices. Based upon in-depth interviews with 30 middle-aged first generation Filipino male and female immigrants who came to Boston (Massachusetts) in the early 1970s, I want to explore the observance of the religious practices of Filipino immigrants in the United States as the venue for conversation and interaction that manifests a complex social construction of their ethnic identity. Drawing on the arguments of secularization theory, I show that transformation and maintenance of the Filipino immigrants’ religious practices do not support the secularization theory. The consequences of the observance show the assimilating tendencies and enhancement of their identity as Filipino immigrants. The study of the religious practices of Filipino immigrants, such as devotions to Catholic saints and their feasts and their relation to indigenous spirituality and practices, will (a) transform and change the silent and invisible character of Filipino immigrants, (b) broaden our knowledge and understanding of the mixed-heritage and mixed identity of Filipino Americans, (c) identify the relationships between religious practices and ethnic identity, and (d) show the relationship of the process of assimilation to secularization.


Over the last fifteen years, the strategic approach to corporate community involvement has become the dominant organizational framework for large organizations in the United States. In essence, this approach links corporate community involvement with business strategy, and turns its practice to a well-organized, proactive, and selective involvement in pursuit of measurable impacts for the corporation and the community. This research views the strategic approach as an organizational innovation. As such, the process of adoption and implementation of the strategic approach can be captured best by a theoretical framework that focuses on the dynamics of interdepartmental politics and the influence of the institutional environments of corporations. A review of the literature on the strategic approach points to the absence of a systematic focus on the internal organizational dynamics, a topic that researchers in the field of corporate social involvement agree unanimously is worth studying.

This study uses an inductive, qualitative research design. Participating corporations have embarked on the change within the last 1-5 years. The focus of the investigation is on the early stages of the adoption of the strategic approach. The findings show the nature of corporate community involvement before the adoption of the strategic approach, the conditions for the successful adop-
tion of the innovation, the different paths that the actual change can take, a number of tactics used, and the process of decision-making. The findings suggest that the strategic approach to corporate social involvement has set the stage for the development of a more comprehensive approach to corporate citizenship ultimately leading to the changing role of the corporation in society.


The purpose of this study is to explore the impact of dominant discourses on welfare on the everyday lives of women caught up within the American welfare system. In the early 1990s, a moral crusade against welfare emerged, marking poor women as lazy, immoral, dependent, and dangerous. Based upon qualitative interviews with 36 women conducted in 1997, I explore the impact of this crusade on identity and daily practice. Clear differences in stigma experience and identity construction emerged from the interviews based upon community and family history. Concerned with how women position themselves as deserving and worthy amidst public and bureaucratic practices that suggest otherwise, I explore the tactics and strategies that these women employ to renegotiate and/or resist dominant understandings of welfare. These practices sometimes resist yet frequently accommodate the dominant ideology; the possibilities for resistance appear linked to the experience and internalization of stigma. Through this examination I explore larger questions of stigma, discourse, identity, and the possibilities of resistance.


This dissertation examines a model for a strategic organizing approach to media (Ryan 1999, 2000) that can, like other parts of an organizational strategic plan, assist community organizations with organizing missions to achieve strategic community organizing goals. The study provides an analysis of a model of a university-based research program collaboration with nonprofit advocacy and community organizations that developed and applied the model to train nonprofit organizations to increase their capacities to affect media coverage of social justice issues. The model attempted to put into practice a theoretical model on the strategic use of mass media for social change (Ryan, Carragee, and Schwerner, 1998).

The analysis examines under what conditions the community organizations were effective at changing media coverage to a more proactive coverage that supported the social change issues of campaigns of the community organizations. Another central question of the research is how this collaboration of university-based research projects and community organizations fits as a model in the growing university-community partnership movement.

This research is informed by theoretical work by Fisher on community organizational approaches to neighborhood organizing, Morris on social movement halfway house models, Ryan on strategic organizing approaches to media, and the literature on university-community partnerships and collaboration. The methodology of the dissertation is a comparative documentary approach to comparing the outcomes of media coverage of the eight community organizations that participated in the media training program.

The findings identify the two organizations with the strongest political activist approaches to community organizing as the most effective organizations in increased mass media coverage of their social justice issues. The media training, in combination with other factors, related to high levels of community organizing and coalition building by these organizations, led to a result of changes in mass media coverage. Organizations with primarily social work approaches to community organizing were more likely to focus on accessing local community media to support their
outreach efforts. The findings also identify reciprocity of benefits in this type of university program-community organizations collaboration. Through collaborative planning and program implementation, the university-based research project and community organizations created a new collaborative structure that bridged traditional gaps between university and community. The collaboration resulted in value-added outcomes.


White ethnic heterogeneity has been ignored as a structural correlate of violence in macrostructural crime literature. This dissertation attempts to remedy that omission by including an index of white ethnic heterogeneity in a structural analysis of violent crime rates for 458 of the largest U.S. counties and smaller subsets. Relying on literature that suggests that homicide is primarily a crime of an ingroup nature, I hypothesize that white ethnic heterogeneity, or the presence of multiple white ethnic groups in a county, should have a repressing effect on overall rates of county violence. I propose that the repressing effect is due to the socio-cultural barriers erected by the continuing presence of ethnic cleavages in a population. These cleavages should serve to contain ingroup violence within particular groups that may be experiencing higher levels of violence than other groups. Therefore, the larger the number of white ethnic groups, the greater the social barriers to the spread of violence across groups and thus the lower the overall levels of violence. The negative effect of white ethnic heterogeneity should be stronger for homicide, which is an ingroup crime, than for robbery, which is not an ingroup crime. Results offer some confirmation of the hypothesis: when an index of white ethnic heterogeneity is included in regression equations along with urbanism control variables, its effect on homicides is negative and significant while its effect on robbery is not significant. Since the relationship is moderate at most, when indicators of economic distress, social disorganization, region, and labor market structure are included in the analysis, the effect of white ethnic heterogeneity on homicide is no longer significant. In addition to testing the relationship between white ethnic heterogeneity and crime, other theoretically relevant variables were included in the analysis. Results show inequality, race, southern and southwestern regions, and percent divorced and separated males to be strong predictors of violent crime rates.


This dissertation analyzes human service management through case studies of two urban community-based nonprofit (CBNP) agencies. The historical and cultural backgrounds of these agencies are reviewed with a special focus on the Black Helping Tradition (BHT). The BHT concept is introduced as a key agency in determining management effectiveness among a spectrum of variables observed to influence the programming and function of the two human services organizations. I thus propose a new hybrid model for assessing organizational management effectiveness.

The broader implications of the BHT concept (described as a ‘forgotten legacy’) are explored for their present and potential future impact on society, particularly African-American society.

These case studies are organizational ethnographies. I take a ‘symbolic interactionist’ research approach to address the significance of program activities and develop the following primary themes:

a) Social interaction within CBNP’s operate on a competition-cooperation continuum. These interactions serve as key influences, especially among leadership cohorts in management.

b) The character of these interactions is a central variable, but it must be supplemented by sound technical, organizational, and managerial skills – including the capacity to establish
productive relationships with entities external to the agency, before success and stability can reasonably be expected to be achieved.

c) I propose the BHT phenomenon offers a unique, valuable perspective on the meaning, purpose, and ‘health’ of interaction as a complex social fact. I also propose that insights, hypotheses, and conclusions from its continuing empirical examination and analysis could be advanced, evaluated, and perhaps confirmed regarding 1) handling problems arising from conflict and competition and 2) the dynamics and nourishment of cooperation itself as a form of symbolic interaction. Such findings and results could be studied within and applied to the CBNP human services setting, other organizational settings, and perhaps beyond.


The United Methodist Church has been in tension over lesbian/gay/bisexual/transgender inclusion issues since 1972. That year, in response to the gay liberation and gay rights movements, wording was added to the UMC Book of Discipline (the compilation of denominational policies and doctrines) characterizing homosexuality as “incompatible with Christian teaching.” Since then, United Methodist ministers have been forbidden to perform same-sex commitment ceremonies (and United Methodist churches forbidden to host them), a rule has been passed that non-heterosexual United Methodist ministers must be celibate, and the UMC has been forbidden to fund any program or organization “supporting” homosexuality. In addition, a number of caucuses on both sides of the issue have been formed within United Methodism in an attempt to change or uphold these policies over the last several decades. In response to votes at the 2000 General Conference upholding the current prohibitions, civil disobedience resulted in the arrest of almost 200 people, including two UMC bishops.

My dissertation applies Friedland and Alford’s (1991) concept of contradictory institutional logics to the Methodist struggle over homosexuality in an attempt to incorporate but move beyond the “culture wars” approach to this topic. Friedland and Alford (1991:232) describe a number of key U.S. institutions, including democracy and Christian religion, with specific institutional logics. The institutional logic of democracy is the maximizing of individual participation in social structures as a basic human right, and religion’s institutional logic is “the symbolic construction of reality within which all human activity takes place” (1991:249). Central to Friedland and Alford’s overall argument is the claim (1991:232) that such institutions are “potentially contradictory and hence make multiple logics available to individuals and organizations.” I describe the form that Christian institutional logic takes among those conservative Methodists who are struggling to keep the current prohibitions against “affirming” homosexuality in place. I also provide evidence that a democratic institutional logic has become interwoven with the Christian logic for the “inclusionists.” I then consider how this case represents an example of a struggle “over the appropriate relationships between institutions, and by which institutional logic different activities should be regulated and to which categories of persons they apply” (Friedland and Alford 1991:256). Finally, I discuss how this approach to the topic suggests a surprising strategic direction for the “inclusionists,” one in which politics and legislative struggles are played down, while a gentle, open and non-political presence in the local church is played up.

Jonathan White, Ph.D. 2002. Jonathan’s dissertation is entitled “Hungry to Be Heard: Voices From a Malnourished America”

There are currently 30 million hungry people living in the United States. Yet, it is a vastly understudied and under discussed social problem, both in the mainstream discourse and in the field of sociology. This dissertation combines 54 intensive interviews of hungry Americans with a small survey of nonhungry college students and a full literature review of hunger and related topics. It connects hunger as a poverty issue, ana-
alyzes the dominant discourses (and lack of discourses) surrounding this social problem, provides insight into the life experiences of those living hungry in the U.S., analyzes the forces of political economy that allow for and perpetuate hunger, and attempts to offer viable and practical solutions. Half of those interviewed are women and half are men; they range in age from 7-83; interviews were conducted in a variety of rural, urban, and suburban settings in 14 states across the country and over a three year period. This dissertation is a call to action for sociologists and concerned citizens to listen to the voices of hungry Americans and to move toward the reduction and elimination of this vast social problem.

Where are they now?

Below is a list of recent Ph.D. and Graduate Student job placements:

**Felipe Bacalso, SJ, Ph.D. 2002**: Tenure-track Assistant Professor of Sociology, Fujen Catholic University Taiwan.

**Teresita Del Rosario, Ph.D. 2002**: Tenure-track Assistant Professor of Sociology, Ateneo de Manila, the Phillipines.

**Steven Farough, PhD. 2002**: Tenure-track Assistant Professor of Sociology, Assumption College.

**Kelly Joyce, Ph.D. 2001**: Tenure-track Assistant Professor of Sociology, William and Mary College.

**Emily Kearns, Ph.D. 1996**: Tenure-track Assistant Professor of Communications, Emerson College. (Previous tenure-track position, Clark College, Iowa.)

**Patricia Leavy, Ph.D. 2002**: Tenure-track Assistant Professor of Sociology, Stonehill College.

**Julie Engel Manga, Ph.D. 2000**: Senior Research Associate, Boston College Center for Corporate Citizenship.

**Karen McCormack, Ph.D. 2002**: Visiting Assistant Professor of Sociology, Wellesley College.

**Janine Minkler, Ph.D. 2000**: Tenure-track Assistant Professor of Sociology, North Arizona University.

**Calvin Moore, Ph.D. 2002**: Visiting Assistant Professor, Bowdoin College.

**Charles Sarno (ABD)**: Instructor, Holy Names College, Oakland, CA.

**Amanda Udis-Kessler, Ph.D. 2002**: Visiting Assistant Professor, Ripon College.

**Jonathan White, Ph.D. 2002**: Adjunct Assistant Professor, Bates College.
Dr. Platon E. Coutsoukis, Soccer Enthusiast; Restauranteur Turned Scholar

Platon Coutsoukis, Assistant Director of Research and Policy Development at the Center for Corporate Citizenship at Boston College, semi-professional soccer player, beloved husband, father, nephew, son, friend, and colleague, died of a heart attack while playing soccer on Sunday, August 4, 2002. He was 46 years old.

Born in Alexandria, Egypt, Dr. Coutsoukis was raised in Greece by his loving aunt and godfather. At the age of 19, he moved to Boston and enrolled in the University of Massachusetts, Boston, where he completed his bachelor's degree in Economics. Having always dreamed of running a restaurant, Dr. Coutsoukis became the original store manager for both of Boston's successful food chains, Au Bon Pain and Mrs. Field's Cookies. Combining this experience with a life-long taste for Japanese food, he opened the Yamasushi restaurant in Boston with a friend. In the early 1990's, Dr. Coutsoukis began his doctoral studies in Sociology at Boston College. During this time, he became an award-winning statistics teacher and worked as a research assistant at the Boston College Social Welfare Research Institute where he conducted studies on spirituality, wealth, and philanthropy, and co-authored the book, Gospels of Wealth: How the Rich Portray Their Lives. He received his Ph.D. in May 2002, writing his thesis on “Strategic Community Involvement: the Inner Thread of Corporate Citizenship.” In all his scholarly work, Dr. Coutsoukis combined a scientist's passion for truth and a philosopher's thirst for meaning.

In 2000, Dr. Coutsoukis joined the Center for Corporate Citizenship as Assistant Director of Research and Policy Development, where he applied his ground-breaking doctoral research in assisting corporations to contribute to the social well-being of their communities. Highly regarded and respected by his colleagues, Dr. Coutsoukis provided expert counsel and research to companies, foundations, and non-profit organizations. As such, his death is also a loss to the emerging field of corporate citizenship.

An avid soccer player, Dr. Coutsoukis played on the Boston Braves Soccer Team and was a fervent supporter of and participant in the International Friendship Soccer Tournament, the largest-ever tournament of soccer veterans in Europe, which took place October 2001 in Athens, Greece. His soccer teammates were a second family, which he joined each weekend for sport and friendship.

Soft-spoken and of gentle spirit, he could be firm and determined, while always maintaining and communicating respect for others. He brought his graduate student colleagues into study groups, freely gave statistical advice, and generously helped them with their research and writing. He loved to laugh, and fully enjoyed life, friends, and family. Most importantly, Dr. Coutsoukis was a loving and dedicated father and husband. He found endless enjoyment and took great pride in his son Christopher, posing for pictures cheek-to-cheek, playing chess, and sitting him on his lap at the computer.

Dr. Coutsoukis was a romantic, sharing 23 years of marriage with his wife Sandy, with whom he fell in love at first sight. He often extolled her personal and professional accomplishments and it was clear to friends and family that theirs was an equal partnership of shared responsibility and mutual affection.

In addition to his wife Sandra A. Houde and their son Christopher, age 8, of Arlington, Massachusetts, Dr. Coutsoukis leaves his mother Amalia Elgazzar and father Panoyiotis Coutsoukis, his godparents Irene Vartele and Lou Mammos, and brother Paris of Athens, Greece.

The wake was held on Thursday, August 8, at the Faggas Funeral Home in Watertown, MA, and the funeral was held on Friday, August 9, at Taxiarchae Greek Orthodox Church, also in Watertown.

Contributions may be made to the Christopher Coutsoukis College Fund, c/o Center for Corporate Citizenship, 55 Lee Road, Boston College, Chestnut Hill, MA 02467.

written by Paul Schervish
Under the leadership of founder Sharlene Hesse-Biber, the National Association of Women in Catholic Higher Education (NAWCHE) remains an exciting intellectual and organizational forum housed within the Sociology Department. With the assistance of Ph.D. student Denise Leckenby, the National Association for Women in Catholic Higher Education held its sixth biennial conference at Santa Clara University in Santa Clara, California on July 12th and 13th of 2002. The theme of the meeting was “Bridging the Divide: Connecting Activism and Academia Through Social Justice.” This theme impacted various presentations and discussions, shaping the ways in which many felt that they reconnected to the tried and true statement, “the personal is political.” This theme of bridging the divide shaped not only the content but also the context of the conference. Bridging divides, reinvigorating old connections, exploring new relationships in a dynamic and dialogic environment seems to be a hallmark of the NAWCHE conferences.

Keynote speakers Trinh Minh-Ha and Ada Marie Isasi-Diaz each opened the conference with invigorating and inspiring discussions. Trinh’s keynote, “Far Away From Home,” addressed the importance of women having a unique sense of self, place, and “home” in their everyday lives, while Isasi-Diaz’s “Reconceptualizing Differences: A Matter of Justice” empowered women to work together to gain a collective voice as leaders.

One of the topics explored was the complexity of the problems surrounding undergraduate service requirements. A panel by King’s College raised important questions such as: What have been the responses of first year students to required service hours in the orientation program? What is the connection between service learning and student activism? If the ultimate objective of service-learning is the academic development of students, does this deter faculty from engaging students in social transformation? How can faculty and students increase administrative support of service and activism? What resources should colleges and universities be providing? These issues were examined both through the current literature on student engagement, and through empirical reflections on their own experiences as teachers, administrators, and facilitators engaging in various types of service learning. King’s College participants also discussed the barriers of student service within litigious social environments.

Examples of activism within academia were also presented at the conference. Particular emphasis was placed on the current social movements on several Catholic campuses to address the issue of gender equity. Panelists from Marquette University joined with those from Santa Clara University to provide practical information about how their institutions worked to form such important groups as the Gender Climate Task Force at SCU and Marquette’s Task Force on Gender Equity. Findings and procedural issues were examined, showing ways in which activism around women’s issues is alive and powerful on these particular campuses.

Sharlene Hesse-Biber joined with the executive director of Eikos Community Services to strategize about how women at institutions of Catholic higher education can work to move the debates and issues surrounding the crisis in the Catholic Church from secrecy to dialogue. This hands-on workshop began to outline the powerful role women can have in the current and future dialogues that are taking place. Tools for setting up structures for listening and fostering dialogue among faculty and between faculty and students were elaborated.

Plans were developed during the business meeting, small group discussions, and personal one-on-one brainstorming sessions to shape NAWCHE’s agenda for the upcoming year. These included planning a retreat weekend to be held January 2003 for further articulation of future agendas. The exploration of the development of a NAWCHE Research Center/Archive for the Study of Catholic Women, listserv development for support and dissemination of information, and deepening NAWCHE’s direct connections with the National Women’s Studies Association were also discussed. These broad and important projects will shape the direction of NAWCHE throughout the next two years until our next conference in 2004.

Rebekah M Zincavage
Global Justice Project: Social Justice Action based on Political Analysis

Led by Professor Charles Derber, Sociology Ph.D. student Deborah Piatielli, and a core group of undergraduate student leaders, Boston College’s Global Justice Project is comprised of a wide range of Boston College faculty and students, as well as members of Boston-area civic organizations and other public interest group activists. Hosted by the Sociology Department, the stated mission of the Global Justice Project is “to promote dialogue in the university and larger society that will lead to a new framework for global policy and advance justice in the global economy.”

The Global Justice Project sponsored multiple events during the 2001-02 Academic Year, including a variety of lectures and workshops. In preparation for its well-planned events, faculty, students and community-partners associated with the Global Justice Project met regularly on an every other week basis over the course of the academic year. For the students involved, these meetings provided complex, participatory lessons in justice-oriented leadership, effective organizing strategies, and a profoundly ethical approach to global political analysis and action. During AY 2001-02 two events organized by the Global Justice Project drew large “standing room only” audiences of over 300 students. These included a Fall Semester panel discussion on corporate sweatshop labor practices in Bangladesh and a Spring Semester lecture by former US Marine Colonel and UN Weapons Inspector, Scott Ritter, on the troubled state of US-Iraqi relations.

MRAP Honors William Gamson, BC Sociology Professor and Social Movements Theorist

On June 14, 2002, the Media Research Action Project (MRAP) in conjunction with the Boston College Sociology Department hosted When Hope and History Rhyme: A Working Conference on the Interplay of Social Movements and Social Movement Theorizing. The conference was held in honor of longtime BC professor and social movement theorist, William Gamson. Under the leadership of Professor Charlotte Ryan and MRAP Office Manager, Louise Lymeris, and with the assistance of an organizing committee composed largely of Sociology Department Ph.D. alumni, this exciting conference brought internationally recognized social movements scholars together with area activists for a day of dialogue and analysis. Other key organizers included BC alumni David Crouse of Virginia Commonwealth University and William Hoyne of Vassar College. On the eve of the conference, a “testimonial/roast” dinner for Bill Gamson was hosted in Gasson Hall. Funding for the When Hope and History Rhyme conference came from Boston College and the American Sociological Association.

As a day-long event the conference was divided into two sections. In the morning, activists and scholars addressed key questions in social movements theory, as well as the challenges facing sociologists when studying social movements. Afternoon sessions focused on “best practice” strategies with interactive workshops examining a wide range of issues concerning strategy, ideology, and transformative social practices. Featured speakers included Richard Flacks (University of California, Santa Barbara), Aldon Morris (Northwestern University), Jorge Martinez (Project RIGHT), Cynthia Peters (Jamaica Plain Action Network and Z Magazine), Richard Healey (Grassroots Project), David Snow (University of California, Irvine), Robert Ross (Clark University), Zelda Gamson (University of Massachusetts, Boston), and David Meyer (University of California, Irvine). The conference concluded with reflections by Bill Gamson.
Awards and Honors

The following is a partial list of Awards and Honors received by faculty members of the Sociology Department during Academic Year 2001-02.

Professor William Gamson, elected as a Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences.

Professor Lisa Dodson, Recipient, Ford Foundation Grant (2002-2003). This grant will enable Professor Dodson to continue her ongoing project: The **Lower Income Work & Family (LIWF)** study, furthering her previous research of documenting, analyzing and publicizing the conditions of work/family life in lower income America. This year the project work will include: analysis of interview and focus group data, limited fieldwork, writing up new findings and disseminating complex issues faced by working families in low-income America.

Professor Eva Garroutte, Recipient, Training Grant, Native Investigator Development Program, administered by the Resource Center for Minority Aging Research, University of Colorado with funding from the National Institute of Health. This prestigious award extends from 2000-2002. In addition to providing travel funds and a variety of research support funds, this grant will buyout half of Professor Garroutte’s teaching time, provide methodological training in aging research, and provide $20,000 of seed money for a research project of Professor Garroutte's choosing.

Professor Jeanne Guillemin, awarded Security Studies Fellowship, Massachusetts Institute of Technology for Fall 2002.

Professor Sharlene Hesse-Biber, named 2002 Sociologist of the Year by New England Sociological Association.


Professor Kerry Ann Rockquemore, 2002 Recipient of Boston College Research Incentive Grant.

Professor Paul Schervish, recognition for the work that he and his colleagues have done in the Social Welfare Research Institute. Their research and commentary have been featured in the Boston Sunday Globe’s “Big Idea” page, and in a New York Times article reporting on how the growth in wealth has created a new generation of younger philanthropists. Schervish has been interviewed and quoted in Investor’s Business Daily, Private Banker International, Reuters Newsday, the Wall Street Journal, Inc. Magazine, the Los Angeles Business Journal, and Parade Magazine. He has spoken on Wisconsin Public Radio, WBUR, and National Public Radio. Internationally, Schervish has been quoted in the London Sunday Times, Australian Financial Review, Danish Kristelt Dagblad, and the British Private Wealth Advisor.
Recent Publications and Presentations

**Patricia Chang, Research Professor**


**Charles Derber, Professor**


Invited Lectures: Colby College; Center on Corporate Citizenship; Council on Foreign Policy; Conference Board and Council on Philanthropy (keynote speaker).

**William Gamson, Professor**


Eva Garroutte, Assistant Professor


Jeanne Guillemin, Professor


Sharlene Hesse-Biber, Professor


HyperRESEARCH version 2.5 for qualitative data analysis [Computer Software]. ResearchWare.com Inc, 2002.

Lynda Lytle Holmstrom, Professor


David Karp, Professor


Recovery in a Therapeutic Culture, review essay. *Qualitative Sociology.* (Spring) 24: 107-115.


Lecture on *The Burden of Sympathy.* Manic Depressive and Depressive Association, McLean Hospital, Belmont, MA, 2001.

**Robert Kunovich, Assistant Professor**


**Michael Malec, Associate Professor**

“Comments of the State of the Society.” Presidential Address presented at the annual meeting of the North American Society for the Sociology of Sport (Nov.).

“Sport and ‘the Moral.’” Paper presented at the 35th Congress of the International Institute of Sociology, Krakow, Poland (July).

**Stephen Pfohl, Professor and Chairperson**


“Memories of Overdevelopment: Cybernetic Capitalism and Ultramodern Power.” Mixed media text with slides, sound and video. Invited presentation, Department of Sociology, Syracuse University, April 24, 2002.

“Theorizing the Spectacle/ Theorizing the Social.” Invited presentation, Department of Sociology, St. Lawrence University, Canton, New York, April 25, 2002.

**Catherine Kohler Riessman, Research Professor**


Analysis of Personal Narratives. In J.F. Gubrium & J.A. Holstein (eds.), *Handbook of Interview*


Invited participant, plenary panel, Narratives of Disease, Disability and Trauma, Wall Interdisciplinary Conference, May 2002.


Kerry Ann Rockquemore, Assistant Professor


Paul G. Schervish, Professor


**Juliet Schor, Professor**


**Diane Vaughan, Professor**


John B. Williamson, Professor


