Message from the Chair: 
Our Many Audiences

James M. Jasper
CBSM Section Chair
Professor of Sociology
The Graduate Center of the City University of New York

For whom do we write? The most traditional answer is that scholars of social movements write for each other, so that we can advance our shared understanding of various aspects of social movements and related phenomena. A trendier answer today is that we also write for the activists in those movements, providing them historical perspective, strategic advice, or simple facts about their situations. Many of us also hope to reach a general reading public, often writing books about movements in order to “explain” them to curious bystanders. And of course we also write for our students, through our lecture notes if not through classroom-oriented books or articles in Contexts.

We rarely reach all the audiences we seek. Activists read little of what we write, published in hard-to-find journals in hard-to-read prose. (The exception is research commissioned by movement organizations, such as surveys of members or assessments of the popularity of different frames or different goals.) Our strategic advice to them is usually superficial or even laughable. And it is sheer luck when one of us develops access to the general public in any sustained way. Instead we are pleased when a book sells several thousand copies, or a journal article is cited a few times. We may have a more compliant audience in our students, facing incentives like tests and grades, but that influence rarely outlives the final exam.

Continued on Page 2
Amenta Responds to Halfmann, Andrews, Banaszak, and Chen

I want to thank Drew Halfmann, Andy Andrews, Lee Ann Banaszak, and Tony Chen for an excellent exchange at the session in San Francisco, and I want to thank the first three for sharing their insights for CriticalMass. I think they make many excellent points and help to identify a common ground from which to move forward. Here I mainly want to underline some of the commonalities, reinforce some of comments, and return to points made in my initial piece and in my (2014) review of some recent books on the political consequences of movements (including Halfmann’s and Chen’s).

Halfmann, Andrews, and Banaszak all call for greater theory development. Halfmann calls for combining insights from separate theories, which he refers to as a hybrid approach. Andrews calls for a better modeling of mechanisms and processes. Banaszak echoes the call for the delineation of mechanisms and suggests the building of meso-level theories. In addition, Andrews calls for engaging with other lines of scholarship, including economic sociology and organizational sociology, as well as political sociology. Banaszak, and especially Chen in his comments in San Francisco, point to the importance of analyzing counterfactual questions in historical movement analyses.

I agree with all of this, though I would amplify Andrews’s point about engaging other relevant literatures. Those of us hoping to understand the influence of movements, or movements as potential causes, will need more radically to turn away from the standard social movement literature, built as it is around movements as outcomes. We will have to start from the literatures regarding specific sorts of social change or institutional influence that movements are seeking and we are studying. Scholars hoping to investigate the influence of movements over legislation, courts, corporations, policing organizations, or the news media should start with scholarship about what drives change in these institutions and theorize about where movements fit in these processes. We will need to become at least as expert in political sociology, the sociology of law, economic sociology, or the sociology of the media, as in movement studies.

The transformation of movements from something to be explained to potential explanations of change in institutions means starting from scholarship regarding those institutions and working back to movements. After all, these institutional changes are not “movement outcomes,” as it is often put, but institutional outcomes that are probably only occasionally influenced by movements. Those studying the impacts of movements on institutions other than political ones may want to think through how closely these processes resemble the development of policy, using the more extensive literature on the influence of movements in politics as a source of hypotheses. And with the recent advances of the literature on the movement influence over other institutions, scholars concerned with their influence on politics should do the same.

Report from the Mayer N. Zald Award Committee

The committee for the best graduate student paper this year consisted of Drew Halfmann, Ali Kadivar, Deana Rohlinger, and James Jasper, chair. After reading thirty submissions, they awarded the prize to Jonathan Horowitz of UNC for “Oh, the Places I’ll Go! Possible Selves, Persistence Narratives, and Activist Identity.” This is a theoretically complex and empirically rich paper, based on both quantitative data and qualitative interviews. It identifies different “identity profiles,” asking why some identities are stronger than others and can lead to sustained activism. It distinguishes, and shows the relationship between, several different types of identity: the kind of solidarity that movement scholars usually examine, but also personal identities in different social contexts, which can have different relationships to group identities and to group membership. Different kinds of action arise from these different kinds, combinations, and uses of identity. Congratulations to Jonathan.

James Jasper (Committee Chair)

Chair’s Letter, Continued from Page 1

Few sociologists write well enough to hold the attention of anyone other than our fellow scholars. We learn a style sufficient for getting into journals, hardly a high bar, and then stop trying to improve our writing. Extra words are scattered about, passive constructions sneak in, paragraphs try to do several things at once, illogical leaps abound. We could do better, if only we had the time.

That leaves our colleagues as our principle audience. Even here the situation is grim and probably deteriorating, thanks to time pressures and to the increasingly detailed division of labor among scholars. Students of the labor movement do not read those who write about the LGBTQ movements, and vice versa. Those who study political and religious movements live in mutual ignorance. Those who write about feminism don’t necessarily read about the civil rights movements; specialists in the environmental movement ignore them both. Who has time to read widely? (My own partial remedy is to team up with brilliant colleagues, for example teaching a course with Ruth Milkman comparing labor and other social movements.)

Publishers’ current obsession with handbooks, encyclopedias, and other digest fills part of our ignorance; we can at least find a superficial summary of a subfield when we need one. Not that publishers are motivated by such intellectual needs; libraries apparently continue to buy expensive handbooks even as they acquire fewer and fewer real books.

The decline of books seems pervasive, but it especially affects one of our key audiences, students. A few instructors still expect their students to buy some books each semester. More of us place snippets and scans on private websites, where snooping publishers cannot see them, with the admirable intention of saving students money but the unintended effect of undermining publishers. Even grad students, once the pillar supporting used bookstores everywhere, no long buy books as they once did. As I look around at the fifteen Ph.D. students in my seminar, one or two have bought the week’s book, a couple more have library copies, and the rest are operating from ebooks or (legal or illegal) scans on their laptops.

Aside from courses, the situation is less grim. Scholars continue to purchase books in their fields; a few titles each year find a nonspecialist audience; and libraries continue to buy books, even if in electronic form. And perhaps the course market is not dead after all. Although Sage stopped acquiring for its esteemed Pine Forge “Sociology for a New Century” series, Polity has launched several new series of books oriented to course use, each priced appropriately at around twenty dollars.

There are other new options for reaching audiences: self-publishing (one quarter of new ISBNs issued every year go to self-published books); working papers on sites like Academia.edu (which also contains published papers, of course; I am always amazed at the number of views and downloads that my papers get from there); materials that we provide on our own websites; blogs or interventions on sites
such as Mobilizing Ideas. None of which counts for much at promotion time, at least not yet. And unless you have already developed an audience – probably through traditional media – no one will find your self-published books and papers. Randy Collins can put his (extremely interesting) examinations of charismatic figures on his website. A new assistant professor can’t risk that.

Electronic access does not mean easy access. The two main journals in our field, *Mobilization* and *Social Movement Studies*, are not widely available. I personally subscribe to one but can’t afford the other. My university library does not get either.

For authors the ultimate ideal is open access: legal and free to all. We want a poor grad student in Indonesia to read what we write (although open access is no guarantee that she will!). Even the ASA, never at the cutting edge of publishing developments, is launching an open access sociology journal (the tentative title for which is *Socius*, which I believe is Latin for “What the hell is that?”). If readers are not going to pay, authors ultimately have to. The details of this need to be worked out, given the inequalities between those with research/publication grants and those without, between well-paid full professors and impoverished adjuncts and grad students, between those at wealthy institutions and those at poor ones.

Open access may be able to save a dying species, namely the edited volume based on a conference. The encounters at these meetings are vital to the spread of new ideas and the creation of new subfields, yet scholarly presses are reluctant to publish the resulting volumes due to shrinking book sales. When they do publish them, they often release hardcover editions that sell for $200, a price tag that only a handful of libraries can afford. Jan Willem Duyvendak and I learned this in trying to publish papers on “players and arenas” from a small conference. Last year we ended up launching our own book series, *Protest and Social Movements*, with Amsterdam University Press because they agreed to bring everything out in open access after twelve months. I can’t help thinking they did their math wrong, and I guess we will find out; in the meantime they have signed up a dozen titles in the first year. Website: [http://en.aup.nl/series/protest-and-social-movements](http://en.aup.nl/series/protest-and-social-movements). (Warning: they aren’t free -- or even published – yet, and are expensive hardcovers until then.)

Conferences and edited volumes remain important because they enable networks to form, of ideas as well as of people. More and more, I have come to see my role as a scholar to consist of bringing together people who can generate ideas and projects through their interactions. I no longer think of my work as that of a solitary writer in my cellar. During meetings of the Politics and Protest Workshop that John Krinsky and I run at the CUNY Graduate Center, I am always impressed by the crowd knowledge that emerges from the twenty people present. Often someone in the audience has been an active participant in the movement under study; someone else has studied parallel mechanisms in other movements; a third person has observed the state’s activities as part of the context. The suggestions end up being more extensive and helpful than any one of us, even the most brilliant, could have provided alone. It is an exciting process to watch. Such face-to-face conversations are another important audience, and not just for the emotional energy they generate.

Our audiences remain fragmented by language. Most scholars around the world can read what we write in English, but we rarely have access to what they produce in other languages. A lot of great work – the vast majority – remains untranslated. Few of us Americans develop or maintain serious language skills.

Native speakers of English have an extraordinary advantage in today’s world, as hundreds of millions read our language as well as their own. This arbitrary privilege imposes a responsibility on us, in my view, to help non-native speakers to reach Anglophone audiences. I challenge each of you: translate works if you can, edit their work in English if you cannot. We should review books in other languages in our US and British journals. Keep up with what is being written in other languages, to the extent you can. And try to network with international scholars. Many of us write about globalization, but we do little to enhance its potential benefits. American sociologists remain embarrassingly parochial. This does the world no good, and it does us no good. Our audiences are small enough as it is.
One of the central lessons of rhetoric is, know your audience. It is hard to target an audience effectively when you are trying to reach several audiences at the same time, and harder still when you are not clear about who those audiences are. No one has enough time to read (I am pretty sure that most of those who received this newsletter never started reading this essay; most who did stopped reading long ago!) As our audiences shrink and fragment, it is more important than ever that we think about the best ways to reach them. They all require different styles.


### Recent Publications

#### New Books


McVeigh, Rory, David Cunningham, and Justin Farrell. 2014. “Political Polarization as a Social Movement Outcome: 1960s Klan Activism and its Enduring Impact on Political Realignment in...

Other Publications


McVeigh, Rory, David Cunningham, and Justin Farrell. 2014. “Political Polarization as a Social Movement Outcome: 1960s Klan Activism and its Enduring Impact on Political Realignment in...


Additional Announcements

Woodberry, Robert D. National University of Singapore, won both the 2014 Best Article Award, Global and Transnational Sociology, American Sociological Association and the 2014 Distinguished Article Award, Association for the Sociology of Religion for his article “The Missionary Roots of Liberal Democracy.” (2012. American Political Science Review 106(2): 244-274). To date the article has won eight awards including two from the American Sociological Association and four from the American Political Science Association.

2014 Job Market Candidates

Jonathan Coley, Department of Sociology, Vanderbilt University (jonathan.s.coley@vanderbilt.edu)

Research interests: Social Movements, Political Sociology, Gender and Sexuality, Race and Ethnicity, Religion, Culture

Dissertation Title: “Varieties of Activism: Pathways of Participation among LGBTQ Religious Activists”

Abstract: My dissertation sheds light on multiple pathways of micro-mobilization in social movements, commitment to social movements, and biographical consequences of social movements, with a specific focus on LGBTQ activism at religious universities in the U.S. Drawing on in-depth interviews with 65 LGBTQ student activists at four Christian universities (which were selected on the basis of a quantitative analysis of all Christian universities in the U.S.), I first identify multiple pathways that students follow into LGBTQ groups: while participants with salient activist identities seem to have been born and raised as social movement activists, participants with salient religious and sexual identities join these groups only after intensive re-socialization processes. Second, I explain variations in commitment to LGBTQ groups in terms of the correspondence between individuals’ identities (political, religious, and sexual) and the forms of LGBTQ groups available to them (direct action, educational, and solidarity groups). Finally, I explore the divergent biographical pathways that students follow out of LGBTQ groups, showing that while participants in direct action groups continue to pursue involvement in social movements, participants in educational and solidarity...
groups focus on applying their groups’ values in humanistic careers or on an interpersonal level.

**Erin M. Evans**, Department of Sociology, University of California, Irvine (emevans@uci.edu)

*Research interests:* Social Movements, Political Sociology, Media, Culture, Policy Reform, Environmental Sociology, Animal Rights

*Dissertation Title:* “The Problems and Promises of Policy Goals for Social Movements”

*Abstract:* Activists rarely get everything they want from policy demands. During the policy making process their demands are tempered into political compromises. Do these policy concessions co-opt movements or do they provide activists a foothold for further change? This question is fundamental to democracy: Can movements promote the change they want through democratic processes like policy reform? The animal justice movement’s on going work to protect animals in research provides a good case for examining this topic. I explore the impact of federal regulation at the laboratory level by interviewing scientists, bioethicists, veterinarians, and other professionals involved in research with animals. I also use ethnographic, archival data, and content analysis of newspaper data to capture changes that are related to increasing regulations of research using animals. I found that policy reforms created structural access to laboratory decision-making. At best, this structural access may have facilitated changes in attitudes and practice of those involved in animal research. At least, increasing regulation has not squelched the movement, but rather has diversified the organizational character of the animal rights movement.

**Brad R. Fulton**, Duke University (brad.fulton@duke.edu)

*Website:* [http://sites.duke.edu/fulton/](http://sites.duke.edu/fulton/)

*Research interests:* Organizations, Social Movements, Inequality, Diversity, Research Methods, Quantitative Analysis

*Dissertation Title:* “Bridging and Bonding: How Social Diversity Influences Organizational Effectiveness”

*Abstract:* Although many organizations aspire to be socially diverse, diversity’s consequences for organizational effectiveness remain unclear. Social bridging theories argue that diverse organizations will be more effective because they have access to more social resources via their members’ diverse networks. Social bonding theories, on the other hand, argue that diverse organizations will be less effective because they are less cohesive by virtue of their members differing socially from each other. When scholars test these competing theories they often (mis)specify social bridging and social bonding as being the inverse of each other. This study specifies them as distinct mechanisms and measuring them independently—bridging as the diversity of a group’s social composition and bonding as the frequency of a group’s social interaction. Then I use original data from the National Study of Community Organizing Coalitions to examine how these mechanisms influence organizational effectiveness. The first analysis indicates a consistent positive relationship between social interaction and effectiveness and a mixed relationship between social diversity and effectiveness. The second analysis indicates that social interaction positively moderates that relationship between diversity and organizational effectiveness. This finding suggests that being diverse is not enough. In order to fully realize the benefits of diversity, diverse groups need to meet regularly and talk about their relevant differences. Overall, this study finds that organizations can improve their effectiveness by having socially diverse members who interact often and in ways that engage their differences.

**Kimberly Creasap**, Visiting Lecturer, Department of Sociology, University of Pittsburgh (kac130@pitt.edu)

*Dissertation Title* (defended in June 2014): “Sweden Ends Here? Social Movement Scenes and the Right to the City”

*Abstract:* This dissertation is an ethnographic account of how, when, and where autonomous social
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movements create alternative cultural communities in Stockholm, Göteborg, and Malmö, Sweden. In Malmö, activists have created a lively, robust activist scene that is an important part of a neighborhood. In Göteborg and Stockholm, the scenes are more fragile and have less impact on their respective neighborhoods. I find that these differences are shaped by the timing of urban development projects in each city and the strategies that activist groups pursue. This research highlights the importance of widening the lens around activism to examine how movements are culturally, geographically and spatially situated in neighborhoods and cities.

2014 CBSM Section Awards

Charles Tilly Award for the Best Book in Collective Behavior and Social Movements

Winner:


Scholars studying social movements often want to make sense of their causes and consequences. Usually, however, they do not have to ask why the movement exists. It seems obvious at least in retrospect that underlying grievances are severe enough and the institutional recourses distant enough that the rise of a movement seems plausible, possibly inevitable.

That is not the case for the movement addressed by Isaac Martin in his *Rich People’s Movements*, which is rich theoretically and empirically. As he notes, political campaigns supporting the rights and privileges of the rich have appeared throughout U.S. history. But why do these campaigns even exist? After all, rich people are by definition doing well, and so do not seem particularly aggrieved. What is more, they can use money to gain privileged access to the political process—they do not need to protest to gain the attention of political leaders. Martin also identifies a second puzzle in the typical activists in these campaigns, which do not typically comprise the extremely wealthy. Why would somewhat rich people engage in such extensive political action in behalf of the very rich people who would benefit most from the efforts and who are sitting these campaigns out?

Martin solves these puzzles with arguments steeped in historical institutionalist thinking and the literature on policy retrenchment. It is a central point of historical institutionalism thinking that policy is central to politics and shifts in policy can change political possibilities dramatically. The literature on retrenchment indicates that policies create new political identities and interests. Any threats to these policies will strongly mobilize those who stand to suffer directly, while only weakly affecting the bulk of the populace.

Employing these ideas, Martin argues that rich people’s movements are mobilized by policy threats, notably those provided by taxation policy. As with bids to retrench more redistributive policies such as social security, these policy threats involve loss. They also impinge on rich people collectively, unlike the economic downturns that often help to drive poorer people’s mobilizations. Following the social movement literature, he also argues that these conditions are not sufficient, but that policy entrepreneurs are also needed to get these movements going.

*Rich People’s Movements* does not stop here, and goes on to addresses the second key question in the literature on movements, regarding their influence. Martin finds that rich people’s movements were sometimes influential, but, that, too poses a puzzle. Generally speaking, bestowing collective benefits to rich people is politically unpopular. Questions asking the public whether taxes should be cut for the rich usually get negative answers. To address this influence, Martin partly employs political mediation ideas in the literature on the political consequences of social movements. He argues that these campaigns had great impacts when the political system was dominated by conservatives.
However, Martin goes beyond standard thinking as well in showing that these movements were more influential than most in at least two ways. First, they were able to use their resources to craft policies and funnel them to supportive members of Congress. Moreover, because only rarely did Republicans hold the levers of power, these organizations had to come up with some other strategies. Specifically, they worked to dominate the Republican party. This long-term project has paid the government-revenue equivalent of extensive dividends, as the tax rate for the richest income group has declined dramatically since World War II.

Martin supports his arguments by way of comparative and historical analyses. He focuses on five campaigns of these movements and locates the principal organizations backing them. He demonstrates why campaigns appear and when they are influential. In doing so, he leverages many historical and across-organizational comparisons in support of compelling arguments about the rise and influence of these movements. He also provides a historical narrative of the development of these connected campaigns over time. The book is well written and makes these developments if, given the results, not exactly a pleasure to read but certainly easy to do so.

In deeply engaging social movement questions about the causes and consequences of movements, *Rich People’s Movements* is innovative in focusing on a highly influential set of movement campaigns that scholars have ignored and providing new theoretical insights. It is must read for anyone wanting to understand the causes and consequences of movements and their campaigns as well our current political predicament.

*Edwin Amenta (Past Committee Chair)*

**Honorable Mention:**


This is a remarkable work that deserves a wide readership among social movement scholars. It examines the third era of the Ku Klux Klan, a movement that has received surprisingly little attention from scholars in spite of its enormous influence on twentieth century racial politics. As the Civil Rights Movement began to make headway against the segregationist racial order in the South, whites poured into the Klan to defend the structures of white supremacy. Nowhere did this Klan grow as large as in North Carolina, a state widely considered more progressive than those in the Deep South. In the 1960s, the North Carolina Realm of United Klans of America (UKA) attracted tens of thousands of dues-paying members. As significant, the hundreds of thousands who flocked to its rallies and events projected an unambiguous message of racial intimidation. Cunningham meticulously assembles data from new archives, surveillance files from the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and interviews with Klan members to understand what led to striking growth and subsequent collapse of North Carolina’s UKA.

One accomplishment of this book is to provide an empirically rich and analytically nuanced account of one of America’s most destructive social movements. Despite its efforts to project a unified image, the Klan in every era tends to be highly federated with significant local and regional autonomy. The 1960s Klan was no exception. Many Klans across the south embraced violence as a strategy against civil rights, but in the more politically moderate North Carolina, the UKA projected a more ambiguous message, what Cunningham terms a “fragile balance between nonviolent rhetoric and militant action.” Klaverns and Klan leaders positioned themselves as defenders of racial segregation in a state in which public officials were willing to accommodate to federal integrationist dictates. At the same time, they recognized that repression and legal consequences would follow from violence in the name of the Klan and worked to temper the actions of their most militant members. Particularly useful is Cunningham’s dual lens on the UKA and the agencies of the police and FBI that simultaneously monitored/opposed and ignored/encouraged its activities.
A second accomplishment is Cunningham’s development of an innovative multilayered “mediated competition” framework that integrates the mechanisms and contexts of Klan mobilization in North Carolina. Drawing from scholarship in social movements and ethnic competition, he argues that UKA was best able to attract members from areas in which whites perceived a status threat, more mainstream venues for resisting desegregation were unavailable, and the policing of the Klan was limited. For example, the Klan gained particular traction in North Carolina where it could claim to be the main vehicle for defending white privilege in contrast to the Deep South where elected officials, Citizens’ Councils, employers, school boards and other institutions were active.

Cunningham not only provides new insight into how organized racism can take hold in unexpected contexts, but also shows the long-term consequences of even relatively short-lived racist movements. The UKA did not succeed in preserving racial segregation in North Carolina. Nor did it endure as a significant movement in the state. But it did leave an impact on racial politics in the state and nation by contributing to the rise of the Republican Party across the South. By fraying the social fabric of communities in which it took root, the UKA also left a legacy of violence and crime. Decades after the collapse of the Civil Rights-era Klan, its former locale continue to exhibit unusually high levels of violent crime.

Kathleen Blee


I should note that this article was the top selection of 3 of our 4 committee members this year and was unanimously agreed upon as the winner of this year’s award.

Shultziner’s article examines the Montgomery Bus Boycotts. While this has been fodder for a wealth of social movements research, this article sheds new light on this critical event. Essentially, Shultziner asks the fascinating question – why did the bus boycotts happen in Montgomery instead of some other city? Through the use of archival data, this study introduces new findings to demonstrate that Montgomery, Alabama, was unique in its segregation system. In addition, it was not simply that black Montgeromians were becoming increasingly sensitive to a stable system of segregation, as commonly assumed; rather, that it was the system itself in Montgomery intensified the abuse of, and sense of humiliation among, blacks in a relatively short period of time leading up to the boycott.

For example, there was a particular system of segregation on the Montgomery buses that forced blacks to confront discriminatory whites on a daily basis – such as by making them come to the front of the bus to pay and then have to get off the bus and reboard at the back. This did not happen in other cities where whites and blacks could enter the bus from the same door. In addition, labor-related issues for the Montgomery bus drivers increased the propensity of these drivers to be abusive of black passengers taking out their frustrations through, for example, name calling and yelling at black passengers. Because of these practices, Schultziner argues that it is not simply that a certain level of discrimination has to exist to inspire mobilization, but that certain practices in Montgomery in particular made the discrimination humiliating on an individual level. This is a truly innovative look at an event that has been extensively analysed. This article was a pleasure to read and provides for wonderful insight into a well-known event. At a wider level, this article also pushes us to think about how the lived experiences of individuals leads to the rise of social movements. This article was so thought provoking that it inspired a two month dialogue on the Mobilizing Ideas blog.


This article is based on intensive archival and ethnographic data used to examine the role of icons in national identifications. Zubrzycki examines these processes through an analysis of Saint John the Baptist, patron saint of French Canadians and
CriticalMass

national icon from the mid-nineteenth century until 1969. In 1969, protesters destroyed his statue during the annual parade in his honor in Montréal. While this event could have simply been a footnote in history, the “beheading” of the Saint instead became a critical event in the Quiet Revolution that transformed Québécois society. Why did this happen? Zubrzycki explains the significance of this event by developing the concept of aesthetic revolt, a process whereby social actors rework iconic symbols, redefining national identity in the process. Zubrzycki offers a theoretical articulation and an empirical demonstration of how cultural objects and symbols come to be significant in protest and mobilization. This article provides both a novel theoretical lens and an illumination of the significance of symbols in social movements as a whole.

Catherine Corrigall-Brown

Secretary/Treasurer Report

As of August 1, 2014, we had 769 members. We are projected to have 829 by the end of the year. That would be 10 fewer than we had at the end of 2013. Justin Lini has indicated that many sections have experienced a drop, so there doesn’t appear to be cause for concern. As long as we have over 800 members at the end of the year, we will have 5 sessions (and the business meeting) at the next annual meeting. This is the same number of sessions we have had for the last few years.

At the council meeting we discussed that it may be worthwhile invest some fresh effort into recruitment. One area for possible growth is in student members. A hand out on benefits for graduate students (mentoring program, etc.) might be a useful tool.

As of June 30, 2014, the section had $11,166 on hand. After expenditures associated with the 2014 annual meetings including the reception ($2000), award plaques ($394.20) and the Outstanding Graduate Student paper prize ($250), we will have approximately $8521.80 left.

Sarah Sobieraj (Secretary/Treasurer)

---

Calls for Papers and Other Opportunities

Calls for Papers

CBSM Sessions at ASA 2015 in Chicago (For more information, see the official Call For Papers on the ASA website).

CALL FOR PAPERS: Sociology of Development

We are pleased to announce that the new journal Sociology of Development (published by University of California Press) is ready for manuscript submissions!

The journal webpage, which includes manuscript preparation information, is here: http://www.ucpressjournals.com/journal.php?j=sod.

The manuscript submission webpage is here: http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/ucpress-socdev

Sociology of Development is a new venue for scholarly work that addresses issues of development, broadly considered. Areas of interest include economic development and well-being, gender, health, inequality, poverty, environment and sustainability, political economy, conflict, and social movements, to mention only a few. Basic as well as policy-oriented research is welcome. The journal further recognizes the interdisciplinary scope of development studies and encourages submissions from related fields, including (but not limited to) political science, economics, geography, anthropology, and health sciences. A foundational principle of this journal is the promotion and encouragement of intellectual diversity within the study of development. As such, the journal encourages submissions from all scholars of development sociology, regardless of theoretical orientation, methodological preference, region of investigation, or historical period of study.

Andrew Jorgenson and Jeffrey Kentor (Co-Editors)
CriticalMass

SOCIAL MOVEMENTS CONFERENCE - CALL FOR PAPERS

From 1995 to 2014, Manchester Metropolitan University hosted a series of very successful annual international conferences on ‘ALTERNATIVE FUTURES and POPULAR PROTEST.’

We're very happy to announce that the Twentieth AF&PP Conference will be held, between Monday 30th March and Wednesday 1st April 2015. (Will we make it to Twenty One? Place your bets…) Problems in getting information out of the university bureaucracy mean that we can’t yet definitely state what it will cost to attend. It should be very much as in previous years. But we wanted to get this information out now, with a promise of more to follow.

The Conference rubric will remain as in previous years. The aim is to explore the dynamics of popular movements, along with the ideas which animate their activists and supporters and which contribute to shaping their fate. Reflecting the inherent cross-disciplinary nature of the issues, previous participants (from over 60 countries) have come from such specialisms as sociology, politics, cultural studies, social psychology, economics, history and geography. The Manchester conferences have been notable for discovering a fruitful and friendly meeting ground between activism and academia.

PRELIMINARY CALL FOR PAPERS: We invite offers of papers relevant to the conference themes. Papers should address such matters as: contemporary and historical social movements and popular protests; social movement theory; utopias and experiments; ideologies of collective action; etc.

To offer a paper, please contact either of the conference convenors with a brief abstract: EITHER Colin Barker, Dept. of Sociology OR Mike Tyldesley, Dept. of Politics and Philosophy. Manchester Metropolitan University, Geoffrey Manton Building, Rosamond Street West, Manchester M15 6LL, England; Email: c.barker@mmu.ac.uk Email: m.tyldesley@mmu.ac.uk

CONFERENCE PAPERS: We ask those giving papers to supply them in advance, for inclusion on a CD of the complete papers which will be available from the conference opening. Preferred method: send the paper to Colin Barker as an email attachment in MS Word. Any separate illustrations etc. should be sent separately, in jpg format. If this is impossible, post a copy of the text to Mike Tyldesley on a CD disk in MS Word format. Final date for receipt of abstracts: Monday 9th March 2015. Final date for receipt of actual papers: Monday 16th March 2015.

Transformative Possibilities in the Global South: The 4th annual conference of the Sociology of Development Section – CALL FOR PAPERS

March 13-15, 2015
Brown University, Providence, RI

The Department of Sociology and the Watson Institute for International Studies at Brown University will host the 4th annual conference of the Sociology of Development section of the American Sociological Association. The conference will be held March 13-15, 2015, in Providence, Rhode Island. The theme of the conference is “Transformative Possibilities in the Global South.”

The conference explores the forces – politics, movements, state structures, policies and institutions – that might drive more inclusive, sustainable, and genuinely democratic trajectories of development in the Global South. A series of plenary sessions and invited keynote speakers will focus on selected conference themes, but other sessions will be organized entirely based on papers that are accepted through this open call. We encourage all scholars with interest in development, including scholars from fields other than sociology, to consider attending. The conference is open to all, whether you are presenting or not.

If you are interested in presenting a paper, please follow the instructions below. All papers will be given full consideration and if accepted organized into panels of no more than 4 speakers. We are especially interested in papers that present new research material.
To submit a paper proposal:
1. Prepare a 2 page abstract (no more than 500 words)
2. Go to www.brown.edu/academics/sociology/socdev to complete application form and submit abstract.

The deadline for submission is Monday, November 24.

Note: There is no fee for registration. Partial funding to defray costs of airfare/lodging will be available for some graduate participants and for some international scholars. Applications for financial support will be available after papers have been accepted.

For questions, please contact our Conference Coordinator at Ricarda_Hammer@brown.edu.

We hope to see you in Providence.

The organizing committee:
Peter Evans, Nitsan Chorev, Ricarda Hammer, Patrick Heller, Jose Itzigsohn, Timmons Roberts, Andrew Schrank

Other Opportunities
Open Access Movement is one for Social Movement Scholars to JOIN!
Jackie Smith, University of Pittsburgh Editor, Journal of World-Systems Research

Here’s a movement CBSM members should know about if you don’t already. The Open Access movement is one in which academics and librarians must play leading roles, and it challenges corporate power and inequality in some important ways. Our work has contributed to the growth and consolidation of one of the most profitable industries in the world—academic publishing. And as fewer companies control more of the publications to which we and our university libraries subscribe, they have been able to raise costs to unprecedented levels, leading libraries to start cutting their journal subscriptions. There are some important discussions happening in the ASA and elsewhere about Open Access and the Creative Commons, so you will be hearing more about these issues, and I provide a few resources here for people who wish to learn more.

- The Open Access Movement and Activism for the “Knowledge Commons” (my contribution to the ASA Footnotes Forum May/June 2014) http://www.asanet.org/footnotes/mayjun14/asaforum_0514.html
- Culture Change in Academia: Making Sharing the New Norm: Lecture at University of Pittsburgh for Open Access Week --Erin McKiernan, an early career researcher in experimental and computational neuroscience and a leading advocate for Open Access, Open Data, and Open Science. McKiernan will explore the powerful, positive benefits of openness in scholarly research, the tension between personal success as a researcher and Open Science, and the need for reform in our academic evaluation and incentive systems. McKiernan is a postdoctoral fellow in psychology at Wilfrid Laurier University. (Link http://d-scholarship.pitt.edu/23441/ provides access to video recording of lecture and McKiernan’s resourceful presentation slides)
- Open Access Week—is organized by the International Open Access Week alliance at the end of October each year. This year was the 7th celebration of Open Access Week.
- Creative Commons: Use Creative Commons licenses to prevent companies from limiting your potential readership and to protect open access to knowledge for everyone—regardless of their ability to pay.

Nominations Sought for ASA Major Awards!

ASA members are encouraged to submit nominations for the following ASA awards. The deadline for nominations is provided with each award criteria. Award selection committees, appointed by ASA Council, are constituted to review nominations. These awards are presented at the ASA Annual Meeting each August. The deadline for
submission of nominations is January 31 of each year unless noted otherwise in the individual award criteria.

We're currently looking for nominees for the following awards:

♦ W.E.B. DuBois Career of Distinguished Scholarship Major ASA Award
♦ Distinguished Book Major ASA Award
♦ Distinguished Contributions to Teaching Major ASA Award
♦ Distinguished Career Major ASA Award for the Practice of Sociology
♦ Excellence in the Reporting of Social Issues Major ASA Award
♦ Cox-Johnson-Frazier Major ASA Award
♦ Major ASA Award for Public Understanding of Sociology
♦ Jessie Bernard Major ASA Award
♦ Dissertation Major ASA Award

For more information go to: http://www.asanet.org/about/awards.cfm
The Premier Review of Research in Political and Social Movements

Are you missing your MOBY?
It's not too late to subscribe

Mobilization is a wonderful gift to the community of social movement scholars. A rigorously edited journal provides a focal point for us all. Almost all American scholars read it, and I suspect most European scholars too.

Maye N. Zald, University of Michigan

In a recent conference I don't think there was a single paper that didn't reference an article published in Mobilization. At this point the field of contentious politics and protest studies would be inconceivable without Mobilization.

Kevin O'Brien, University of California, Berkeley

Mobilization: An International Quarterly is a selective, peer-reviewed review of research in social and political movements, riots, insurrections, revolutions and other forms of collective action. A recent study ranks it as a top sociology journal based on citation scores.

For library subscriptions, contact the managing editor at Hank.Johnston@sdstate.edu

☐ Please charge my credit card (Visa, MasterCard, Amex) for US$48.50 ($88.50 outside US).
☐ I enclose a check payable from a US bank.

Credit Card 
Exp. Date

Name (please print)

Signature

Mail Copies to

You may contact our office directly 619.594.1323 to place your order. Or you may fax your order for a 2010 subscription directly to the publication office at San Diego State University 619.594.2836
Or mail to: Mobilization: An International Quarterly, San Diego State University, San Diego CA 92182-4423
Or contact the managing editor directly at Hank.Johnston@sdstate.edu