President’s Message

By Patricia Yancey Martin

Dear SWS colleagues,

It was wonderful to see so many SWSers in Denver. To all who participated in an SWS activity, thank you. The meeting rooms provided by ASA were spacious and, thanks to Shirley, the AV equipment in the rooms worked correctly the entire time. When it was time to change the room set-up, e.g., for Christine Williams’ talk or the Business Meeting, the Convention Center staff were on the spot, ready to roll. Finally, and not least, Shirley and Jazmyne assured us of an ongoing supply of food in the Hospitality Suite: Coffee, yogurt, juice, muffins, and power bars. The banquet was as always a celebration of our veterans who have done amazing things and our up-and-coming “new stars” as well. Congratulations to the award winners and to all SWSers whose good fortunes over the past year included a new child, a new job or commitment, a promotions, a positive tenure action, a new article, book, or (continued on page 2)

(continued on page 3)
We owe Shirley and Jazmyne immense thanks for the way they handled things. They were in office only a little over a month by then yet they managed the registration desk, program, meeting facilities, banquet, etc. to perfection. We are in their debt. Thank you, thank you.

At the business meeting, I presented an overview of the status quo of SWS which, in brief, was akin to the following. I pointed out that until a decade ago, the SWS Winter Meeting was dedicated 100% to SWS business. All in attendance were decision-makers who debated whatever and tried to make decisions. Myra Marx Ferree, SWS president in 2001, shifted the meetings to a “programmatic” focus thus making it possible for members to present papers and obtain support from their home institutions. The change gave the president of SWS leeway to focus on a particular theme and gave the Winter meeting a substantive - rather than business-focus. What it meant, in effect, was that SWS business was transferred to the elected officers on Council. Over time, a structure evolved that included Council, EOB (see below), and 11 standing committees.

How are decisions made in SWS? The members of our elected Executive Council are: President, Past President, President-elect, Vice-President, Treasurer, Past-Treasurer, Treasurer-Elect, Secretary, and Student Representative. The VP, Secretary, and the Student Rep serve two year terms each. The others serve one year in office with an additional two years as “elect” or “past.” Council assumes primary responsibility for the organization’s welfare. All SWS policy decisions of a binding nature are affirmed (or not) by Council. Of course, suggestions for those policies come from committees, individuals, and so forth.

An Executive Office and Budget Committee (EOB) also exists with these members: Three presidents (current, past, elect), three treasurers (see above), Gender & Society editor, and two Chairs of the SWS Publications Committee. The EOB considers financial issues that fall outside the regular budgeting process and recommends actions on financial matters to Council. Ironically, six of nine EOB members also serve on Council with the result that they “advise themselves.” Such redundancy may be unwise and, if there is a better arrangement, we hope the Strategic Planning Task Force will suggest what it is. (If you have ideas, let them know!)

In addition to Council and EOB, SWS has 11 standing committees and, presently, an Ad Hoc Strategic Planning Task Force with an 18-month agenda (three working subcommittees—Mission, Bylaws, Long Range Planning). The plan is for the Task Force to report recommendations to Council which will respond to them and pass them on to members, likely in the form of an online referendum. If you have ideas, concerns, or suggestions for the Task Force’s subcommittees, please tell Leslie Hossfeld (hossfeldl@uncw.edu) and she’ll pass them on to the proper subcommittee. The dedicated work of Task Force members is very much appreciated. They met for a full 8 hours in Denver. Now that’s commitment.

Council and EOB met for four hours each to consider many issues (see minutes in this issue). During one Council meeting, two committee chairs attended and described their committee’s work and goals. Roberta Villalon from the Discrimination Committee and Minjeong Kim from the International Committee offered reports, posed questions and asked for guidance.

What do SWS committees do? They are charged with implementing SWS policies & procedures; with communicating to and asking for guidance from Council, Executive Office, and the membership on issues within their purview; they make suggestions to improve their service, significance, & impact for SWS members & for women and girls in society. Our committees need members who want to invest in SWS. Please let me or any current committee chairs (see SWS Webpage) know if you are willing to serve in this way. Being on a committee is the best way to get a feel for what SWS is, does, stands for, and tries to achieve.

Since I last wrote in Network News,
interdisciplinary team has developed a mega-project using public funding for fighting against gender based violence and to include gender as a category to permeate the regions (departamentos) of Bolívar and Valle del Cauca development plans.

Ciclo Rosa, a program we created to advance the public understanding of the LGBT population’s needs and accomplishments, is now 12 years-old. Pensar (en) Género was awarded official recognition for its long-term commitment to such communities; the group has been instrumental for enacting Bogotá’s LGBT public policy, which includes training the metropolitan police and the creation of a liaison police officer. Ciclo Rosa is also a film festival offered in Bogotá, and that travels to Medellín and Cali, the two other major Colombian cities. In 2012, Ciclo Rosa Académico was held August 24–27 featuring guest speakers such as Daniel Balderston (U of Pittsburgh), Robert Irwin (U of California), and a group of Colombian scholars and artists: Pedro Adrián Zuluaga, Julián David Correa, Santiago Monge, Nancy Prada, Camilo Rojas, César Sánchez and the Mujeres al Borde collective.

Pensar hosts a permanent seminar on gender studies every other week, with promising young scholars and faculty members whose seniority in research create an informal mentoring program that has trained hundreds of students. (The oft result of this mentoring in the seminar on gender studies is the acceptance and enrollment of Colombian students into the United Kingdom, Australia, and US Master’s and PhD programs.) We also have on-line courses sponsored by international and national agencies to teach how to address gender issues in schools and public offices, and the on line basic course on LGBT issues and social inclusion, titled Virtual Certificate on Sexual and Gender Diversity in contemporary social and cultural processes (Diplomado virtual: la diversidad sexual y de género en los procesos sociales y culturales contemporáneos). Between 2001 and 2005 we joined the Siegen-Wuppertal Feminist Philosophers Group, located in Germany, for Ethics in our own Words, a research project on displaced and migrant women in Colombia. Some of our members are currently part of Resistir y Articular, a LGBT national coalition comprised of activists, artists, and academics; others are working with interventions such as Vidas móviles (Mobile lives), a social responsibility program helping displaced persons located in Ciudad Bolívar (a poor and violent neighborhood in the South East region of Bogotá). Upon the request of USAID in 2012 we have joined the campaign MissRepresentation to address women’s symbolic annihilation by the media in school programming.

Publications include a series of books on displaced and migrant women: (1) Diario de uma prostituta argentina – An Argentine Prostitute’s Diary. (2) Mujeres colombianas en España: historias, inmigración y refugio—Colombian Women in Spain: Histories of Migration and Refuge, (3) Gender theory: Pensar (en) Género, a primer that gathers national and international scholars, (4) LGBT theory and social intervention: Crímenes de odio—Hate Crimes, also a primer, and (5) Otros cuerpos otras sexualidades – Other Bodies/Other Sexualities, to mention but a few.

Our group has been working in teaching basic legal concepts to address three situations pending with the Judiciary: gender-based violence, job related conflicts, and divorce/separation-related legal issues. In doing so, we have designed e-learning courses and a series of primers that are distributed by thousands in Colombia, accompanied by a radio series we aired through the university radio stations (35).

Pensar is member of CLACSO—the Latin American Council of the Social Sciences. The research group also has been recognized by COLCIENCIAS, the National Agency for the Advancement of Sciences. Our institution has received grants from national and international agencies.

The Global Feminist Partnership that connects SWS with many progressive and activist/scholar organizations, such as Instituto Pensar, becomes a partnership thanks to the voluntary involvement of SWS members – in our case, our nominating SWS member (and Fulbright sociologist from American University) was Salvador Vidal-Ortiz. The partnership with SWS will benefit our seminar and Pensar (en) género; we look forward to building a strong network among colleagues in the Andean region, and across the Americas. Instituto Pensar/Pensar (en) género also looks forward to informing feminist and gender discussions among SWS members, with our research findings, local realities, and theorizing, in the near future.

*****

If you would like to get connected to Pensar (en) género for research collaboration or research abroad or other inquiries, please contact Carmen Millán de Benavides (cmillan@javeriana.edu.co), Salvador Vidal-Ortiz (vidalort@american.edu), or Minjeong Kim (mjkim@vt.edu).
How a CSW Meeting Works

by Daniela Jauk

“A CSW meeting functions in circles,” an NGO representative explained at the daily morning briefing in the Church Center of the UN across the street from the UN Headquarters. “In the core of the circle you have the Member States who have their negotiations, the next ring are the side events held by Member States and UN agencies, and the outer ring are the parallel events held by civil society members like us, here in the Church Center.” While in former years access to the United Nations Headquarters was easier and regional caucuses by NGOs were held in the various rooms in the “eye of the tiger,” as one NGO representative calls it, since 2010—due to reconstruction work and spatial limitations—the stages for action and interaction between government delegates and civil society have become more limited. Even though more than 4000 civil society members are registered for the meeting in 2012 for instance, of which about 1000 are present at the meetings at any given day, only about 400 “secondary access passes” (one per accredited organization) are given out to enter the United Headquarters -without problems- in order to sit in on official CSW meetings, panels, and roundtables held by Member States. In order for an NGO to be accredited and granted access to the CSW, it has to achieve consultative Status with the Economic and Social Council of the UN well in advance through lengthy application procedures (DESA NGO branch http://csonet.org/). SWS has achieved consultative status with ECOSOC in 1999 thanks to efforts of the International Committee of SWS.

The “core of the circle” is comprised by actual members of the Commission which was founded in 1946. Forty-five Member States of the United Nations serve as members of the Commission at any one time. The Commission consists of one representative from each of the 45 Member States elected by the Council on the basis of equitable geographical distribution: thirteen members from Africa; eleven from Asia; nine from Latin America and Caribbean; eight from Western Europe and other States and four from Eastern Europe. Members are elected for a period of four years. Yet all 193 Member States are invited to participate in the negotiations of the “Agreed Conclusions,” the outcome document of the CSW. Most member states send delegates to New York City for the meetings who negotiate standpoints and language in member state groups (e.g. African group, EU) and participate in negotiations for the Agreed Conclusions and other resolutions that may be tabled during the CSW meetings (Website of CSW for further info and history: http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/csw/). Even though the Vatican is not a state nor a member of the United Nations, The Holy See became a Permanent Observer State at the United Nations on 6 April 1964, and as such is able to participate in the meetings of all the sessions of the General Assembly, in all missions, and intergovernmental bodies, yet does not hold voting rights. Its rights were extended and spelled out again in U.N. General Assembly resolutions A/58/314 and A/58/871 in summer 2004, which will develop a detailed SWS Operations Manual to help us avoid institutional memory lapses, keep track of our policies, and inform us about our financial status, actions, and plans. In short, a detailed Operations Manual will be invaluable in making SWS more transparent to the membership.

With these changes at hand, I ask you to help Shirley and Jazmyne in any ways you can. I invite you to let me and other officers and chairs know your views. And please let the Task Force know your ideas for making SWS even better that we already are. As our President-elect writes elsewhere in this issue, I hope to see you in Tamayo, New Mexico, in February!
SWS Members’ MEDIA

For links, visit http://www.socwomen.org/web/media/sws-newsmakers.html

Orit Avishai wrote, at CNN.com, “Do Powerful Women Need to Tame Their Unsightly Bulges?”

Bernadette Barton wrote “‘Ex-Gay’ Group Proves That Change is Possible.”

Mary Bernstein was quoted in “Undocumented Activists Follow LGBT Tactics.”

Chloe Bird wrote “Obesity is not all your fault” and “Why the Gender Double Standard?”

Amy Blackstone wrote “Childless and loving it: Not being a parent has advantages for families and kids.”

Chris Bobel wrote, at the Christian Science Monitor, “Why It’s Easier to be a Good Daddy than a Good Mommy.”

Tressie McMillan Cottom wrote, at Huffington Post, The Way Forward for Higher Education Is Not For-Profit Colleges. Also, a post at The Nation owes its “Trickle-down feminism” title to her.


Georgiann Davis wrote, for the Ms. Magazine blog, “Olympics’ new hormone regulations: judged by how you look.”

Leta Hong Fincher wrote, in the New York Times International Weekly, “Missing out on a real estate boom.” She was quoted in The Telegraph’s “Young, free, and shengnu: China’s Bridget Joneses.”

Jeanne Flavin wrote, at Huffington Post, “That Sound You Don’t Hear: Catholic Leadership’s Response to Project Prevention.”

Afshan Jafar wrote, for Inside Higher Ed, “Visiolibrophobia: Fear of Facebook.”

Carol Joffe wrote “Race, Reproductive Politics and Reproductive Health Care in the Contemporary United States.”

Emily Kane wrote “Parental fear, social judgments, and the gender trap.”

Michael Kimmel wrote, at Huffington Post, “Rape and Women’s Voice.”

Adina Nack wrote “Supreme Court Health Care Ruling—a Significant but Incomplete Victory.”

Virginia Rutter wrote “Who knew? dudes in traditional marriages are traditional at work too.”

SWS Members’ AWARDS

Shannon Davis won the OSCAR Mentor Award for Excellence in Undergraduate Research Mentoring, and was recognized as a Teacher of Distinction, at George Mason University.

Nikki Jones became Chair of the Race, Gender & Class Section of the ASA. Julie Bettie is Chair Elect, and newly elected Councilmembers are Lorena Garcia and Natalia Sarkisian.

Andrea Miller is the 2012 recipient of the Kemper Excellence in Teaching Award at Webster University.

Gwen Sharp and Lisa Wade won the CITASA Award for Public Sociology, for the Sociological Images website.

SWS Members’ JOBS AND MOVES

Shannon Davis was promoted to associate professor with tenure at George Mason University.

Sheri Kunovich was promoted to associate professor with tenure at Southern Methodist University.

Anne Lincoln was promoted to associate professor with tenure at Southern Methodist University.

Christin Munsch is now a Postdoctoral Research Fellow at Stanford University’s Michelle R. Clayman Institute for Gender Research.

Kristen Myers is now Director of Women’s Studies at Northern Illinois University.
IT’S TIME TO VOTE!

SWS will be electing new officers, chairs, and committee members online in its annual election from October 15 to 31, 2012. Thank you to each of our candidates for their willingness to stand for election as this is an important service to our organization. They’re doing their part, now do your part: vote and help us choose our leadership for the coming years!

Information on the election will be sent to the listserv and posted on the SWS website (www.socwomen.org). The website is where you will be able to review the names of candidates and read candidate profiles. To vote, you will need to log in at www.socwomen.org/members, then click on “VOTE” to view expanded statements online and to cast your votes.

Award Winners

2012 Feminist Mentoring Award
Professors Kramer & Simonds – Joint Award For Mentoring

The Awards Committee has decided that Professors Laura Kramer and Wendy Simonds be co-awarded the 2012 SWS Mentor Award.

Laura Kramer is a truly devoted and committed teacher and scholar, which explains how she is such an outstanding mentor. Her mentoring has included working with administrators, faculty in STEM, undergraduate students at Montclair, as well as women scholars across the academy. One nominator wrote that “she connects with mentees on a deep personal level”, a thought that is echoed by many of the others. Letter writers also said that she is “forthright and balanced”, a “champion of all women in academia” and “knows the value of networking for women in academia’. Professor Kramer was formerly with the NSF, as a Program Officer for the ADVANCE program, and she has drawn on that background to mentor women widely across disciplines, something that comes through very clearly in all of the nominating material. In sum, the committee agreed on Professor Kramer for her determination to ensure that women and feminist scholars, in all disciplines, are given they respect that is truly theirs.

Wendy Simonds is clearly an outstanding mentor who values her relationships with colleagues. She creates relationships that, as one letter writer said, “intertwine friendship and scholarship” has, as stated by another, considerable “feminist energy”, and, as suggested by yet another nominator, an “enviable ability to integrate her art and her work into her everyday life”. It is clear that Professor Simonds embodies much of the spirit underlying the SWS Mentorship Award: she is a woman academic who devotes herself to the discipline and its organizations in many ways. She is currently the President of the Society for the Study of Social Problems and has chaired the C. Wright Mills Award Committee (SSSP), and taken on many other challenges. These commitments, combined with her deep understanding of the processes by which many oppressions are expressed, and her ways of using her leadership to “promote fairness and equity”, and thus mentor students and colleagues in a deep and profound way led us to recognize Professor Simonds with the 2012 SWS Mentorship Award.
— Joya Misra

2013 SWS Distinguished Feminist Lecturer

The distinguished feminist scholar we honor with the 2013 SWS Distinguished Feminist Lecturer Award is currently one of the most sought after discussants on women’s health in the United States. A Research Associate in the Women’s Studies Department at SUNY-Albany, she has previously worked at Texas Women’s University and Vassar College.

Our honoree is truly a public sociologist, boldly tackling on the airways, in the blogosphere, any public venue where a feminist critique is needed, cultural imagery that is so pervasive that it borders on the absurd: the pink ribbon. Her work has challenged the ways the biomedical industry, mass media, and corporate interests facilitate the infantilization and commodification of women diagnosed with (or afraid of being diagnosed with) breast cancer. Her research has interrogated the ways a

(continued on next page)
breast cancer diagnosis challenges women’s relationships, yielding a balancing act between caring for themselves while supporting others with the same diagnosis and simultaneously maintaining their families. Her scholarship blends sociological analysis of culture and identity to produce accessible and useful critiques of prevalent medical and cultural ideologies of women’s health and health care that actually undermine women’s health. Women are sent off to war battling breast cancer armed with a pink ribbon, a teddy bear for comfort, and some hope. Challenging this imagery in a public forum may not be popular, but it certainly is feminist!

In her nomination letter, Margaret Vitullo, ASA Director of Academic and Professional Affairs, closed with this statement: “The timeliness and broad interest of her topic, as well as her remarkable ability to respond to the human and lived experience of breast cancer while also offering a complex and cogent critique of the breast cancer industry, will help her reach out powerfully and effectively to audiences who might view a feminist perspective with suspicion, or even hostility – precisely the goal of the SWS Distinguished Lectureship.” The Awards Subcommittee agreed. It is with great pleasure that the Awards Committee names the 2013 SWS Distinguished Feminist Lecturer: Gayle Sulik.

—Shannon N. Davis

**2013-14 Feminist Activism Award Winner: Jeanne Flavin**

You almost certainly already know Jeanne Flavin, even if you haven’t met her yet. She is currently the chair of our Social Action Committee and, if you subscribe to the SWS listserve, you have seen messages from her for various opportunities to engage in feminist activism—for both faculty and students. Her role as President of the Board for the National Advocates for Pregnant Women (NAPW) and her work as an advocate for incarcerated women in South Africa are identifiable improvements for women’s lives. Her research also exemplifies feminist activism—her 2009 book, Our Bodies, Our Crimes: Policing Women’s Reproduction in America, analyzes the way the criminal justice system enforces and regulates gender roles. For these and many other reasons, Jeanne Flavin exemplifies the feminist activist and we are honored to present her with this award.

**The 2012 Recipient Of The Chow Green Scholarship Is Paula Ross.**

Paula Ross is currently a doctoral candidate at Wayne State University. Her research interests include minority women’s health, sickle cell disease and reproductive justice. Her dissertation qualitatively explores the reproductive health and health care experiences of women with sickle cell disease, paying special attention to the ways in which race, gender and class positions shape health and illness experiences for women.

The evaluation committee received a number of stellar applications for the Chow-Green award. The committee felt that Ms. Ross’s proposal was distinguished by the quality of its writing, its sociological significance, and its exemplification of an intersectional, feminist approach to women’s health.

Congratulations, Paula Ross!

**2012 Beth B. Hess Memorial Scholarship Winners**

The Beth B. Hess Memorial Scholarship is given annually to a Ph.D. student in sociology who began her or his college career at a two-year community or technical college. The 2012 selection committee consisted of Denise Copelton, Myra Marx Ferree, James McKeever, Nancy Naples, and Irene Padavic. This year the committee is pleased to present an honorable mention award, in addition to the scholarship winner.

The honorable mention winner receives complimentary membership in Sociologists for Women in Society (SWS) and the Society for the Study of Social Problems (SSSP), and registration and banquet tickets for the SWS, SSSP, and the American Sociological Association (ASA) summer meetings.

Our honorable mention winner is **Laura Logan.** Laura attended Houston Community College before transferring to the University of Nebraska at Kearney to complete her Bachelor’s degree in Sociology where she graduated Magna Cum Laude. Laura’s journey to Kansas State University, where she is currently a Ph.D. candidate in Sociology, is remarkable; Laura persevered through domestic violence, single-parenting, poverty, and homelessness, experiences that give her rich insight into the intersections of multiple systems of social inequality. Her dissertation research examines the experiences of and responses to street harassment among a racially diverse sample of lesbians and queer women. Congratulations Laura on being awarded this year’s honorable mention winner!

The 2012 Scholarship carries a stipend of $15,000 from SWS, and travel support of $300 from SSSP, to be used to support the pursuit of graduate studies, as well as one-year student memberships in SWS and SSSP. Additionally, the winner receives complimentary registration and banquet/reception tickets for the summer meetings of SWS, SSSP and ASA.

We are delighted to award the 2012 Beth B. Hess Memorial Scholarship (continued on page 14)
Call for SWS UN Representatives to the Department of Public Information (DPI)

The International Committee is seeking SWS members to fill two openings as DPI representative and youth representative (student) to the Department of Public Information (DPI). We encourage members interested in active engagement with the UN process and enthusiasm for building SWS’s participation in the UN to consider becoming a representative. Requirements for serving include:

- A three-year commitment to serve as alternative representative and main representative and a two-year commitment to serve as youth representative
- Willingness to fulfill responsibilities and duties as follows:
  - Report to International Committee meetings on DPI activities
  - Prepare annual report for Network News on DPI activities
  - Participate in some DPI activities, if feasible and if support can be secured.
  - Relay pertinent UN communications to SWS newsletter, listserv and meetings

The International Committee will review applications for the two open positions at the SWS Winter Meeting in Albuquerque, New Mexico.

If you are interested in applying, please send your contact information and a paragraph explaining your interest to Minjeong Kim, mjkim@vt.edu, by October 30, 2012.

For more information on the Department of Public Information, please visit the website http://www.un.org/dpi/ngosection/index.asp.

Please see below for more information on SWS representative activities in DPI.

The UN Department of Public Information (DPI) is the central coordinating agency of the UN, linking all agencies and special departments. Information, communication, education, and public relations activities are coordinated through the UN DPI. Importantly for SWS, the DPI coordinates all affiliated NGO projects and participation, including the annual NGO conference in September.

Weekly briefing sessions and workshops for NGOs are held at the UN headquarters in New York City which has been the predominant site for annual conferences. Since 2008, DPI operation was changed to emphasize a more “global” reach to all NGO affiliates and members. Instead of meeting at NY headquarters in September, the NGO conference met in Paris in 2008, Mexico City in 2009, Bonn in 2010, and Sydney in 2011. SWS DPI representatives participated in all DPI conferences in New York and one SWS representative participated in the 2009 NGO conference in Mexico City.

SWS representatives to DPI, like Economic and Social Council, represent SWS agendas on women’s equality, with support for global women.

Representatives selectively participate in weekly briefings and session, attend the annual conference, and work with other NGOs on comparable agendas. The DPI representatives have coordinated with ISA (RC 32) and other academic associations to support resolutions opposing violence against women and disarmament. These positions were presented and discussed at SWS meetings and supported at the summer meetings prior to attending the conferences. The educational and advocacy aspects of SWS work with the UN are supported by the DPI, which works together with ECOSOC for all NGO activities. DPI representatives also have participated in CSW annual sessions, coordinated with the main reps of ECOSOC.

It is important and beneficial for DPI reps to be interested in knowing the full UN system ideas as well as the changes in the Commissions, including the SCW and the agencies, such as the UN WOMEN agency (headed by Michel Bachelot). A network of NGOs SWS can/should work with includes CTAUN, the Committee on Teaching about the UN. Other academic associations (psychology and anthropology) are good to associate with as well but these can be varying.

SWS has published and posted upcoming information, as well as alerted SWS members of the now very accessible websites for NGO registrations, reviews, and approvals. All proceedings and outcomes are available through the UN website, DPI link, http://www.un.org/dpi/ngosection/index.asp.
At the UN: Reflections on the 56th session of the CSW

by Daniela Jauk, Barret Katuna, Susan Lee, Beth Williford, Manisha Desai, Shobha Gurung, Shang Luan Yan, and Kristy Kelly

The fifty-sixth session of the Commission on the Status of Women took place at United Nations Headquarters in New York from Monday, 27 February to Friday, 9 March 2012 with the priority theme “The empowerment of rural women and their role in poverty and hunger eradication, development and current challenges.” The closing meeting was held on 15 March 2012. This year SWS was highly visible not only through delegates infiltrating formal and informal sessions as well as briefings and parallel events. It was due to the hard work and determination of Barret Katuna, the SWS Main Representative to the UN that the SWS International Committee organized its own parallel event which was the highlight for many of our delegates and a great success over all. The official statement of SWS, as well as draft language for the “Agreed Conclusions” and colorful flyers for our own parallel event permeated the spaces of CSW every day thanks to Susan Lee’s extraordinary prep work. The session ended without an outcome document; yet, at the same time a 5th Women’s World Conference was announced by the Secretary General which raises controversial debates among the NGOs. The situation requires our attention and – with your help and support – we will work on a strong SWS presence next year.

SWS panel at the CSW was a big success

It has been a goal of the International Committee for several years to present its own parallel event at the CSW. Susan Lee had gratefully initiated a panel at the SWS Summer Meeting in 2011 in Las Vegas that established the basis for our event in which Manisha Desai of the University of Connecticut, Shobha Hamal Gurung of Southern Utah University and Kristy Kelly of Columbia University shared their research for the March 5th panel that took place at the Church Center that was entitled, “Feminist Sociological Insight on Literacy Projects, Community Grassroots Groups, and Rural Women’s Leadership.” The panelists spoke on rural women’s lives in India, Nepal, and Vietnam discussing farmers, fisherfolk, carpet weavers, and female CEDAW trainers. Sometimes CSW parallel events are sparsely attended. Our event was a big success; 50 people signed our attendance sheet and even more attended our event. The event space allowed for up to 70 people; and was definitely filled with people sitting on the floor at some points.

Those who attended represented various organizations that were participating in the CSW. We had participants from India, Taiwan, Albania, Spain, Scotland, Nigeria, South Africa, Sudan,

(continued on next page)

Well-attended presentation by SWS members at UN-CSW. Photo by Daniela Jauk.

Nine members of SWS attended the UN CSW (Committee on the Status of Women) meeting. Photo courtesy of Daniela Jauk.
Canada, Indonesia, Guyana, Austria, Mozambique, Russia, and the United States in attendance. The question and answer session was especially compelling and revealed that many of the women in attendance were energized by our use of the word “feminist” in the title of our session. They had not witnessed the common use of this word in CSW proceedings so far and confirmed the need for more feminist ideology at the CSW. Manisha recalls that a colleague from Nigeria said that she had been waiting all day for our session because she was pleased to see a session that used Feminism in our title. Barret Katuna did a fabulous job preparing and facilitating the event and sent an e-mail to all of our attendees to thank them for their participation and to give them more background on SWS and provide them with contact details of the speakers who were in great demand after the presentations.

NGO Consultation Day

Barret Katuna, Kristy Kelly, Susan Lee and Dani Jauk also enjoyed the sessions at Consultation Day, a conference for NGOs held the day before the CSW begins. Susan recalls a session on NGO advocacy practices. A speaker at the session was Charlotte Bunch, an experienced NGO leader who has been involved with the UN for many years as the director of the Center for Women’s Global Leadership at Rutgers University (http://www.cwgl.rutgers.edu/). Charlotte encouraged the NGO delegates to think about what they want to accomplish in the UN arena and who their target audience is. For instance, it could be the national delegations that have official power. Or it could be other NGOs gathered from many countries for the CSW. Or it could be the UN staff members who work behind the scenes, drafting the Agreed Conclusions and arranging expert group meetings in between CSW sessions. Are NGOs interested most in UN policy or national-level policies? She suggested that we think of the UN forum as a “global town meeting,” a place to raise issues in an international setting about women’s lives and consider what policies mean for the daily lives of women. The NGO audience should be as important as the official national delegates, she suggested. To raise a new issue at the UN such as violence against women, largely lacking from the UN agenda, NGOs must first work among themselves, raising the issue on the local and national stage, and then coordinate their efforts internationally. Only then could the issue be brought to the UN effectively. A highlight of the Consultation Day for Dani Jauk was that Leymah Gbowee’s gave a presentation (Nobel Prize winner 2011, speech available at http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fspsnNgnl4) in which she emphasized how important it is to actually ask rural women what they want. Rural women know the solutions; we have to bring in their voices. Given the importance of rural women in today’s world and their multiple disadvantages it is particularly sad and disturbing that member states could not agree on an outcome document.

SWS First timers at the CSW

For Shobha Gurung, it was the first CSW meeting she ever attended and she “enjoyed every bit of my first UN CSW engagement. Especially our own panel, I was honored to be included in such a vibrant community!” Shobha is one of two new delegates to the UN for SWS that had been elected in the last summer meetings (current delegates are Barret Katuna, head delegate; Astrid Eich-Krohm, Kristy Kelly, Shobha Gurung, Daniela Jauk). Newbies Shoba and Daniela enjoyed mentoring and excellent written and oral preparation of the meetings by Barret Katuna and on site guidance by Kristy Kelly, but also info transfer and loving support by Susan Lee and Pat Ould who stepped down as long time UN delegates and had paved the way for a professionalization of SWS’ UN work over the last years. In fact Shobha felt so empowered that she took the opportunity to walk straight up to the Nepali embassy seeking an appointment with the ambassador for advocacy and lobbying work. Surprisingly she got an appointment the next day and promoted the knowledge base in SWS and her expertise for Nepal’s participation in next year’s session of the CSW that will focus on violence against women.

This year marks the first time as well for Beth Williford to attend the CSW. In her reflections also Beth points out her gratitude to SWisers with more CSW experience that had thoughtfully offered their wisdom about how to make the most of our time at the UN each day. Beth left the CSW “energized by the lively conversations” she observed (continued on next page)
at the parallel events she attended. In the presentation “Rio + 20 and Rural Women” participants were asked to think about the issues (financial, fuel, and food crises) that have emerged since the original Rio meetings and the 1995 Beijing conference. Another presentation “Thousands of Miles Apart, Rural Women Stand Together” brought together the expertise of rural women leaders who work directly with the international women’s human rights organization Madre. Beth heard from four community organizers representing the Haitian organization KOFAVIV that assists women who have survived rapes in Port-au-Prince; the Nicaraguan organization Wangki Tangni that works with Miskito indigenous women to protect their culture and improve food sovereignty; the Sudanese organization Zenab that works to provide higher quality seeds to women agriculturalists and small farmers; and the Kenyan organization Womenkind Kenya that is working to increase girls education and open discussions of gender, equality, and human rights with the local community.

SWS working on many levels— NGO briefings

Not only did SWS delegates organize a panel and attend other events, we engaged in active lobbying work. Susan Lee had coordinated the submission of a Written Statement that SWS submitted to the UN in preparation for CSW 56, drawn from the Summer 2011 SWS panel (available in the UN document system http://www.un.org/en/documents/ods/,E/CN.6/2012/NGO/54). Susan also prepared copies of this statement and handouts with actual language we proposed to include in the Agreed Conclusions. They were practical when attending NGO briefings of member states and regional groups, as these encounters provide opportunity to lobby for more progressive language in the Agreed Conclusions (see Box). This year we followed NGO briefings of the US, the EU, and Austria.

The EU briefings were the high point for Susan Lee. She felt that The EU made our advocacy work easy by holding several briefings to hear NGO views on the draft Agreed Conclusions. The briefings Susan describes in her notes were held in the conference room used by the EU nations to discuss their strategies at the UN. The tables in the pleasant airy room overlooking the UN were arranged in a large rectangle with name plates for each of the 27 EU nations. The NGO delegates were invited to sit around the table and give their views on the Agreed Conclusions one by one. At the first briefing Dani Jauk presented the SWS concerns, and at the later one Susan Lee spoke. Based on our Written Statement we focused especially on the need for adult literacy programs for rural women, a concern left out of the draft Agreed Conclusions. We had handed our suggested language to be inserted into the Agreed Conclusions to the EU negotiators.

Dani Jauk also participated in the rather tiny and informal NGO briefings of Austria, her home country. Austria as part of the European Union is bound to the group opinion but the size of the government delegation (5 persons) and the NGO delegation (8 persons) make for a good and cordial communication atmosphere that allowed for gaining background knowledge. The US briefing Shobha Gurung, Kristy Kelly, and Dani Jauk attended was by far the largest briefing. There were about 150 persons from civil society in attendance whereas the panel of delegates did not particularly invite input but rather reported from the negotiations. Considering the current political climate and debates within our country, it did not come as a surprise – but is nevertheless disturbing - that more critical comments were made by US NGOs rejecting the US approach that focused on the right of the child and reproductive rights in the outcome documents.

No Agreed Conclusions— a global backlash?

It was distressing after the conclusion of the CSW to learn that the official delegates had been unable to come to consensus about the draft Agreed Conclusions and so no outcome document would be issued at all. The negotiations were not open to the NGOs (see Box) and so the conflicts took place behind closed doors. According to a gender expert in the Turkish delegation, the disagreements concerned some basic UN language on women such as the phrase “gender equality.” Family planning also was a controversial issue. These conflicts reflect a disturbing backlash against the global women’s movement and long-established UN language enshrined in internationally-endorsed documents such as the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), the Beijing Platform for Action, and previous CSW Agreed Conclusions. It happens for the second time that there is no Agreed Conclusions. The first time had been 2005, the topic was violence against women back then. This produces a lot of anxiety in the UN system and among NGOs as next year’s priority theme will be violence again. Even though some tend to explain the lack of agreement with leadership change and a laissez faire facilitator, it is clear that it is a signifier for a backlash on the global gender equality stage. Helen Raisz, SWS activist at the UN and at the international level from the first hour, states in an email: “As one who attended Beijing 95 and
experienced the excitement of 40,000 women at the Forum in Huairou, I am so sad that all that promise for progress has come up against the wall of misogyny.”

An UN staff informant of Dani Jauk (who had used the meetings to collect data for her dissertation on the CSW) says that the Holy See was this year less outspoken, yet the African group “did the job” of pushing back reproductive rights and gender equality. The African group had also sponsored a traditional resolution on “Women, the girl child and HIV and AIDS” in 2012. The Austrian delegates revealed that these negotiations were mind-numbing because African states dragged them over days and days unable to agree to reproductive rights for girls. In the official press release of the UN Iran’s representative said a “hardball” was played “by one side of the room” (i.e. US’ and EU’s insisting on reproductive rights). Zimbabwe’s representative affirmed the sovereignty of States and their right to maintain their own systems of governance, she said it was the African Group’s understanding that the term “gender” referred to “male” and female.”

This is an issue pushed annually as well by the Holy See. The African Group also reaffirmed that sex education should be age-appropriate and provided under the guidance of adults or other appropriate authorities (http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2012/wom1905.doc.htm).

Towards a 5th Women’s World Conference and CSW 2013

Lacking any consultation with UN Women the UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon announced a 5th world women’s conference for 2015 on March 8 this year. Even though some women’s activists have been pushing a 5th World Women’s conference for a few years at the CSW (http://5wcw.org/) discussions in the Europe/US caucus of NGOs are divided: some NGOs fear this will be a huge regression and already agreed upon language and norms would be watered down in this climate of backlash. These activists would rather not “open the package of the Beijing Platform” and feel this conference should possibly be blocked, postponed, while focusing on mainstreaming gender in other important areas like Rio +20. Others says it is a question of political mobilization to make this a forward looking event and especially in times like these women have to get together and exhibit common resistance. Most of the SWs delegates agree that the lack of CSW 56 Agreed Conclusions only underlines the importance of global women’s activism and the necessity of participation by organizations like SWS. “SWS has come a long way in our 13 yrs at the UN from getting the NGO status and figuring out how to bring UN news to SWS we are now in a phase where we are bringing SWS expertise to the UN and to the activists who come from all over to the CSW meetings,” says Manisha Desai. Manisha thinks that the success of our feminist event “is a reflection of the uneasy times that women are facing all over the world that we are willing to put aside our differences and claim feminism as a means to continue the fight for equality and justice.” Furthermore, “SWS actively working with other NGOs is the way to extent our feminist perspective” suggests Shang Luan Yan.

The theme for the CSW in 2013 is violence against women. At the 2012 SWS Summer Meeting in Denver, the International Committee begins to focus on how SWS can participate next year given our contributions to research on violence against women. Please join the discussion if you are interested in participating in this project. Direct emails to Barret Katuna barret.katuna@uconn.edu or just share ideas on our listserv. To honor the history of our organization and its work at the United Nations, Dani Jauk is currently collecting oral histories and documents of SWS UN activists over the years to be incorporated in her dissertation. You may find calls for participation on the listserv, but please contact her if you can share your UN experiences and/or have other contributions and comments: da18@zips.uakron.edu.
Going beyond the hype and controversy, Elliott examines how a diverse group of American parents of teenagers understand teen sexuality, showing that, in contrast to the idea that parents are polarized in their beliefs, parents are confused, anxious, and ambivalent about teen sexual activity and how best to guide their own children's sexuality. Framed with an eye to the debates about teenage abstinence and sex education in school, Elliott also links parents' understandings to the contradictory messages and broad moral panic around child and teen sexuality. Ultimately, Elliott considers the social and cultural conditions that might make it easier for parents to talk with their teens about sex, calling for new ways of thinking and talking about teen sexuality that promote social justice and empower parents to embrace their children as fully sexual subjects.

https://www.riener.com/title/Women_Confronting_Natural_Disaster_From_Vulnerability_to_Resilience

Natural disasters push ordinary gender disparities to the extreme—leaving women not only to deal with a catastrophe's aftermath, but also at risk for greater levels of domestic violence, displacement, and other threats to their security and well-being. Elaine Enarson presents a comprehensive assessment, encompassing both theory and practice, of how gender shapes disaster vulnerability and resilience.


The transformative event known as “Katrina” exposed long-standing social inequalities. While debates rage about race and class relations in New Orleans and the Katrina diaspora, gender remains curiously absent from public discourse and scholarly analysis. This volume draws on original research and firsthand narratives from women in diverse economic, political, ethnic, and geographic contexts to portray pre-Katrina vulnerabilities, gender concerns in post-disaster housing and assistance, and women's collective struggles to recover from this catastrophe.

Leavy, Patricia. Essentials of Transdisciplinary Research: Using Problem-Centered Methodologies.
www.lcoastpress.com

Essentials of Transdisciplinary Research: Using Problem-Centered Methodologies presents an overview of transdisciplinarity as a problem-centered approach to research. Transdisciplinarity is a social justice oriented approach to research and may provide a pathway for addressing major contemporary challenges such as sustainability, violence, unequal development and health and well-being. Essentials of Transdisciplinary Research provides a user-friendly guide to the key principles and research design strategies needed for building a transdisciplinary project. This book can be used by researchers, graduate students designing thesis projects and undergraduate courses in research methods, qualitative research, mixed methods, service learning or community-based research as well as any courses that emphasize critical thinking, problem solving, problem-based learning and/or research.

(continued on next page)
(Bookshelf continued from page 13)


As the Leaves Turn Gold examines the challenges and opportunities around aging for Asian American women and men in the United States. The book looks at a range of Asian Americans—affluent and poor, third-generation natives and recent immigrants, political exiles and recent migrants, people who immigrated early in life and those who immigrated later in life—and features interview excerpts that bring these issues to life. The book shows how the life courses of individuals, including discrimination they may have faced in earlier years, can shape their golden years. As they grow older, Asian Americans continue to struggle to fit into American society—this is true even of those who are highly educated, relatively affluent, and have lived and worked with non-Asian Americans for most of their lives. As the Leaves Turn Gold discusses not only the challenges older Asian Americans face, such as lack of adequate support services, but also local and transnational solutions. As the Leaves Turn Gold is an important examination of aging, immigration, and social inequality.


Challenging the idea that feminism in the United States is dead or in decline, Everywhere and Nowhere examines the contours of contemporary feminism.

(Award Winners continued from page 7)
to Autumn Green. A Ph.D. candidate in Sociology at Boston College, Autumn began her college career at Chemeketa Community College in Salem, Oregon before transferring to the University of Oregon to complete a Bachelor’s degree in Sociology, where she graduated Magna Cum Laude. A mother of two, Autumn’s dissertation project is a work of public sociology examining how fifty low-income college student mothers navigate the world of higher education, including their struggles to access needed resources and the difficulty of combining college-level studies with parenting. Autumn is a staunch advocate for low-income students, having testified before Congress in 2010 with Women for Economic Justice. She is currently working with the Higher Education Alliance of Advocates for Students with Children (HEAASC) and the Institute for Women’s Policy Research’s Student Parent Success Initiative to bring the issues that low-income college student parents face to the attention of policy makers and higher education administrators. Her commitment to advancing mother’s educational opportunities through scholarship and activism is truly inspiring and reflects Beth’s own legacy of public sociology. For her outstanding research and activism, we are pleased to recognize Autumn Green as the 2012 Beth B. Hess Memorial Scholarship recipient.

This year’s Cheryl Allyn Miller award goes to Carrie Alexandrowicz Shandra. Carrie’s paper “Gendered Work, Gendered Family: Women’s Employment in Sex-Segregated Occupations and the Division of Household Labor,” uses data from the National Survey of Family and Households to perform the first longitudinal, nationally representative analysis of the relationship between the sex composition of an occupation and the division of household labor. Using multilevel regression models she shows that working in a more male-dominated occupation is negatively related to the share of housework that women do. Ultimately, Carrie’s analysis provides support for stratification and feminist theories that suggest that gender inequality is interrelated across work and family contexts.
Guidelines for Arranging and Funding Campus Visits for the Feminist Lecturer and Feminist Activist Awardee

Communication and Planning
The host and speaker will communicate directly about travel arrangements, accommodations, scheduling, and any other details of the site visit. This communication should occur in a timely fashion to facilitate reasonable airfare and flight schedules (including best local information about alternative airports). The SWS Executive Office is not responsible for travel arrangements or scheduling.

In the event that the award winner is based internationally, the committee choosing the host institutions should work with them to attempt to schedule talks so only one international flight is necessary.

SWS does not pay costs upfront. The host and speaker are responsible for all payments and must submit receipts for reimbursable expenses to the SWS Executive Office within 30 days of the visit.

The speaker should not incur any financial costs for these trips.

Funding
- SWS reimburses up to a total of $750 for domestic travel (airfare and ground) or $1500 for international travel (airfare and ground) and lodging at each site if needed.
- SWS reimburses only the cost of coach airfare (up to the $750/$1500 limit). If the speaker prefers to fly first or business class, she or he (or the host institution) is responsible for paying the difference compared to the coach class fare.
- If airfare, major transportation, and lodging exceed the funding limits, SWS will match the host institution’s expenditure dollar-for-dollar, to a maximum of $250.
- The host is responsible for local transportation, food, and any other hosting expenses in excess of the reimbursable limit (as described above).

Campus Visits

2012-13 Feminist Activism Award Winner Laura Kramer
Laura Kramer will be visiting two campuses, both of which made compelling arguments of their serious need for feminist activism on their campus. The applications from both Weber State, in Ogden, Utah, and Saint Louis University, in St Louis, Missouri, argued that they need Laura’s experience and guidance in feminist institutional transformation and to help bring feminism to undergraduates. We are glad to help facilitate these visits and express our appreciation and support to Laura Kramer.

2012-13 Distinguished Feminist Lecturer Christine Williams
Dr. Williams will be making her campus visits at:

University of Southern Mississippi, Hattiesburg

The proposal letter submitted by University of Southern Mississippi, Hattiesburg detailed an excellent array of reasons for Christine to visit as the SWS Distinguished Feminist Lecturer, especially given the politically active nature of the campus and “the particularly precarious situation of women’s rights and gender equality” in Mississippi at this point in the state’s history. The committee was particularly impressed by their account of the ways a campus visit from Dr. Williams to deliver the SWS Distinguished Feminist Lecture would aid in addressing the needs of their diverse student population, support and educate faculty, and complement the needs of the University’s Committee on Services and Resources for Women as part of their Women’s History Month program.

Joint proposal of University of Chicago and DePaul University
The joint proposal submitted by the University of Chicago and DePaul University emphasized that the audience for Dr. Williams’ visit will be drawn from five different universities with varying levels of resources and programs in service of feminist scholarship and teaching: DePaul, Loyola, Northwestern, University of Illinois-Chicago, and University of Chicago. The committee was especially impressed by their plan to organize a “joint, one-day symposium on the theme of ‘Gender, Sexualities, & Work,’ in honor of Christine Williams.” The fact that the symposium also provides a forum for “graduate students and junior faculty members from the Chicago area” to present their research, culminating with a keynote lecture from Dr. Williams was an especially important and compelling consideration. This type of opportunity, which encourages cross-collaboration and the opportunity to construct mentorship ties across university settings, is an excellent forum for the SWS Distinguished Feminist lecture.
define its privileged participation rights compared to other observers to the United Nations. The support structure of the CSW is provided by the UN-system. Staff members of UN Women (http://www.unwomen.org/) who work year round to prepare and document the CSW meetings, and support the facilitator of the meetings (usually a vice chair of the elected bureau of the CSW consisting of five Member States) to compile and update the quickly, sometimes hourly, changing draft conclusions and work towards a frictionless flow of the events. UNWomen is the new gender equality architecture in the UN System that became operational in 2011 and merges four gender units into one. Representatives of UN Women appear daily at morning briefings for the NGO’s and give an update on the consultations, answer questions, and function as a link between civil society and member states.

Goffman’s (1959) dramaturgical metaphor lends itself to portray the dynamics of an actual CSW meeting. The different circles mentioned above largely constitute front stages where actors formally perform, adhere to conventions, and meet the audience. Backstage of the meetings are the actual negotiations of the Agreed Conclusions, when member state delegates get together and sentence by sentence, paragraph by paragraph, bargain about the language of the outcome document. These meetings are closed and informal, the audience (in this case NGO’s and observers) cannot monitor this process only at scarce discretion of the facilitator.

However, civil society is encouraged to organize in regional NGO caucuses and to lobby their own government representatives on site, as well as approach delegates from other countries or regional groups. This “outside” or off-stage in Goffmanian terms is where individual actors meet the audience members independently of the team performance on the front-stage, and civil society members and delegates interact on the fringe of the overwhelming event schedule of these two weeks. Civil society is literally encouraged to meet and talk to delegates “outside,” as delegates and CSW bureau members who attend the daily morning briefings for NGO’s repeatedly advise to “meet your delegate in the corridor or go for a coffee.” Many representatives of civil society are very critical about the fact that they are pushed back into the “corridors of power” and perceive a massive exclusion through the “excuse” of the reconstruction and the space limitation argument brought forward by officials. However, NGO representatives continue to try to lobby “their language” into the outcome document and submit typed and handwritten notes to their delegates in country specific civil society briefings, or regional group briefings which may be held (e.g. the EU group holds briefings for their civil society members). The battle for gender equality on these various stages is a battle for language, a battle for words that become signifiers and sites for conflict. The parallel events as well as a consultation day for NGOs are organized by the NGO Committee on the Status of Women (NGOCSW), in cooperation with sister organizations in Geneva and Vienna (http://www.ngocsww.org/). NGOCSW has for the first time in 2012 also facilitated meetings between UN Women and representatives of regional NGO caucuses, as UN Women seeks to establish NGO advisory boards on the regional and global level.
A Life with Significant Others: Letter to the late Arlene Kaplan Daniels

by Michael Burawoy

[Ed.: Daniels, a founding mother of SWS, was memorialized in previous issue, NN 2012 issue 2. One addition here.]

My Dear Arlene:

I know you wouldn’t want me to talk about you behind your back, so I’m writing a letter directly to you. Besides I’ve only got 6 minutes so I have to be sure to get my skittles in line. I know, if you were here, you would make sure I didn’t go a second over so I won’t.

I know how you loved letters and cards, and notes such as the ones you used to leave in hotel rooms thanking the invisible workers who made up your room. “Invisible work” was one of your most celebrated concepts, but you not only invented concepts, you lived them too. For you sociology was not just something to be studied; it was the art of life.

You loved to send cards to lonely people. I remember the cards you sent to my mother in her dying years, not to mention the visits you made to her London nursing home. They meant so much to her, and you assigned me the task—yes you were good at assigning tasks—of looking after you in your own dotage. I was not the only one you commandeered—since you were as you know quite a handful. As you used to say of yourself—you were a feral child in need of civilizing.

We agreed that I’d help you write your memoirs. Once you moved to Oakland we would set up times to record your reminiscences. Alas, we only managed one session and then you kept on forgetting appointments. I thought you must have decided that I was not the appropriate interlocutor after all. It never occurred to me that Arlene Kaplan Daniels was losing her memory—your memory was always infallible.

But your memory was a curious one—it centered on people, “significant others” as you used to say. That was how you wanted to write your memoirs—a life with significant others. As I discovered you had a particular passion for psychiatrists, starting with the charming, funny, irresistible Norman Bernstein. But best of all I delighted in your disrespectful stories of Goffman, Lipset, Selznick and all those guys for whom you had utter contempt in public, though begrudging recognition of their small intellectual contributions in private. And that was what I loved about you—the irreverent denunciation of pomposity, pretentiousness and simple arrogance and the proud discover of virtues in the doorman, the waitress, the homeless, the janitor, the car park attendant, the nurse and so the list goes on. That’s where your feminism and the Chicago School strangely converged.

There was one sociologist who rose to the top of your significant others. You know who I mean—the social psychologist Tamotsu Shibutani whom you both admired and adored. He was your guide into sociology. Early on you decided, “Whatever he is, I’m going to be that, and I became that”—a sociologist. He gave you, the feral child, a way of seeing. When I met you your vision was already well developed.

It was at Northwestern in 1994 that I got to know you a little, as you tried to educate me in the ways of the opera, the theatre, and good food—a Sisyphean task that you never gave up. What I did learn from you was an unstinting devotion to students. Students whom I would have written off as unfit for sociology. In them you found merit. These were often students who came from backgrounds that ill prepared them for a PhD, but you took them by the hand, listened to their stories, fed them sushi, read their inchoate chapters, edited their English and got them through.

When it came to sociology our paths did converge—sort of. We were both devotees of fieldwork and curiously field work in the field of work—your dentists, psychiatrists, and charity women, my machinists and furnacemen. But that’s where it began and ended. I would take off into the macrosphere and you’d be riveted to social interaction. The world of macro constraints meant so little to you. You were invincible and incorrigible, social constraints melted under your very gaze. After all you had to overcome so much—coming from an anti-intellectual Brooklyn family, discouraged in your educational endeavors by your mother—that negative significant other you so disliked. You bravely stormed the barricades and lost your job at SF state, and the boys at Northwestern picked you up, their diamond in the rough. A pioneer of feminism you had to be rough and tough, absorbing the slights and insults that came your way. In a sense for you the macro had to bow before the micro.

The battle was in the here and now, in daily life, not against some remote institution, some anonymous macro force. And so you perfected that artless, planespeaking New York style, turning it into a weapon of mass destruction, though the bark was always bigger than the bite—at the same time coveting close relations with so many significant others throughout your life. You leave behind generations of sociologists you have cultivated, generations of sociologists you have inspired with a feminism-become-humanism. You live on larger than life as a significant other for so many, people who remain attached to you. As you said to your most significant other—your beloved Richard—if you ever leave me, I’ll be coming after you. And, sad to say, that’s how it happened. But we are following you in our different ways.

With love and admiration, Michael.
About the Natalie Allon Fund and the Discrimination Committee

By at Villalon, Discrimination Committee Chair

Soon after I became the Chair of the Discrimination Committee (DC), in the SWS 2012 Winter Meeting, two SWS members approached us seeking assistance in discrimination cases. The DC provided informational and institutional support (in the form of letters of support to their respective institutions) as well as financial assistance to defray legal costs related to their cases. While processing these two cases, some questions emerged in regards to the procedures to be followed, particularly in terms of the allocation of funds. Consequently, SWS President Patricia Yancey-Martin suggested me to look into the Natalie Allon Fund history and share it with all SWS members through Network News. What follows is simply the result of conversations with SWS members and officers, email communications with former members of SWS who had been helped by the DC in the past, and the review of institutional information on the Discrimination Committee.

Let me begin by contextualizing the Natalie Allon Fund in SWS given that you are probably wondering what can the Discrimination Committee (DC) do for SWS members? While you may have heard of, and hopefully attended, sessions organized by the DC to inform the SWS collective on Discrimination in the Workplace at SWS Meetings, the DC also provides direct, individual support to SWS members in trouble. The DC is to assist members by offering informational, institutional and/or financial assistance to members of SWS who believe they have been victims of discrimination based on gender, sexuality, race, ethnicity, age, disability, religion or other group characteristics, or when their academic freedom or other rights have been violated at their institutions of employment. The SWS DC Chair is to be reached by the SWS member in trouble. The Chair gathers all pertinent information and shares data (anonymously) with DC members and SWS officers (if necessary). The DC assesses the information and, on a case-by-case basis, recommends what kind of support the DC will offer to the SWS member.

It is important to emphasize that since its inception, the DC has not been an investigative body (that is, the DC is not to investigate or judge whether and how discrimination occurred as perceived by the SWS member). The DC acts on the basis of four principles: trust, confidentiality, promptness and conviction. First, the DC trusts that the claims of SWS member who believes she may have been subject to discrimination in the workplace are honest. Second, the DC keeps SWS members’ identity confidentially and carefully unless the member explicitly states her willingness to go public. Third, the DC is committed to respond to the SWS member’s call promptly. Fourth, the DC is informed by and believes in scholarly research devoted to issues of discrimination in the workplace. Hence, the SWS DC is convinced that SWS members should be supported through their experiences of discrimination, regardless of the member’s background. In other words, as an institution devoted to women in society, SWS pays attention to how gender in its intersection with other social structures shapes discriminatory practices in the workplace.

The SWS DC can provide four main kinds of support to SWS members in trouble. The DC provides members with information on the EEOC, ACLU, ABA, AAUP, and other organizations that may be of support, as well as legal and other kind of advice on how to proceed (for example, to look into HR and/or union of their university, to look into their own faculty code/regulations, to have witnesses, to keep track of events, to contact a lawyer). Also, the DC and other SWS members do their best to provide informal, emotional support to the person in trouble.

Institutionally, the DC can write a letter of support to an administrator at the member’s workplace. This letter of support is signed by the President, President Elect, and/or Past President, as well as the DC Chair. In the letter, without making a judgment of whether or not the SWS member is right or wrong, SWS shows knowledge of her situation, states concern for her condition, and encourages a fair resolution. The SWS DC (in consultation with SWS presidents) may suggest further measures reprimanding the discriminatory behavior of an institution (such as sharing SWS’s awareness of and action on the discriminatory situation with pertinent organizations like ASA and AAUP, or not accepting advertisement coming from a university that denied tenure discriminatorily to a SWS member).

Finally, the DC can provide financial support by recommending to allocate Natalie Allon Funds to help defray the cost of legal advice or representation of the SWS member in a discriminatory situation. These funds were endowed by Dr. Allon’s parents given the experiences of their daughter. So, now, let me get into who was Natalie Allon and what the history of the Natalie Allon Fund is.

Dr. Natalie Allon was one of the first sociologists to look at the social construction of fatness as deviance from a cultural norm and as a feminist issue. She was a very prolific researcher, and her work has been acknowledged and cited widely. Judith Lorber locates her work in the symbolic interaction (continued on next page)
engaged in similar battles."

Dr. Allon was an active member of SWS, ASA, SSPP, and ESS. She received her B.A. at Wellesley in 1963, her M.A. at Boston University in 1966, and her Ph.D. at Brandeis in 1972. Dr. Allon worked at the Hofstra University. In 1980, she brought a sex discrimination suit against this institution, which had denied her tenure. Unfortunately, before the suit could be settled, Dr. Allon had a minor automobile accident and was taken to hospital, where an improper administration of anesthesia caused her to suffer brain damage. Her parents kept Natalie on life support for 30 years until their own deaths.

Two years after the accident, Dr. Allon won her suit against Hofstra University. In honor of Natalie, her parents established a scholarship at Hofstra University in the Department of Sociology for undergraduate students on the basis of their academic excellence and financial need. Moreover, Dr. Allon’s parents gave a sum of money to SWS to assist other women sociologists who struggled to combat sex/gender discrimination in their workplaces. As Judith Lorber explains in the Obituary she wrote in 2001, the Natalie Allon Fund “commemorates her discrimination battle, which has become a symbol and a model for others engaged in similar battles.”

As SWS tries to strengthen its institutional memory, I contacted SWS members and reviewed the business meeting reports of the DC in SWS newsletters. From Myra Marx Ferree, I learned that in the early years of the establishment of the Natalie Allon Fund (that is in the early 1980s), there were “more significant awards, including helping to fund lawyers” of SWS members involved in discrimination suits. As the cases got “more complicated and other sources of funding existed for the lawsuits,” the DC continued to provided financial aid but in less volume and frequency. By looking into the Newsletters, I was also able to find that since 1993 to the present day, the DC assisted 29 members, seven of whom received Natalie Allon Funds. Overall, the SWS members who have been helped have expressed their gratitude and emphasized the importance of the support they received from SWS.

In an effort to continue to honor Dr. Natalie Allon, the DC invites all of whom have been helped by this committee in the past to share their stories with us (for more details on confidentiality, length, etc. please contact me at villalor@stjohns.edu). To end this note, I extend my gratitude to Susan Chase, who chaired the DC from 2004 to 2006, and kindly wrote about her own experience. In her words:

Almost twenty years ago, SWS provided me with both moral and financial support for my tenure battle.

Here’s the story: I was reviewed for tenure and promotion to associate professor in the fall of 1992 at the University of Tulsa. My department’s review of my file was strongly supportive, and I later found out (through the appeal process) that the four external reviewers by sociologists, three of whom were SWSers, were also very positive. However, the college committee—the make-it-or-break-it committee at my institution—turned me down unanimously. My sociology colleagues felt this was an attack on the department as well as on me. I hired a lawyer and appealed the decision, claiming sex discrimination. (I did contact the local EEOC, but was advised to go through the internal university process before pursuing a case with them.) In appealing the decision, I had several sources of support: students who wrote letters on my behalf; colleagues who stood by me as well as made contributions toward my legal expenses (several helped organize a garage sale, the proceeds of which went toward those expenses); and, of course, SWS. I submitted a request for help with legal expenses to the SWS Discrimination Committee and was pleased to receive $500 from the Natalie Allon Defense Fund. Equally if not more important, during SWS meetings that year many SWSers listened to my story and let me cry on their shoulders. The tenure battle was stressful and exhausting, and it was important to me to be able to talk with people outside of my university environment. I especially appreciated Carla Howrey, Pat Martin, Irene Padavic, and Mary Rogers whose kindness and wisdom helped me get through that year.

In the summer of 1993, the internal appeal process resulted in a reversal of the original decision and I was granted tenure and promotion. I will forever be grateful for the support I received from SWS because it helped me to win the tenure battle.

Susan Chase’s story is a vivid example of how SWS DC and Natalie Allon Funds have worked in practice. As the current Chair of the Discrimination Committee, I hope we can continue to offer assistance to SWS members in the future. We have several projects and we are always looking for volunteers to join us. Please reach out!
Call for Applications
Sociologists for Women in Society Undergraduate Social Activism Award
Deadline for Submission: November 1, 2012
Submit Applications to Jeanne Flavin: jflavin@fordham.edu

History and Overview
The Undergraduate Social Activism Award is given annually to recognize a student or team of students making a substantial contribution to improving the lives of women in society through activism. SWS initiated this award in 2003. The work honored by this award is central to the SWS goal to foster activism for women.

Nature of the Award
SWS recognizes that action “for women” does not mean that the work was done “with women” or even “by women.” Substantial need exists for social action working with men, boys, LGBTQ communities and other groups where change will benefit women and can be understood as feminist action. Therefore, SWS recognizes work done in this spirit regardless of applicant gender identity.

The Award Reward
The Undergraduate Social Activism Award includes a $700 travel stipend that may be shared among a team of applicants who have worked collectively on a substantial social action project. In addition, each awardee will have her or his registration fees and banquet ticket fees waived and may submit travel expenses to receive up to an additional $300.00 to defray costs of travel and lodging. The award is also accompanied by a plaque or other physical memento. The awardee will be featured in the Winter Meeting Program and will receive a one-year SWS membership and related benefits. The SWS Social Action Committee may select up to three awardees each year.

Eligibility and Criteria for Selection
A candidate for the Undergraduate Social Activism Award must be nominated by an SWS member. The work for which the candidate is nominated must have been undertaken during the undergraduate career. Nominations are acceptable for candidates up to one-year after they complete their BA. The candidate is not required to be a member at the time of nomination. A recipient may be honored for a collection of ongoing activism for women or for a substantial single action that has affected positively the lives of women.

At least one member of a social action team must attend the Winter meeting to retain award eligibility. The awardee will also be asked to prepare and share a short presentation about the activism recognized by the award.

Nomination and Application Procedures
At a minimum, an SWS member must nominate a candidate for the award with a letter written to the awards committee. Beyond the nomination letter, a winning application packet tends to have these elements: an overview document (e.g. curriculum vitae or resume, biography) and a 3-5 page essay written by the activist describing the activist contributions and their impact (see below). Nominees may also include testimonials from those benefiting from or witnessing the activism and support documents such as newspaper clippings or an event program.

Guidelines for Essay
1. Describe the organization(s) and/or project(s) structure, goals and funding
2. Identify challenges in action work and any changes made to address challenges
3. Discusses connections between the action work and educational experience and knowledge
4. Report contribution to women’s lives and/or feminist social change
5. Reflect on experiences

Applicants are encouraged to prepare some or all of the nomination in the form of an “electronic portfolio” (ideally in ONE pdf file) or direct the committee to the appropriate URL where materials can be found.

Committee Process
All materials must be submitted electronically by November 1 to the Chair of the Awards Committee, Jeanne Flavin jflavin@fordham.edu. Please include “SWS/USA: [Nominee’s name]” in the subject heading.

The Chair will forward information to the committee members. The committee chair will acknowledge nominations received and communicate the selection process outcome to all nominees. Award decisions will be made in December allowing recipients several weeks to make plans for travel to the Winter Meeting. Award information will be available ongoing on the SWS website and announced in the Fall Network News.

The Award Presentation
The Undergraduate Social Activism Award is presented annually by the Chair of the Awards Committee at the SWS Winter Meeting. The Awards Committee will share information about the award recipient with the full membership by preparing a short feature article for the Spring Network News.
2013 Call for Applications for Campus Visits

DISTINGUISHED FEMINIST LECTURER, GAYLE SULIK
FEMINIST ACTIVISM AWARDEE, JEANNE MARIE FLAVIN
DUE MARCH 1, 2013

During the 2013-2014 academic year, each award winner will visit two campuses. These campus visits are intended to celebrate and enhance feminist scholarship and social activism on college campuses.

The Distinguished Feminist Lecturer visits campuses that are isolated, rural, located away from major metropolitan areas, bereft of the resources needed to invite guest speakers, and/or are characterized by hostility to feminist scholarship.

The Feminist Activism Awardee visits campuses with departments with a focus on feminist activism, social movements, sociological practice, and/or activist research.

The selection committee will look especially favorably on campuses that are committed to gaining the widest possible audience for these visits. This may be demonstrated by evidence of

- collaboration with other departments and programs on campus
- multiple-campus cooperation
- community partnerships

SWS will pay at least a portion of the expenses for the two site visits; institutions should not let resource scarcity prevent them from applying. (See Guidelines on page 15.) SWS awards the Distinguished Feminist Lecturer and the Feminist Activism Awardee a one-time honorarium of $1000.

If you are interested in hosting a campus visit send your application by March 1, 2013 to:

Distinguished Feminist Lecturer Committee Chair Shannon Davis
email: sdaviso@gmu.edu

Feminist Activism Award Committee Chair Dani MacCartney
email: dmaccartney12@webster.edu

The application should include the following information:

1. An explanation of your interest in hosting a campus visit and the merits of awarding a campus visitation to your school.
2. A description of the type of presentation you are interested in hosting (this is particularly important in the case of the Feminist Activist).
3. The number of days you will ask the awardee to stay.
4. The audience to which the presentation will be targeted.
5. A description of how local costs will be met.
6. Tentative dates.
Employment

California State University, Fresno
Sociology—Urban and Rural Assistant Professor—Academic Year
http://www.csufresno.edu/socsci/ Vacancy # 11861

California State University, Fresno is a learning-centered University. We believe learning thrives when a strong and active commitment to diversity is shared by all. This is because learning can only take place in a climate where differing positions are welcome, and diversity of all kinds is valued by everyone.

• Available for Academic Year: 2013/2014.
• Fresno State has been recognized in the Community Engagement classification by The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
• Fresno State has been recognized by the Federal government as an Hispanic-Serving Institution (HSI) and an Asian American Native American Pacific Islander-Serving Institution (AANAPISI).
• Faculty members gain a clear path to tenure through the University’s Probationary Plan Process.
• Salary placement depends upon academic preparation and professional experience.
• Instructional Level: Undergraduate and Graduate
• This position is part of a University-wide Cohort that collaborates on research related to Urban and Regional Transformation issues in Central California.

The Department of Sociology at California State University, Fresno is seeking a scholar with a specialty in urban/rural sociology, public sociology and/or applied community-based research, including knowledge of nonprofit, community benefit organizations. Other responsibilities include research, publication, and other scholarly activities, as well as advising students and engaging in service at all levels of the university. Specific duties will depend on departmental needs. The successful candidate may be called upon to teach in a distance education mode and will be encouraged to develop web-enhanced and/or web-based instruction. Outcomes assessment and service learning are important components of the university curriculum. The successful candidate will be expected to work cooperatively with faculty and staff in the department, college and university. This unique position will also be part of a cohort of faculty working across disciplines to develop research and other activities related to Urban and Regional Transformation, including development of curriculum; acquisition of grants and contracts; and participation in the development of a Center for Urban and Regional Transformation at California State University, Fresno.

Open Until Filled: To ensure the full consideration, applicants should submit all application materials by 11/08/2012. Searches automatically close on 4/1/2013 if not filled.

For Experience and Other Requirements, Equal Employment Opportunity statement, and Application Instructions, visit: http://apptrkr.com/274595.
Female and Food Insecurity: The Burden on Poor Women

By Margaret Smith, MA

Introduction

This fact sheet intends to be a comprehensive resource for information on women and food insecurity. It presents a review of the key concepts, current data and policies of food insecurity, as well as addresses in detail the specific gendered outcomes of food insecurity and the burden of food insecurity that falls on poor women. In addition, a bibliography of current research and resources is provided.

Definition of Terms

There are important conceptual differences between the definitions of food insecurity and hunger. Food insecurity is a social and economic concept, usually measured at the household level, whereas hunger is an individual physiological factor. Food insecurity, as defined by the USDA, is the limited access to sufficient amounts of nutritious food (Coleman-Jensen et al. 2011). Hunger refers to the discomfort, illness, weakness or pain an individual experiences as a result of prolonged and involuntary lack of food (National Research Council 2006). It is a possible, but not necessary outcome of food insecurity (NRC 2006). Whether or not household members experience hunger is a result of the severity and duration of food insecurity. In the United States, households experience food insecurity in short episodes, and if a household experiences one instance of food insecurity, it is likely to have recurring experiences (Coleman-Jensen et al. 2011).

There are four categories of food insecurity, as defined by the United States Department of Agriculture. A household may have high food security, marginal food security, low food security or very low food security (Nord and Coleman-Jensen 2011). A household with high food security has dependable access to sufficient amounts of food (Nord and Coleman-Jensen 2011). A household with marginal food insecurity reports some anxiety over food sufficiency in the home, but this anxiety almost never manifests to any real changes in food intake (Nord and Coleman-Jensen 2011). In a household with low food security, there is also very rarely a reduction in food intake, but the diets of household members are reduced in quality and variety (Nord and Coleman-Jensen 2011). Finally, in a household with very low food security, household members report both disrupted eating patterns as well as reductions in food intake (Nord and Coleman-Jensen 2011). A household is also considered food insecure when there is not a reliable source for future food and when food is acquired through socially unacceptable means, such as theft (NRC 2006).

Current Data: Food Insecurity in the United States

To interpret the USDA statistics on food insecurity in the United States, it is important to remember that these numbers present a slightly inflated picture of the actual state of affairs. Food insecurity in the United States is recurrent and episodic. That is, a household is likely to experience short periods of food insecurity that repeat periodically. However, as measured by the USDA, a household is considered food insecure if it meets the standards of food insecurity – at any level – at least once during the year. This method of measurement results in a national average rate of food insecurity that is higher than the actual number of households experiencing food insecurity on any given day.

Poor, single women with children are the most disadvantaged group, with the highest rates above the national average for household food insecurity, food insecure children and very low household food security. Single men with children, Black, Hispanic, low income households and households in urban centers all have higher food insecurity rates as well, according to the most recent USDA data. Table 1 presents a summary of the percentage of food insecure households in the United States, highlighting the categories of households with the rates highest above the national averages.
Table 1: Summary of Food Insecure Households in the United States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF HOUSEHOLDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food Secure</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Average</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with Children</td>
<td>79.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food Insecure</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Average</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low food security</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very low food security</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single women with children</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single men with children</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black households</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic households</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low income households</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households in urban centers</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households in the South</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food Insecure Households with Children</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only food insecure adults</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food insecure adults and children</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Gendered Causes and Risk Factors of Food Insecurity**

Poor women are particularly vulnerable to food insecurity. Often, they experience many of the key risk factors for food insecurity simultaneously. For example, poor women are more likely to live in neighborhoods with restricted access to food, as well as have high risk family structures, such as being single parents.

**Neighborhood Effects and Food Deserts**

There is a body of literature establishing the presence of food deserts in urban neighborhoods in The US. A food desert is an area, usually in a poor urban neighborhood, characterized by a lack of supermarkets, grocery stores and fresh, healthy food. Food deserts exist in rural areas, as well. There are areas of concentrated retail food outlets and areas with very few food options (Sharkey 2009). This variety in accessibility to food outlets is associated with increased transportation and food costs for consumers, as well as lower quality and variety of food (Sharkey 2009). Moreover, this restricted access to supermarkets is associated with worse health and higher rates of obesity (Larson et al 2009). Women living in areas likely to be food deserts are living at a crossroads of disadvantage, as they are more likely to be women of color, and living in poverty.

Low income neighborhoods and minority neighborhoods are most likely to have restricted access to food, as well as have increased access to sources of unhealthy food, such as fast food restaurants and convenience stores (Alwitt and Donley 1999; Block, Scribner and DeSalvo 2004; Galvez et al 2007; Larson et al 2009; Moore and Roux 2006; Morland et al 2002; Powell et al 2005; Zenk et al 2005). Low income neighborhoods have fewer large, chain supermarkets, but often have more small and local grocery stores (Alwitt and Donley 1997; Moore and Roux 2006; Morland et al 2002; Powell et al 2005). There is also an effect of race on access to grocery stores and fast food restaurants. African Americans and other minorities are more likely to live in poor neighborhoods, but Galvez and colleagues (2007) found that after controlling for income and population density,
Black neighborhoods in Harlem remain less likely to have supermarkets or grocery stores. Additionally, Block and colleagues (2004) find that race is a stronger predictor than wealth of a higher density of fast food restaurants in a study of New Orleans neighborhoods.

However, there have been recent studies contradicting both of these findings. Recent findings suggest that food deserts are not that common (An and Sturm 2012; Kolata 2012), and not associated with the health of neighborhood residents (Kolata 2012; Lee 2012). An and Sturm (2012) find no association between the accessibility of supermarkets, fast food restaurants or convenience stores and patterns of consumption or health of young people in California. Lee (2012) finds that although children in disadvantaged neighborhoods have greater accessibility to fast food restaurants, they also have greater access to supermarkets and grocery stores, as well as restaurants, than do children in wealthier neighborhoods.

These recent findings question the literature that had previously established the neighborhood effect on food access and health. However, they by no means disprove it, and the women living in these poor at risk neighborhoods are still more likely to experience food insecurity than are women living in wealthier areas.

Family Structure

Certain family structures are more likely to experience bouts of food insecurity than others. Low-income families, families with children and single mother households are more likely to be food insecure (Coleman-Jensen et al 2011). However, adults in the household are more likely to be food insecure than are the children. This supports a buffering hypothesis, in which the adults in the household shield the children from hunger by reducing their own food intake so that the children's food intake is uninterrupted (Hadley et al 2008). Since women are typically responsible for managing the food in a household, they are more likely to suffer the negative consequences of food insecurity as they limit their own intake in order to shield their children (Olson 2005). Recent research demonstrates that children in low income households experience less food insecurity when the household resources are managed by a mother rather than a father (Kenney 2008). These findings suggest that household structure and allocation of resources has a significant influence on the food security of the household members, including children, and that women play a significant role in mediating these processes. When high risk family structures coincide with structural neighborhood characteristics, these women and children are particularly vulnerable to experiencing food insecurity and the associated outcomes.

Gendered Consequences of Food Insecurity:

Women's Physical Health

Food insecurity has poor health effects for men and women, although evidence suggests that women bear the brunt of the consequences. Food insecure adults are more likely to self-report poor or fair health (Stuff et al 2004), citing hypertension as one health issue (Seligman, Laraia and Kushel 2010). Additionally, food insecure adults score low on objective health assessments (Stuff et al 2004) and have higher incidences of laboratory evidence of hypertension and diabetes (Seligman, Laraia and Kushel 2010).

Food insecurity is associated with cardiovascular risk factors for all adults (Seligman, Laraia and Kushel 2010), but the risk of obesity is confined to women. Townsend and colleagues (2001) find that food insecurity status is related to overweight status, but only for women. Women in food insecure households are 30% more likely to be overweight than are women in food secure households. Several others studies corroborate the findings that women in food insecure households are more likely to be overweight than women in food secure households. Olson (1999) finds food insecurity is significantly correlated with women's higher body mass index, or BMI. Women in food insecure households were approximately 2 BMI units heavier than women in food secure households (Olson 1999). However, BMI as a measure of obesity is limited by the fact that it may overestimate body fat in some populations, such as the elderly and athletes (NHLBI 2012).

Another study by Adams and colleagues (2003) found that the risk of obesity associated with food insecurity is highest for non-whites. The association between obesity and food insecurity is well established, but the mechanisms driving the relationship still require further study. Food insecurity clearly causes a poor diet, particularly for adults in the household. Food insecurity can contribute to increased consumption of low cost but high calorie foods (Adams, Grummer-Strawn and Gilbert-Chavez 2003). Some theories further suggest that food insecurity creates disordered eating, and this contributes to obesity (Adams, Grummer-Strawn and Gilbert-Chavez 2003; Olson 1999). Previous experiences of food deprivation can lead to over eating once
the period of deprivation is past (Adams, Grummer-Strawn and Gilbert-Chavez 2003). As such, food insecurity is an important factor in predicting obesity, although certainly not the only relevant factor.

**Women's Mental Health**

Food insecurity influences women's mental health as well as physical (Siefert et al 2004; Wu and Schimmele 2005). There are many key sociological factors that predict women's mental health, including poverty (National Institute of Mental Health 2011), family structure and marital status (Barrett and Turner, 2005; Brown, 2004; Carlson and Corcoran, 2001; Osborne and McLanahan, 2007, Page and Stevens, 2004; Thomson et al, 1994) and neighborhood effects (Hill, Ross and Angel 2005). However, food insecurity has a unique influence (Siefert et al 2004; Wu and Schimmele 2005).

Studies find evidence that women in food insecure households have an increased risk of depression and anxiety disorders (Casey et al 2004; Heflin, Siefert and Williams 2005; Whitaker, Phillips and Orzol 2006; Wu and Schimmele 2005). Some evidence suggests that the effect of food insecurity on depression is stronger for women than for men (Wu and Schimmele 2005). In addition, a reduction or loss of public food assistance is associated with depression, although the causal direction of this relationship is undetermined (Casey et al 2004; Heflin, Siefert and Williams 2005). One interesting study suggests that the level of food insecurity influences the likelihood of mothers experiencing mental health problems (Whitaker, Phillips and Orzol 2006). As household food insecurity increases in severity, there are higher percentages of mothers experiencing depression and anxiety (Whitaker, Phillips and Orzol 2006). The incidence of children exhibiting problem behavior also increases with the severity of household food insecurity (Whitaker, Phillips and Orzol 2006).

**Social Programs and Policies**

**Governmental Services: SNAP and WIC**

The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP, and its sub-program for Women, Infants and Children, or WIC, are of the four two primary federal food assistance programs administered by the USDA's Food and Nutrition Service, or FNS (USDA 2012). The USDA also offers free or reduced-price school lunches and breakfast for children (USDA 2012). SNAP benefits are available to all Americans, with household incomes below 130% of the federal poverty standards (USDA 2012). Households with children receive a majority of SNAP benefits, and 47% of SNAP recipients are under the age of 18 (USDA 2012). Approximately 16% of SNAP households have an elderly member (USDA 2012). Benefits are provided via an electronic debit card, which increases the household's ability to purchase healthy food. In 2011, almost 45 million individuals used SNAP services (USDA 2012). WIC benefits are more focused, and are available only to pregnant, postpartum and nursing women, infants and children under the age of five (USDA 2011). In order to be eligible, the women's income must be below 185% of the federal poverty standards (USDA 2011). In 2010, approximately 9.17 million women and children received WIC services (USDA 2011). Most women using WIC benefits are young, have a lower than average amount of education, and are Black or Hispanic/Latino (Geller et al et al 2012). There is some overlap between the programs. Many women (53%) on WIC also receive SNAP benefits (Geller et al et al 2012). Only 13% of families receiving SNAP benefits do not also receive benefits from WIC or the reduced-price school breakfast and lunch programs.

A recent meta-analysis of the effectiveness of WIC finds that WIC participation has a positive effect on children's birth weights for prenatal participants, infant feeding practices and children's diets (Colman et al 2012). However, the associations between WIC service utilization and children's physical developmental outcomes, such as height, weight and BMI, are less conclusive (Colman et al 2012).

As a food security promoting program, the SNAP is fairly effective. A 2010 study found that receiving SNAP benefits reduces the likelihood of being food insecure by 30% (Ratcliffe and McKernan 2010). However, a study emphasizing the nutritional role of SNAP found less positive results. SNAP participation alone was found to have little effect on the amount of iron, potassium and fiber intake of children, whereas WIC increases intake of these nutrients (Yen 2010). That is, SNAP has very little effect on its own, and no additional effect when utilized in combination with WIC (Yen 2010). Another examination of SNAP efficacy finds that when there are more local stores available for individuals to patronize, people are more likely to participate in SNAP. That is, SNAP is more effective when there are local convenience stores that can be accessed without a car, as well as when there are larger stores with a wider selection of low-priced food items, such as Walmart, nearby (Bonanno and Ghosh 2010).
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- Feed the Future: http://www.feedthefuture.gov/
- Feeding America: http://feedingamerica.org/
- International Food Policy Research Institute: http://www.ifpri.org/
- Food Security Portal, Facilitated by the IFPRI: http://www.foodsecurityportal.org/
- Food And Agriculture Organization of the United Nations: http://www.fao.org/
- The World Food Programme: http://www.wfp.org/hunger
- The Hunger Project: http://www.thp.org/
Notes from Buenos Aires

by Bandana Purkayastha and Manisha Desai

Several SWS-ers joined the four thousand sociologists who came from 77 countries to attend the Second International Sociological Association (ISA) World Forum in Buenos Aires, Argentina in August 1-5, 2012. A special recognition and congratulations to Margaret Abraham, who was the President of the World Forum (and the ISA Vice President for Research). This conference included several online fora, the launching of the democratization and social justice initiative for ongoing virtual and face-to-face exchanges, a series of public fora and plenaries conducted in English and Spanish with simultaneous translation devices ready for all participants. The evening plenaries brought together a dazzling array of internationally renowned scholars and activists from Latin America, Africa, Asia, North America, and Europe. Margaret’s opening address “Making a Difference: Sociology, Social Justice and Democratization in the 21st Century” set the tone for an intellectually engaging conference that focused on issues that were of critical importance locally, regionally and around the world.

Another initiative by Maggie, democratization and social justice website is now open for global exchanges of research and teaching. Maggie’s achievements are even more impressive when we consider that she organized this in another country; it will, no doubt, act as a template for many forthcoming conferences.

Several SWS-ers are active in ISA Research Committee 32 that is the hub of research on women. Bandana Purkayastha serves as the secretary/treasurer; Manisha Desai serves as the US regional representative. Bandana was one of the invited senior scholars invited to meet junior scholars at the ISA. Akosua Adomako Ampofo (Ghana, the 2011 Feminist Activist award winner) and Josephine Beuku-Betts are the Presidents-Elect. Their term begins in 2014.

Roberta Villalon, the chair of SWS’s discrimination committee, organized the lunch for sixty RC-32 members. Among the SWS-ers who were at this luncheon were Cynthia Deitch, Shobha Hamal Gurung, Melanie Heath, Kristy Kelly, Katherine Maich, Solange Simoes, Nazanneen Sharokhani and all the women mentioned earlier. Shirley Jackson, our EO, could not make it to this luncheon, but she, Sylvanna Falcone, and other SWS-ers found each other at receptions and plenaries.

Josephine Beoku-Betts, Akosua Adomako, and Manisha Desai were among the people who went to Plaza del Mayo and marched in solidarity with the women who continue to march in silence to keep alive of the memory of those who disappeared during the military dictatorship and to protest similar government-sponsored violence in today’s world. In a significant mark of solidarity, Margaret brought Ines Cortinas, Co-founder, Association Madres De Plaza del Mayo as a panelist to the Opening Forum of the conference.

Congratulations to Maggie for such inspiring international leadership.
Call for Applications for the SWS Global Feminist Partnerships Program (GFPP)

SWS is seeking to strengthen its international ties, particularly to the global south, and share resources and experiences (as well as activist and research knowledge) across national and disciplinary lines. We are looking for partners from whom we can learn in terms of their research, scholarship, and activism as well as with whom we can share our own research expertise, scholarly findings, and activist projects. While feminist and gender issues circulating in the global north are well documented, north-south and south-south relationships, research, and activism success stories travel less to (and through) the north. SWS seeks to remedy some of this potentially power-filled vacuum.

As part of this effort SWS is pleased to welcome applications for our Global Feminist Partnerships Program (GFPP). We define partners as research and activist centers, programs, institutes or collectives working on feminist and gender issues. Our hope is to build connections longer term (beginning with a 3 year commitment) with partners from any countries around the globe (excluding North America); we seek to primarily establish partnerships with at least two partners from each of the following regions: Asia, Africa, Central/Eastern Europe, Latin American/Caribbean and the Middle East. For the next review cycle, we are especially looking for nominations for potential partners in Africa and the Middle East.

The GFPP reflects the commitment of SWS to support activism by feminists (related to the scholarship/expertise/skills we can offer), support research on gender issues, increase organizational inclusiveness and active participation, and attempt to expand feminist influence on campuses, and in society. In addition, the GFPP seeks to offer a forum for global south feminist and gender-based work to be showcased, in an act that truly reflects a partnership among US-based and global partners. Our goal is to establish paralleled partnerships, based on mutual understanding of the research, activism, and overall organizing work outside the U.S. Selected partners should embody the principles of information sharing, in the basis of activism, and/or scholarly work, as well as share the spirit of feminist research characteristic of SWS.

To be considered, a center, collective, or research program must be nominated by one or more current SWS members. The nominating member will be responsible for working with the organization to establish the partnership by:

- Working as a liaison and coordinator for activities between the partner and SWS
- Working with the organization to submit an article to SWS’s Network News
- Maintaining contact with the organization to determine how both the partner and SWS can benefit by the partnership
- Helping the partner with a bilateral review at the end of the three-year term

Organizations eligible for consideration are those:

- That are research institutes, programs, collectives or women’s centers that explicitly focus on gender-related research
- With or without college and/or university affiliation
- Would benefit mutually, materially, and intellectually
- Preference will be given to organizations with which SWS members are already personally familiar and/or engaged in some way.

As part of the program SWS offers:

- Annual organizational membership to SWS
- Continued subscription to Gender & Society (the Official Publication of SWS)
- Subscription to the SWS Listserv: The Listserv provides a forum to exchange teaching tips, research advice and assistance, and news and events related to feminism.
- Space in Network News for article(s) about the center and its region, particularly on the specific issues confronting women in that area.
- Support to attend a SWS bi-annual meeting (and be showcased) dependent on the availability of funding.
- Particularly productive partnerships may be renewed based on bilateral assessments after the first three-year term.

We also hope to explore other possibilities for journal publications or research collaborations.

To apply: SWS sponsor/nominating member should send a one-page letter outlining the work of the potential partner and how we would benefit mutually from the partnership, including what relation the sponsor has or has had with it. The Director of the nominee should send a one-page letter confirming its willingness to accept the partnership and agreeing to submit a minimum of one article for Network News describing the group/center/program/institution and its role in researching and/or addressing gender issues in its region. The SWS sponsor/nominating member should email both letters as attachments to Patricia Ould, Chair of the GFPP Subcommittee at pould@salemstate.edu. Nominations will be accepted on a rolling basis. The applications will be reviewed collectively by the GFPP Subcommittee and a recommendation will be made to the International Committee at each SWS meeting. Once partnership is agreed, it will be announced to the SWS membership.
Winter 2013 Meeting

by Bandana Purkayastha, SWS President-Elect

Tamaya calls! As you deal with the daily demands of your workplaces, set your sites on the place of peace and tranquility, where we will gather in February (7-10) next year. SWS has gone through significant transitions this year. We thanked Jessica Sherwood, executive officer for the last six years, and welcomed our interim EO Shirley Jackson and Jazmyne Washington as our interim Administrative Officer. We have a new network News Editor, Angela Lewellyn Jones. We are in the process of finalizing other hires. The strategic task force has been working hard to review the path we have tread and compile our ideas about possible futures. Lets get together in Tamaya to regroup and renew ourselves.

You will be in a beautiful place. Hyatt Ramaya is located in Santa Ana Pueblo. You can enjoy the resort, the walks in the desert or along the cottonwood groves along the Rio Grande, the all the facilities the site provides. For those of you who will come from warmer parts of the country, be prepared for cold weather. For the rest of us who will come from freezing climes, we will enjoy the balmy 50 degrees weather. The place is in the desert, so the nights get cold. Our location in Santa Ana Pueblo puts us in touch with a rich and layered history of the US. While the spiritual ceremonies that take place at this time of the year are not open to visitors, you can reflect on the sacred mesas and turquoise mountains that surround you.

I managed to get a very reasonable price for us ($139 for two people and $149 for four people per night, including resort fees), and these rates are available three days before and after the conference. Tamaya is about 26 miles from Albuquerque airport; if you don’t plan to drive look for the shuttle sign up on our website. I hope you will take the opportunity to visit Santa Fe and Albuquerque. (We will set up opportunities for optional conducted tours, but you can plan these trips on your own). You will be in touch with many histories: of groups looking for wealth or salvation, of wars over ownership of these lands, of clashing cultures, the barely visible footprints of the infamous Japanese American internment camps, the arts trail and galleries, the weekly Native American art and crafts markets, and the food that reflect the fusions and fissures that make this place so special.

We are preparing for an intellectual feast. The theme for next year is Connecting Circles: Research/Activist Knowledge in the 21st century. We are now aware of the ways in knowledge travels through our transnational networks. Most of us connect to these global circles of knowledge through virtual networks; others rely on international conferences and publications to keep abreast of knowledge generated in different parts of the world. There are many such global, regional, local circles of knowledge; many emphasize themes that are not foremost on our minds, researchers and activists organize knowledge in diverse ways to express and address gendered/racialized social realities. We will continue our efforts to connect to such circles of knowledge at Tamaya and reflect on the current fissures and fusions. Three renowned scholar activists—Jane Bennett (South Africa), Amina Mama (South Africa, US) and Margaret Abraham (US)—have agreed to be our plenary speakers. I hope you will look through Feminist Africa and the Africa Gender Institute website to learn about Professor Mama and Professor Bennett’s and foundational work. Their current foci on gender, social and sexual violence, security and human rights will open up many conversations. We will also hear from Professor Margaret Abraham, Vice President for Research, International Sociological Association, and learn about her perspective on democratization and social justice. There will be many opportunities for conversations and exchanges of ideas.

We will also focus on circles closer to home. We continue to deal with significant discrimination in our workplaces, especially as universities rapidly embrace profit-making initiatives. Do we face similar challenges? Can we share strategies across worksites? How can we be proactive in creating more feminist spaces in our lives? Come and hear about battles and successes.

I am working with our EO Shirley Jackson, AO Jazmyne Washington, our program committee members Vrushali Patil, Ronni Tichenor and Shobha Gurung along with committee chairs, and University of Connecticut sociology graduate students Barret Katuna, Miho Iwata, Chandra Waring, Shweta Adur, Roseanne Njiru, Farhan Yousaf, Trisha Tiamzon and Ranita Ray to make sure your interests and passions are reflected in YOUR conference. Contact me at bandana.SWSPresident@gmail.com with your suggestions and ideas. I will provide more information over the next couple of months.
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