

Winter Quarter 2004

I HAVE A NEWSLETTER!

by Colin J. Beck

So it struck me the other day that this is an election year. Normally, I would not take much notice of this given my well-known political apathy, but the flow of unsolicited political mail to my department box has gotten quite large. Usually, I don't look at these things, but I received a letter from the president himself!

This lovely gesture from our nation's leader was, in fact, inviting me to a black tie dinner in Washington, D.C., held by Republican Congressman in honor of President Bush. According to the schedule enclosed there was to be a cocktail reception at 6 pm, followed by dinner with a lovely evening of dessert and dancing afterwards. And I could be a part of this for only a small donation! Unfortunately, I already had plans.

But the organizers were ever thoughtful, also including an offer for a limited, collector's quality photo of the president. I quote: "President Bush, in office only 36 months, has earned a prominent place in our nation's history as well as in our nation's heart. In honor of your support and dedication to President Bush, The President's Dinner has commissioned a limited-edition, presidential photo which will be accompanied by a note from President Bush." This was to be my gift for serving as an Honorary Co-Chairman of said dinner. Double-damn those plans I had made!

The Democrats were not about to be outdone, however. A few weeks later, I received a note from James Carville on the letterhead of the William J. Clinton Presidential Foundation.

It begins "Dear Friend: Throughout the eight years of his presidency, you've been one of President Clinton's most loyal supporters." After getting up off the floor where I had spent about five minutes laughing, I just had to read on. It got better: "For someone like myself, who saw poverty up close and knows what a helping hand from government can do for people, making the Clinton Presidential Library a reality is very important." Once again, I'm voting for Nader.

I'm not sure how I got on such diametrically opposed mailing lists. It's possible, I suppose, that I have been living three lives. Graduate student by day, union organizer at night, and energy company executive even later at night. That could explain where this quarter has gone.

Enjoy the newsletter! And please consider writing something for next quarter. Because we'll print anything!

BARBADOS AND BURRITOS: TWO THEMES. NO TRANSITION.

by Brian Colwell

Hello, Everyone. I hope you are all doing well. I'm enjoying my extended stay here in Barbados where the sky is sunny and the taxman is not welcome! By now you've probably figured out who cleansed the Soap Dispensers operating budget. Before you start pointing fingers in my direction, let me just put it into context for you.

Before my term as chief-editor ended, I attended a talk on political instability in third world nations. The

speaker claimed that without a healthy private sector, political leaders lack an alternative means of income once they are removed/unelected from power. Therefore every past, as well as present, party boss engages in a zero-sum battle for the public coffers. Lacking access to a livelihood based on production rather than taxation forces them to struggle like a litter of puppies. Puppies with RPG's. This brings me to my point. First, be thankful that in these United States,

we can bribe self-interested public servants with lazy-boy consulting jobs in private sector companies. Secondly, why doesn't the department have a similar system in place? We could franchise out lemonade stands across campus, maybe even a lemonade delivery service. I could be contracted to consult on something or other. The department could pay me for the inconvenience of consulting on something or other and I wouldn't be forced to commit

continued on page 2

BARBADOS AND BURRITOS

continued from front page

unscrupulous acts of white collar crime. You see, according to the talk I attended I am a victim of a deficient social structure. My own agency is irrelevant under these circumstances.

I have been eating out at the food truck a lot. What Victor calls the “roach-coach” and Frank calls “cheap tamales”. For the last year, while the Tressider food court was in construction, the food truck was able to provide vittles unencumbered by the intrusive hand of Big Stanford Government. In the shadow of the Hoover Tower the food truck broadcast the virtues of free enterprise and competition while clogging the arteries of those such as myself who came from yards around to partake in it’s deep fried delicacies. I often contemplated getting my own fixer-upper food truck and trying my hand at owning a small business on wheels. In the end, if I wasn’t able make my truck a success through hard work and ingenuity, I could always deep-fry my broken bootstraps and sell them as giant clamstrips. But I digress.

So get this, after a year of serving good food to starving students and

staff, the heavy hand of Big Stanford Government came down to quash the food truck’s dreams and dissolve the lunchtime free-market system. The truck began receiving tickets and getting chased to the perimeter of campus by Stanford parking enforcement goons. Why the sudden change? Well it happened within days of the reopening of Tressidier food court. Instead of competing for customers, political influence peddlers got the ear of Big Stanford Government and the rest is history. Not even that rag-tag bunch of social activists at the Hoover Institution could protect the little food truck that could. Isn’t this the sort of injustice that the ‘profit’ Milton would have raged against. My fellow free-marketers, if we don’t save the food truck, the Communists will win!

Currently the Freedom truck is conducting a guerilla war in parking lots using large bushy trees as camouflage. If you see it, don’t blow it’s cover by screaming and pointing at it. Just calmly walk up and order a Veggie Burrito Supreme, Chicken Malibu sandwich, or a bucket ‘o’ fries. Your dollars will help fund the resistance.

FROM A RECENT UNDERGRADUATE FINAL

Author’s Disclaimer: This is an intentionally bad rap!! After all, I put it into the mouth of an orthodox economist, so what would you expect?

1. The TV show American Idol branches out to have contestants give academic lectures. Among the first is noted economist Prof. H. Eco Nomicus. Breaking off a rather mathematical discussion, he remembers the show’s musical origins and suddenly raps: “Who am I? I’m the illest fool. Cooler than the water in a swimmin’ pool. Granovetter’s concept of embeddedness is a fraud. Oh my Lord! It is totally consistent with a neoclassical economic argument—but wait to hear what I meant. You just have to add that folks calculate—chill! They don’t hallucinate—who are the right social contacts and networks to invest in. Where they would do best in. Yo! Rational actors use their resources—now hold your horses—to cultivate the right people and avoid offending the wrong ones, then reap the benefits of these investments. Oh what contentment”.

The stunned audience falls silent. The judges get ready to score the contestants; help them score Prof. Nomicus by evaluating the correctness of his claims. In so doing, use evidence from several studies in Sociology 114/214, including material from outside the United States and at least two industries. Comments on Nomicus’s musical and rhyming skills could mercifully be omitted from your discussion.

[Extra credit (but not much) for identifying the 2001 album he stole two of his lines from].

YOUR ARTICLE HERE
SPRING QUARTER
2004

STEF'S TEN EASY TIPS FOR DRAFTING A DISSERTATION PROPOSAL

(INCLUDING WORDS OF WISDOM FROM OTHER MEMBERS OF THE FIFTH-YEAR COHORT)

by Stef Mollborn

1. Write a memo before you start. This could be a Buzz-style document or not. Mine included what the problem I wanted to study was, why it was interesting to study, why I liked it, what was new about my project, potential data sources, and a chapter outline.

2. Don't feel so pleased with yourself for writing a memo that you stop working on your dissertation for 2 1/2 years. Trust me on this one.

3. Pick a month as your goal for defending. Plan backwards from that month, draft by draft, giving your readers two weeks to read each draft you give them. If you are like me and get motivated by external deadlines, then tell your committee members when you want to defend and when you will be giving them drafts. This

will encourage you to turn them in on time.

4. Know your committee members' schedules. If a committee member will be out of town for the coming year, quarter, or whatever, don't expect them to remember to give you advance notice.

5. Nail down a tentative defense date months in advance. It is unbelievably hard to coordinate five faculty members' schedules. Once you have a tentative date in your calendar, it becomes easier to work towards that goal, yet you don't have to feel like it's set in stone.

6. Have a baby, be her/his primary caretaker, and don't hire a regular babysitter. The sheer level of terror you are likely to experience from having no time to work triples your level of productivity when you finally get a chance to write. Except that

you never have time to write....so maybe ignore this one.

7. Write the front end first, even if you're an analysis buff. I learned this one the hard way. If you start at the back, you'll repeat some things multiple times and leave others out entirely, mistakenly believing that you said them somewhere else.

8. Don't include a lit review in the first draft. Two faculty members told me to "tell the story" and explain my perspective on the problem without initially being bogged down by what other people have said before. Fill in the citations later, and don't write pages full only of who said what.

9. Always take time off from writing to procrastinate by writing articles for the Soap Dispenser. By writing them, you can help countless others procrastinate by reading them.

10. If I fail my defense, ignore everything I said here. This advice is currently untested. If I pass my defense, you're invited to my party!

A SECRET SOCIETY IN STANFORD SOCIOLOGY REVEALED!

by Storm Shadow

As the pigskin veered away from the yellow uprights in Honolulu, Hawaii, dashing the hopes of a last-second tie in the NFL Pro Bowl, I understood that with football season coming to a close, there was little to look forward to in the wide world of sports distractions. (At least until spring training ushers in questions about whether or not the Bronx Bombers can really buy a World Championship with their acquisition of A-Rod, or until the Lakers gets Payton and Malone their fist championship ring in June. Free Kobe!

Oh wait, he's not in jail...[yet?].)

But then it dawned on me. How could I forget the thrill, the excitement, the rush of sports competitiveness that hovered just over the horizon? How could I forget the major sporting phenomenon that turns poor, starving graduate students in to poor, starving graduate students that can buy \$1.25 tamales and fried burritos at the library lunch truck? (Save the lunch truck! If you have no idea what I'm talking about, ask Brian Colwell for his theory about repression against on-campus lunch trucks.)

What major sports phenomenon

am I talking about?

Last year, I discovered that a secret society of sociologists (and friends⁰, with members in this department and others nationwide, came together to celebrate an ancient ritual commemorating the sports deities, the pre-Spring ritual known as...MARCH MADNESS\$!

So, for the fortunate few who may find themselves initiated into these clandestine circles of college hoop cabals, who learn the esoteric meanings of secret phrases like "Sweet 16", "Elite 8", or "Final Four", who

continued on next page

SECRET SOCIETY

continued from previous page

wish to test their iconological and symbological skills by deciphering the hidden messages embedded within the complex collection of geometric lines and shapes collectively known as the “tournament bracket”, you may one day receive that special e-mail or unobtrusive note in your department mailbox inviting you into that most exclusive circle of those who practice the ancient art of financially-backed prognostication. For you chosen few and those who aspire to such hal-lowed status reserved only for the secret elite, I offer here some words of advice to illuminate your way through the dark times ahead.

Q. Do I need to know anything about the teams in the tournament?

No! I discovered through eaves-dropped whisperings behind closed doors and voices that carry down long, narrow hallways that one of last year’s two winners did not follow college basketball. This person’s secret to success? Networks. (FYI,

every year there is at least one refer-ence to Mark or his work in the department newsletter. One year, someone wrote an article about Thai noodle soup at the Thai café and the “Strength of Weak Thais.” Just try and figure that one out...)

Q. But I have no sports-related network ties. What do I do?

Not to worry! Intercepted e-mails (don’t forget to log-out!) and sealed notes that just “happened to fall out” of mailboxes also revealed that the second winner of last year’s competition picked their winning bracket based on which mascot of the two contending teams would win in an actual fight. For example, the fact that Stanford’s men’s basketball team is ranked #1 in the nation (sorry Duke!) is irrelevant to whether or not Berkeley’s Golden Bear mascot would decimate a Cardinal Tree in a no-holds-barred, caged death match (for WWE fans, think “hardcore” match).

So, armed with this theory, your correct pick would be: unranked Berkeley Bears over #1 Stanford Cardinals. How can you beat such

impeccable logic!

Q. Wait, what if I don’t have any money to enter the pool?

C’m on now, you are a Stanford graduate student. I’m sure you can think of any number of ways to dip into that pot of discretionary funds and find a research relevant justifica-tion for your March madness entry fee. How about: “Funds needed to pay registration fees for national conference evaluating several hypotheses that predict probabilities of success for goal-oriented organi-zations in situations of group con-flict and competition.”

Disclaimer: But be forewarned, should you be caught participating in these secret ceremonies, you will be disavowed by your fellows and severe punishments could await you. Legend tells of a Pac-10 football coach fired because his participation in these forbidden rituals were dis-covered by the uninitiated public. While the rewards may be great, the risks are many. For those given this rare, sought-after opportunity, dare you brave the MADNESS OF MARCH?

PRESIDENTS’ DAY REFLECTION

by Jen Solotaroff

On this President’s Day of 2004, I’ve decided to take a moment to consider our current national leader, George W. Bush, the 41st president of the United States, in relation to the other 40 men who also have served as “POTUS,” as the secret service likes to say. Granted, the first three years of “Dubya’s” presidency bring to mind many questions, such as (and, please note: I’m attempting to be nonpartisan here), “Has there ever been a U.S. president who has had a weaker command of the English lan-guage?” and “Has there ever been a

U.S. president whose pre-presidency educational, military, and profession-al mediocrity has been more offset by privileged family connections?” and finally, “Why couldn’t Ralph Nader have minded his own business and just stuck to local grassroots initia-tives?” (ok, not so non-partisan right here). Yet when considering George W. Bush in relation to the 40 presi-dents preceding him, perhaps it’s most relevant to respond to the charge leveled by the political left in the United States and many individu-als in countries across the globe: Is George W. Bush the worst president

we’ve ever had? How does he com-pare with those before him?

What makes a worst president? Quantitative measures

How does one go about answering such a question? As sociologists, per-haps we could consider ways to quan-tify the quality of a presidency. But what could we count or calculate? How about the country’s deficit? Before the current Prez Bush took office, under then-Prez Bill Clinton, the national budget was running sur-

continued on next page

continued from previous page

pluses for the first time in three decades. After only three years of Bush's presidency, according to the Congressional Budget Office, the U.S. deficit is projected to hit \$477 billion this year (and more with any increase in tax cuts or government spending), a record in U.S. history. Before this, the largest deficit in American history came under the presidency of Richard M. Nixon, due largely to problems with inflation and continuing expenditures on the Vietnam War, which Nixon inherited from Lyndon B. Johnson's administration. LBJ, for his part, escalated the Vietnam War with the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution, yet at the same time, his Great Society Program was making landmark progress in domestic matters, creating the Department of Housing and Urban Development, Medical Care programs for the elderly, and persuading Congress to pass a huge number of civil rights, anti-poverty, and environmental conservation measures.

The Bush-incurred deficit is attributable to tax cuts, the creation of a new federal agency to oversee homeland security, and the funneling of close to 100 billion dollars into the war with Iraq—a war that George W. Bush did not inherit, but which he and his advisors launched. The purpose of this war ostensibly was to ensure the safety of U.S. citizens and to liberate Iraqi civilians from terrible conditions under Saddam Hussein. And under LBJ and Nixon, the Vietnam War wasn't contributing anything to the safety of U.S. citizens, and wasn't liberating Vietnamese from any clear and identifiable tyrant, since the enemy was the vague and distant threat of Communism. Oh, but hold on a second: the immediate threat that Iraq posed as a rogue state developing weapons of mass destruction, which Bush & co. cited

as justification of a preemptive strike against Saddam Hussein, has not been proven to exist. There's still the matter of liberating Iraqi civilians from a corrupt, greedy, and genocidal dictator. If the Iraqi people are better off now than they were under Saddam Hussein, then maybe the U.S. presence in Iraq is far more justifiable than in the Vietnam War, which was far more costly in terms of finances, human life, and time than the Iraq situation—at least so far. Will this hold true if civil war breaks out in Iraq, which seems increasingly possible?

At least under Nixon (of whom I am no great fan, mind you), the United States saw improvements in relations with foreign countries: Nixon reopened communications with Communist China, isolationist in policy and long-estranged from Western nations, and made a state visit there after his reelection in 1972. He also was the first U.S. president to visit the Soviet Union, where he signed bilateral SALT agreements designed to curtail the manufacture of strategic nuclear missiles. Bush has managed to flout the advice of foreign nations and of the United Nations in general, alienating most of its members, and nearly ruining the political career of the one national leader who genuinely supported him—British Prime Minister Tony Blair. Citizens of the UK seem hard-pressed to trust Blair these days.

Ok, but just a minute: by comparing George W. Bush to Nixon, I'm invoking possibly the most notorious president in American history, given Nixon's secret wartime bombing of North Vietnamese military centers and sanctuaries Laos and Cambodia, the Watergate scandal, and Nixon's subsequent impeachment and resignation from the presidency—the only presidential resignation in American history. Surely such acts were more damaging to the American populace's

trust in the leadership than anything Bush has done to his own reputation or to Blair's? Isn't Nixon's cooptation of government agencies like the Central Intelligence Agency and Federal Bureau of Investigation in a conspiracy over Watergate on a greater level of corruption than the Bush administration granting lucrative contracts for Iraqi reconstruction projects without competitive bidding to Halliburton, Cheney's former oil company, which still pays Cheney several million dollars per year?

Ok, I've gotten off-track here. I was supposed to be thinking of ways to measure the success or failure of a presidency, in terms of its effect on the general well-being of the American populace. Sticking with the statistical approach, let's consider levels of unemployment. According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, the current rate of unemployment among the civilian labor force, age 16 and up, is 6.0 percent. This is the highest unemployment rate since 1994, one year after Clinton assumed the presidency, and it is a full 2.0 percent higher than it was in the year 2000, when George W. Bush won the presidential election. This rise of two percentage points might not seem very significant, but in terms of employment for Americans, it amounts to a loss of more than 8.2 million jobs. Then again, this is not as dire a statistic as those between 1981 and 1987, when the unemployment rate never fell below 6.2 percent and peaked in 1982 at 9.7 percent. Nor is current unemployment under Bush as extreme as it was in the 1930s during the Great Depression, when percent of the labor force unemployed was 14.6 percent (1939) and much higher earlier in the decade. What does it say that, other than the Carter/Reagan recession and the

continued on next page

Depression years, unemployment is at its worst in a century?

George W. Bush has engineered the return of the national deficit, moreover, as discussed above. Is this necessarily a bad thing? Some argue that deficit spending is necessary when an economy is in recession, as ours has been. Under Ronald Reagan, policies based on supply-side economic theories promised to pull the country out of the recession inherited from the Carter presidency, to promote rapid growth, and to shrink the federal deficit. The “trickle-down” theory promised that a regressive tax package initially benefiting the wealthiest one percent of Americans would eventually bring financial relief and even prosperity to the other 99 percent. By 1986, however, the national debt had doubled since Reagan assumed the presidency in 1981. The problem was serious enough to require that Reagan’s successor, George H. W. Bush, impose unprecedented tax increases in 1989, thereby breaking his campaign promise of “Read My Lips: No New Taxes.” The economy did not recover in any of its growth indexes until the mid-1990s, when Clinton had assumed the presidency. And those indexes offer far weaker measures now than when George W. Bush stepped up in 2001.

The Matter of Legitimacy

Does this mean that Americans are in worse shape in terms of employment because of George W. Bush’s policies? Hard to tell, since Bush has been president for only three years, and economic cycles are inevitable. Perhaps economic and other statistics are not the best way of gauging the quality of a presidency. What about issues of legitimacy? What about the legitimacy of the process by which

George W. Bush assumed the presidency? Many individuals question this process, as Bush II lost the popular election to Senator Al Gore by 500,000 votes, and his success in the electoral college was questionable. The electoral votes he needed ultimately were delivered by a U.S. Supreme Court vote, and the son of one of the Supreme Court justices voting in his favor (Antonin Scalia) had already been employed by Bush in a lucrative legal advisory position. Yet George W. was not the first man whose presidency was decided by another branch of government, rather than by winning a majority of votes in a straightforward fashion. In the election of 1824, John Quincy Adams became the sixth U.S. president based on a decision by the House of Representatives. He had been one of three candidates, none of whom had received a majority of electoral votes, although Andrew Jackson had achieved a plurality. JQ Adams, the eldest son of second U.S. president John Adams, received critical support (and thus electoral votes) from House Representative Henry Clay, thereby winning the presidency. Adams immediately made Clay the U.S. Secretary of State. An angry Andrew Jackson vanquished Adams in the next presidential election, and Adams served in the House thereafter. Perhaps a pampered son of the political elite, John Quincy Adams nevertheless dedicated his life to public service and took unequivocal, forward-looking stances as an outspoken opponent of slavery, proposing a constitutional amendment forbidding slavery in any state newly admitted to the Union. In 1841 he succeeded in defending slaves in the Amistad Uprising case; moreover, as a result of his efforts, the gag rules that permitted Southern legislators to silence antislavery discussions were repealed in 1844. Plus, in spite of favoritism

that seemed to win him the presidency, Adams II was long-experienced in national leadership: he had served extensively as a foreign diplomat and U.S. statesman prior to the 1824 election, joining his father on diplomatic missions to Europe in the late 1770s, and achieving appointments as U.S. minister to the Netherlands in 1794, Prussia in 1797, Russia in 1809, and Britain in 1815. He also served as a U.S. Senator (1803-08) and as Secretary of State (1817-24). His leadership and diplomatic qualifications were extensive.

George W. Bush, also the eldest son of a former president, was in the oil business for a decade, with mixed success, and then became a managing general partner of the Texas Rangers, a baseball franchise. He then was elected twice as governor of Texas, in 1994 and 1998. He technically had served in the military during the Vietnam War as a stateside reserves officer, but five months of his duty are unaccounted for, which technically makes him ‘absent without leave’ (AWOL). These months did coincide with the period characterized by his struggle with an addiction to alcohol and possibly to illegal substances (i.e. “nose candy”).

Ok, so Bush had no active military duty and no experience abroad before his presidency, and he did not become president through a straightforward election. Neither did Gerald Ford, the only man to serve as president and vice president who was never elected to either post (Nixon appointed Ford to the vice presidency when Spiro Agnew resigned in 1973, and then Ford assumed the presidency after Nixon’s resignation). Yet Ford did have a successful earlier career in law—he attended Yale Law School and practiced law in Michigan after World War II—and he also was

continued from previous page

experienced as a national legislator, serving in the U.S. House of Representatives from 1948 to 1973, and as minority leader starting in 1965. Ford succeeded in lowering inflation during his presidency, putting a dent in the national deficit that had accrued under Nixon. Gerald Ford also exhibited a certain fortitude in his brief tenure as president, appearing before Congress to explain his reasons for pardoning Nixon in 1973, an action that incensed many Americans. Near the end of his presidency, Ford also ordered an airlift of more than 230,000 Vietnamese refugees, most of whom settled in the United States.

Looking Out for Number One

It is hard to imagine a rescue on this scale, devoid of self-interest, initiated by our government today, when our borders are virtually sealed and when suspicion of outsiders appears to be a part of the rhetoric of 'patriotism.' The increased restrictions on immigration, the Patriot Acts, and more frequent reports of racial profiling make it seem as if there is a reversal of many of the civil liberties that were hard-earned during the presidencies directly following the American Civil War and also since World War II—particularly under John F. Kennedy, Lyndon Johnson, and Jimmy Carter, whose agendas manifestly included the advancement of civil rights. Even Dwight D. Eisenhower, whose conservative Eisenhower Doctrine was based on a suspicion of and attempt to contain Communism around the globe, at home sent army troops to Arkansas to enforce the racial integration of a Little Rock high school.

Populations and their leaders do tend to become more closed and socially conservative in times of economic or political uncertainty, partic-

ularly when sensing a threat from an outside country. This has occurred under the watch of presidents long before George W. Bush and his cabinet members began creating anti-terrorist policies in the wake of September 11, 2001. The second U.S. president John Adams (pres. 1797-1801) passed the Alien and Sedition Acts, aimed at Irish and French immigrants, which allowed the expulsion of aliens considered to be threatening, increased waiting periods for naturalization, and restricted the press's ability to criticize the government. Calling for a "return to normalcy" after World War I, Warren Harding (pres. 1921-23) passed stringent protective tariffs and restrictions on immigration, and he convened the Washington Conference to negotiate security agreements in the Pacific region. Even Abraham Lincoln had to abolish some civil liberties (such as the writ of habeas corpus, which requires judicial investigation of the legality of detaining an individual) and had his generals close down a number of newspaper—all to expedite his resolution to the upheaval of civil war.

Yet each of these previous presidents who restricted civil liberties at one point also made some major and palpable contribution to the organization and general welfare of American society and/or government society during their careers. John Adams helped draft the Declaration of Independence and served on a committee to build a national navy; Warren Harding worked with Congress to create a budget system for the federal government in 1922; Abraham Lincoln abolished slavery and preserved the Union. Franklin Delano Roosevelt, who regrettably authorized the internment of Japanese Americans in camps after the attack on Pearl Harbor in 1941, had rescued the

nation's economy and society from the Depression with his New Deal program; he also entered the U.S. in World War II and helped bring an Allied victory, for which the world no doubt was better off.

Who Wins, Who Loses?

At this point, one cannot tell the net effect of Bush Administration policies on the well-being of Americans, and on individuals of other countries, such as Iraq, for that matter. The most sophisticated intelligence reports still cannot confirm that, as a society, Americans are safer from harm than we were before 2001. What we know at this point is that since George W. Bush assumed the presidency, life has become more difficult for the American labor force, for foreign refugees and immigrant hopefuls, for American soldiers, for those who need medical care but cannot afford it, for those concerned about irrevocable environmental damage, for those fighting to prevent degradation of natural land preserves and extinction of species by oil and mining industry activities, for people who may look Middle Eastern in appearance, for those concerned about international alliances and anti-American sentiment around the globe, for the homeless, for the jobless, and for future generations who will bear the direct burden of the ballooning federal deficit. None of these difficulties has not existed under other presidents, yet it is hard to say that they all existed at the same time, as they do now, and that they were not counterbalanced by some easily identifiable, unequivocal improvement in the welfare of the average American citizen. It does not necessarily follow that George W. Bush is the worst president this country has ever had. Maybe over time, it will follow. Hopefully not.

SOCIOLOGY PUZZLE #5

Each of the following “trios” can be combined with one common word to form three well-known expressions. (For example, for the trio “BALL – BOARD – BOY”, the common word would be “GAME”, giving you “ball game”, “board game”, and “game boy”.) Find the common words for each trio and write them in the blanks. Then read down the list, looking at the first letter of each word you generate, to find the name of an author. What is the title of his 1994 book?

- _____ 1. BLUE – FINGER – FOOT
- _____ 2. EXPENSE – SAVINGS – BANK
- _____ 3. WEAR – WATER – STAND
- _____ 4. GREEN – MARK – SCAPE

- _____ 5. POKER – SECOND – WRITING
- _____ 6. BREAKER – CUBES – DRY
- _____ 7. FIBER – WINE – WATER
- _____ 8. GUESSING – SHOW – THEORY
- _____ 9. TREASURE – BARRIER – EASTER
- _____ 10. SUBMARINE – WEAPON – PHYSICS
- _____ 11. EGG – SEA – FISH

Book title:

_____ : _____

SOCIOLOGY PUZZLE #4 -- ANSWER

A		E		C	A	A	E	A		D		
E		I		E	I	E	I	C	A	D	F	
L		L	G	I	N	L	K	O	I	L	N	A
O	B	R	I	U	N	L	L	S	L	N	T	E
R	R	S	O	V	N	R	R	S	O	O	U	H
T	U	T	S	W	O	S	S	V	S	R	Y	O
O	U	R		I	N	D	I	V	I	D	U	A
L		L	I	V	E	S		C	A	N	N	O
T	,		G	E	N	E	R	A	L	L	Y	,
	B	E		W	O	R	K	S		O	F	
A	R	T		U	N	L	E	S	S		T	H
E		S	O	C	I	A	L		O	R	D	E
R		I	S		A	L	S	O	.			

“Our individual lives cannot, generally, be works of art unless the social order is also.”

-- Charles Horton Cooley