



(If you would like to receive the newsletter in email format only, please email Ed Nelson—ednelson@csufresno.edu). Otherwise, we'll also mail you a paper copy.

President's Corner—Tim Kubal, CSU Fresno

I want to thank everyone involved in the 2016 conference, which was a resounding success. I am going to use my space in this "President's Corner" to sketch some thoughts on the recent election. I will outline some of the key irregularities of the election, analyze the public opinion about Trump and his promises, address the issue of Trump's authenticity, describe some of the problematic cabinet appointments and executive orders, and conclude by discussing the free press and ongoing resistance. Because of the length of the essay, it is not available in the print version of the newsletter, but the full text is available in the electronic version, which is emailed to many members, and is available on the CSA website:<http://cal-soc.org/>.

Election Circus

Of course, this election was not the only one in American history to raise eyebrows. The 2000 election was especially contentious. However, there likely has been no other election in history with so many irregularities as occurred in the 2016 election. We regularly question or invalidate elections in other countries for a variety of reasons that we saw in our own election. Some of the most glaring irregularities included:

- Fraud in the primaries – Iowa, Nevada and a host of other states had suspect if not arbitrary processes for choosing candidates, from coin flipping, to ignoring votes, to outright fraudulently changing votes. The Democratic Party may have colluded to disenfranchise Bernie Sanders and support the candidacy of Hillary Clinton.
- Fake news – Outrageous propaganda spreading lies about criminal behavior of political opponents spread throughout social media. Much of this fake news was delivered by Russia, who openly sought to swing the election so Hillary would lose. Millions of people turn to social media as their primary news source. Many people likely believed some of this fake news to be real. One man believed the fake news story that Hillary Clinton ran a child trafficking ring out of the back of a restaurant and showed up at the restaurant with an automatic rifle to settle the score.
- FBI investigations – Against protocol, FBI director Comey repeatedly released information about ongoing investigations of Hillary Clinton, with a devastating, but ultimately disproven release of information just before the election. Many people believe these were politically motivated investigations. The FBI is widely known for a conservative political bias. There were some reports that the FBI agents had a culture of describing Hillary as the devil and that Comey had to come out just before the election because a FBI operative who was also on the Trump payroll promised to leak the information anyway. At the same time, there were ongoing investigations against Trump, but Comey later said he did not release information about these before the election because he would never release information about an ongoing investigation.
- Threats from Trump – The list of threats is very long, and there is not space to include all of them. Here are a few: He repeatedly promised to imprison his opponent, Hillary Clinton. He encouraged chants of "lock her up" at his rallies. He wavered in denouncing violence-prone groups such as the KKK and weakly denounced supporters that claimed Hillary should be murdered. He promised to pay his supporters to commit violence against anti-Trump protesters at his rallies. He gave cryptic guidelines for his supporters to "watch" polling places for irregularities. He implied that gun-rights advocates would have no choice but to use their guns to stop Hillary. He said he could murder someone in broad daylight and get away with it. He suggested his fame gave him the right to sexually assault women, but then denied ever doing so, even in the face of over a dozen similar accounts that corroborated his own story of assault. He dismissed charges from his wife who said that Trump had raped her. He threatened mass violence if electors defected and did not elect him. He advocates torture, advocated the murder of family members of terrorists, said he loves war, and said that nuclear proliferation was no problem. These are just some of the most visible examples of Trump's threats of violence. There were more.
- Computer hacks and leaks – We now know that the Russians hacked the Democratic Party and the Clinton campaign, and gave the material to WikiLeaks. U.S. intelligence agencies agree that Russia clearly wanted Trump to win. There is an ongoing investigation if the Trump campaign had colluded with the Russians. In the summer, Trump rightly predicted an "October surprise." This debacle sounded like a second Watergate, without the political upheaval or hearings. [Continued on p. 3]

California Sociological Association 2017 Annual Meeting
November 17-18, Holiday Inn-Sacramento
 Send proposals for sessions, panels, workshops, and abstracts of papers to Thea Alvarado, Pasadena City College
tsweoalvarado@gmail.com

President Elect and 2017 Program Chair-Thea Alvarado, Pasadena City College

The theme for the 2017 conference in Sacramento is “A Legacy of Sociology.” This topic was selected with great care and consideration of all the people over the years who have worked to ensure the success of the California Sociological Association. We all have mentors that have helped us, guided us, and shaped us through the years. As sociologists, connecting with others is an integral part of what we do. Hearing the stories of others encourages us to develop our sociological imaginations, and to see the world through their eyes. More specifically, mentors provide institutional memory, historical context, and share hard-learned lessons. They are the trail-blazers who have worked to grant greater opportunities to those who follow in their footsteps.

The topic of marginalization is again at the forefront of sociological research. Never before has there been such a platform for people from all walks of life to share their ideas, and never before has there been more of a need for critical thinking to be employed to discern what we hear and how we make sense of the world around us. Public policy and popular media could benefit greatly from the methods and outcomes of sociological research.

The mobilization of women throughout the country for the Women’s March on Washington, and the simultaneous sister marches around the world, were an impressive demonstration in support of women’s rights, and possibly the largest demonstration in U.S. history. One of the most heartening aspects of the marches, though, was the participation of people who may not be directly affected by recent changes in legislation. For, as we know, everyone bears responsibility for the success of all members of society.

The outcome of this past presidential election was a big shock to many, but the lessons learned include the need for everyone to feel heard. In California, we have made strides towards acceptance, inclusion, and greater education. Yet, as always, there is more work to be done. The annual California Sociological Association conference is an opportunity for you to be heard. Anyone can organize, present, or moderate a session. At this past conference, we covered issues of race, immigrant status, the military, age, gender, sexuality, parenting, feminism, health care, the environment, teaching pedagogy, and of course, politics. If your interest lies in leadership, we also invite you to stay for the business meeting.

As we begin to shape our next conference, I would like to encourage each of you to share your unique research, experiences, and lessons. You never know who will be in the audience, and who will be shaped by your words. It is with great gratitude that I reflect on the people and experiences that have paved the way. I plan to organize a session that pairs mentors with their mentees, so that they can share their experiences and their journey, and I welcome you to do the same. See you in Sacramento!

2016 Student Award Winners

A highlight of the annual conference is always the Friday evening student awards and keynote address followed by the buffet reception. Here is a little bit about the 2016 award winners:

- **Giovanni Roman-Torres**, University of California, Berkeley, Undergraduate Student Award--Giovanni graduated from East Los Angeles College in 2011 and recently from UC Berkeley with high honors. He is applying to PhD programs in sociology.
- **Kevin Gonzalez**, California State University, Los Angeles, Undergraduate Student Award—Kevin completed a BA in sociology with an emphasis on Law and Society in Fall, 2016.
- **Brent Clark**, California State University, Sacramento, Graduate Student Award—Brent received associate’s degrees in social science and liberal arts from Sacramento City College in Spring 2014, a bachelor’s in sociology with a government minor from CSUS in Spring 2016, and is beginning a Master’s of Sociology program at CSUS.

CSA Governing Council 2016-17

The California Sociological Association has a governing council made up of an Executive Board of officers and Governors-at-Large who represent our constituency groups. Each year we elect a President Elect who serves as the program chair for the conference that year and becomes the president the following year. Some new officers are also elected each year so there is continuity on the Governing Council. At the end of the 2016 annual meeting in November, Tim Kubal became the president for 2016-17 and Thea Alvarado became President Elect and Program Chair for the 2017 conference in Sacramento.

Regional vice presidents are elected for two-year terms. One represents members living in Kern County and south, and the other vice president represents the northern region. The vice-president assists the program chair when the annual conference is held in his/her region as well as serving as secretary for the organization the other year. Anne Marengo, College of the Canyons, was elected Vice President South, and Elvia Ramirez, CSU Sacramento, continues as Vice President North.

In addition to these officers who form the Executive Board, a seven-member Governing Council representing the constituency groups in the Association is elected to three-year terms. Our constituency groups are students, practitioners, private colleges and universities, community colleges, the University of California, and the California State University System. Christopher Chase-Dunn, UC Riverside, is the UC Representative; Jeb Middlebrook (CSU Dominguez Hills) resigned as CSU Rep. and David Boyns (CSU Northridge) was appointed. Community Colleges have two representatives--those in northern California are represented by J. Vern Cromartie (Contra Costa College), and Rebekah Villafana (College of the Canyons) represents community colleges in the south. Ed Clarke (Vanguard University) represents private colleges and universities, Robin Franck continues to represent practitioners, and Elizabeth Bogamil (UC Riverside) was elected as the students' representative. (Contact information for the council is listed on the end of this newsletter.) Past presidents may continue to be part of the Board, and many of them work very hard for the Association.

Here are the details for the newest representatives:

- Elizabeth Bogamil earned her M.A. at CSU Northridge and is currently a Ph.D. student at UC Riverside. Her current research interests are quality of life, sense of community, attachment to place, and walkability. While much of her research is quantitative, she enjoys engaging in innovative qualitative arts-based research methods for data collection, analysis, and representation. She credits road-trips, walking through cities across the U.S., and her W.P.A. Writer's Project book collection for her interest in sociology.
- David Boyns is a Professor of Sociology at California State University at Northridge (CSUN). He is also the current Director of the CSUN Institute for Community Health and Wellbeing. His research interests include sociological theory, emotions, self and identity dynamics, media and culture, and community-based participatory research. He is currently studying practices that impact socio-emotional wellbeing like mindfulness and alternative healing experiences.
- Rebekah Villafana earned both her Bachelor's and Master's degrees in Sociology from California State University, Northridge. She is currently an Associate Adjunct Professor of Sociology at College of the Canyons, with multiple sociological interests, including women and poverty, education, privilege and power, and the complex intersections of race, class, and gender.

We thank the council members for their continued service and welcome the new members!

College of the Canyons Students at the 2016 Conference

Students from the Sociology Club at College of the Canyons again volunteered at our 2016 conference. They worked with registration and the audio visual equipment as well as helping in many other ways. It was a great help to us and an important learning experience for them. We thank them and their mentors, Anne Marengo, Rebekah Villafana, and Kim Bonfiglio.

Thank you to the Departments that Donated to the 2016 Conference:

- CSU, Channel Islands
- CSU, East Bay
- CSU, Fresno
- CSU, Northridge
- CSU, San Bernardino
- CSU, San Marcos
- Humboldt State
- Santa Clara University

2017 Conference at the Holiday Inn, Sacramento

The next conference will be at the Holiday Inn in downtown Sacramento. It is a good location for our meeting in northern California. There are good conference rooms, and it is close to many capital attractions, and Old Sacramento historic district is just across the street. (From the Sacramento International Airport, it's a 15-minute drive down I-5.) For more information, please visit their website at www.missioninn.com.

Odds and Ends:

- The spring newsletter will include the preliminary list of sessions for 2017.
- Please join the California Sociological Association on Facebook.
- Is your Department doing something especially well—receiving awards, preparing students for employment or graduate study, promoting research skills, service learning....? Please let the rest of us know by contacting Elizabeth Nelson (elizn@csufresno.edu).
- Other 2017 Sociology Meetings:
 - ◇ Pacific Sociological Association April 6-9, 2017 Portland Oregon, pacificsoc.org
 - ◇ American Sociological Association August 12-15, Montreal, Quebec, Canada asanet.org

.....
 [President's Corner—Continued from p. 1.]

- Gerrymandering – There were many examples of gerrymandered districts around the country that redrew electoral boundaries to help ensure a Republican victory.
- Purging voter rolls – There were many examples of Republican state legislators purging voter rolls in an attempt to fight non-existent voter fraud, which reportedly removed high amounts of legitimate voters who were registered as Democrats.
- Voting laws – Republican legislators were caught creating new onerous voter id laws, and other acts of disenfranchisement such as eliminating early voting; these were especially popular in Republican states that had been restricted before the recent repeal of the Voting Rights Act. In at least one case, in North Carolina, the actions were reversed because a judge said they were done with “surgical precision” in order to disenfranchise Black voters.
- Limiting voting – There were many reports that voting machines were limited in Democrat districts, resulting in very long lines and limited access to voting.

Historians and political analysts will have to produce extensive analyses to support academic debate about whether this was a fraudulent election. One thing is sure – it was quite a spectacle. Trump's ascendance, of course, was not simply due to fraud. Many of his proposals were widely supported among the electorate.

Trump, Proposals and Public Opinion

While many sources of public opinion measure public opinion about the presidency and Trump's proposals, Gallup is perhaps the most trustworthy, and thus this section of the essay relies on findings from recent Gallup polls. Trump's disapproval rating, as of Jan 31st, 2017, is as high as it ever has been at 51%. His approval rating is as low as it ever has been at 43%. Other presidents have produced similar low approvals such as presidents George W. Bush, Carter, Nixon, and Truman. The following paragraphs first review those Trump proposals supported by public opinion, and then review those proposals that contradict public opinion (<https://goo.gl/jQmZJa>).

Many of Trump's proposals meet with widespread public support. Trump's proposal to cut middle-class taxes follows public opinion; more Americans than any time in the last 15 years say their tax bill is too high, and an increasing percentage of the public says the middle class and lower class pays too much tax. Similarly, Trump's proposal to simplify the tax code has garnered widespread support in recent polls. Trump promised to spend more dollars on infrastructure, and 75% of the public says they agree with such increased federal spending. Trump proposed a constitutional amendment to impose term limits on all members of congress, which has had broad support of nearly three-quarters of Americans since the question began to be asked over twenty years ago. Trump proposed new ethics rules for Congress, which included a five-year ban on White House and Congressional officials becoming lobbyists after they leave government, a lifetime ban on White House officials becoming lobbyists for foreign governments, and a total ban on foreign lobbyists raising money to influence U.S. elections. Congress and lobbyists have the lowest honesty and ethics ratings of any profession tested. Over 50% of the public says Congress' performance is "poor" or "bad," due mostly to their perceived allegiance to lobbyists, and financial interests. Trump has promised to expand military investment and a majority of Americans agree with a proposal to increase federal spending on the U.S. military. Confidence in the military is higher than any other institution. Public support for military spending is at its highest point since 9/11. More people believe that the military is “not strong enough” than believe it is "about right" or that it is "stronger than it needs to be." *Trump proposes to privatize, modernize and improve care at VA hospitals. Citizens agree with allowing veterans to receive medical care from private providers, and agree with spending more money to modernize the VA; 87% favored prioritizing improved healthcare for veterans.*

Many of Trump's proposals contradict public opinion. Trump promised to reduce taxes, including on the wealthiest citizens. 60% of the public thinks the upper class pays too little in income taxes, a majority agrees that the government should use the tax code to redistribute wealth through heavy taxes on the rich, and 45% agree with a proposal to raise tax rates on high-income households. Trump's plan to build a wall on our southern border, paid for by Mexico, met with disapproval -- 66% of Americans said they opposed it. Trump has vowed to support mass deportations of all undocumented immigrants. In contrast, 84% of U.S. citizens favor allowing undocumented immigrants to have a pathway to citizenship, and 45% agree that the pathway to citizenship should be “swift”. Trump promised to revive the governmental emphasis on fossil fuels by lifting regulations. The public, however, disagrees -

- 73% prioritized alternative energy sources over traditional fossil fuel sources, and 59% prioritized preserving the environment over traditional energy sources such as oil, gas and coal.

The public is divided on many of Trump's proposals. Trump proposed to fully repeal Obamacare, and replace it with an alternative plan. While 43% said they want the law changed significantly, only 37% say it should be repealed and replaced. Trump's hiring freeze on all federal employees shows about 50% support in recent polls. Trump's proposal to end common core met with mixed reaction – 51% admitted they did not know enough about it to make a decision but 31% agreed to its abolishment, and only 17% disagreed. Trump has promised to move the U.S. Israeli embassy to Jerusalem. Over 50% have no opinion, and among those with an opinion, 24% agree and 20% disagree. Trump proposed changes to trade deals such as to renegotiate NAFTA and withdraw from TPP. When asked about this proposal, 28% agreed, 28% disagreed, and over 40% did not have an opinion. In a separate question, only 16% thought these changes to our trade policies would be "very effective" in improving the U.S. economy, and 58% said that foreign trade is an opportunity for economic growth rather than a threat to the economy. Trump has promised less government regulation. Over 50% of Americans say there are too many regulations. Over half are dissatisfied with government regulation, but only 25% want decreased regulations. Trump proposed lowering taxes on businesses, and 43% of Americans agreed to lowering corporate tax rates (with only 30% disagreeing), but in a separate survey two-thirds said that corporations pay too little in taxes. In regards to small businesses, 77% of respondents agreed to lowering the tax rate.

While many of Trump's proposals receive mixed reaction, others receive public support, and some are clearly disliked. Another common criticism of Trump is his strange relationship with telling the truth.

The Authentic Liar

I agree that reality is malleable, so I have trouble with casually using the words "truth" and "lies" and "facts" because I know that there are alternative perspectives on reality, and that sometimes competing perspectives both can be true based on how things are defined, differing perspectives, opposing estimates, alternative assumptions, and varying interpretation of "facts."

Still, I think it is accurate to say that it is widely believed that Obama was a trustworthy politician who only got caught in a few lies. On the other hand, Trump is widely considered to be one of the most egregious liars in the history of politics. Even Republicans, and people in Trump's own cabinet, speak regularly about having to educate Trump about the truth and push back so he doesn't spout off his conspiracy theories and "alternative facts" (usually to no avail). Because of his penchant for playing loose with the truth, a new term has emerged to define our current condition; some people are saying that our political system is moving into a "post-fact" era, or "post truth" era.

Wikipedia says: "Post-truth politics (also called post-factual politics) is a political culture in which debate is framed largely by appeals to emotion disconnected from the details of policy, and by the repeated assertion of talking points to which factual rebuttals are ignored" (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Post-truth_politics).

One way to assess the truthfulness of politicians is through fact checkers:

PolitiFact is widely considered to be a non-partisan news site. They won the Pulitzer Prize for journalism. They are not perfect, and some Republicans have claimed (with limited evidence) that PolitiFact is somewhat biased in favor of Democrats. Still, many Republicans trust the site and use it regularly, and PolitiFact is probably the most well respected fact checker available.

PolitiFact documents the "truths" and "lies" of Republican and Democrat politicians. Trump's file says that of about 350 contested statements, only 16% are true or mostly true, and he has nearly 250 (70%) that are mostly false, false, or pants on fire false: <http://www.PolitiFact.com/personalities/donald-trump/>. In such a short political career, the numbers of statements labeled as lies are quite alarming, and likely this is the reason for the widespread interpretation that Trump is a serial liar. In contrast, Obama's file says that of about 600 contested statements, 48% are true or mostly true, and he has only 150 (26%) that are mostly false, false, or pants on fire false: <http://www.PolitiFact.com/personalities/barack-obama/>. In such a long career, to have such a small number (and percentage) of statements labeled as lies reflects Obama's widespread approval ratings and his widespread reputation as a truth-teller.

Could Trump be both a liar and a truth-teller? Yes. This answer isn't just because of political bias, where Republicans trust Trump and Democrats do not. It may be the case that both political sides are correct, because of differing definitions of "truth". Among his supporters, Trump is widely believed to be honest because he always says what he believes. Trump has said that if the public believes something to be true, then, on some level, it must be true. Trump's supporters believe he does not alter his beliefs depending on the audience. This understanding of truth suggests that truth is based on authenticity rather than being based on factual accuracy. To Republicans, Trump is authentic. Liberals and Democrats seem to seethe when Trump is inaccurate factually, which is quite often, at least according to PolitiFact. To many Democrats, Trump is a liar. Both sides could be correct if Democrats see truth measured through factual accuracy, and Republicans see truth measured through authenticity; combining the two views transforms Trump into an authentic liar.

Further supporting the interpretation of his authenticity, Trump's cabinet appointments seem to support many of his proposals.

Corrosive Cabinet Appointments

President-elect Trump's cabinet appointments threaten the agencies that protect us.

Trump appointed Andrew Puzder as Secretary of Labor. Puzder makes \$4.4 million, 291 times his average worker. He wants workers replaced with robots. He opposes federal minimum wage, overtime pay, sick days, and health care benefits. Jeff Sessions' racism disqualified him as a federal judge, but as Attorney General, he will protect our civil rights? He wrongly prosecuted black activists for voter fraud and opposed portions of the Voting Rights Act. Many human rights organizations oppose Sessions confirmation. Trump appointed Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt to lead the EPA. Pruitt has repeatedly sued the EPA over Clean Power and methane emission regulations. He defended ExxonMobil for climate change propaganda. He has no scientific credentials, but doubts over 98% of all climate scientists who state that climate change is a human-made problem. Dr. Ben Carson will head the agency responsible for assisting the elderly, disabled and poor with housing. Carson has no government experience and doubts the department should strive to achieve its mission. The energy secretary campaigned for president on a platform to abolish the Department of Energy. Trump's education secretary has worked to dismantle established public education through vouchers and privatization. The proposed head of our public health care system proposed the destruction of federal Medicare, Medicaid and Obamacare. The president's cabinet picks show a dangerous pattern of disregard for the public good: Unqualified nominees who vow not to enforce the mandate of their agency.

Equally worrisome in the eyes of many are the radical executive orders he has signed in the first two weeks in office.

Executive Orders

Trump began his first week in office with a flurry of executive orders. In addition to promises to overhaul Obamacare, the Trump administration seems focused on making sure it will fail before it is even repealed, by restricting funding and rescinding all advertising to tell citizens they may still join or change their coverage.

Trump campaigned on reviving and building stalled pipelines and signed an executive order that promised to expedite review of the Keystone and Dakota pipelines. American Indians have sovereignty over their own land, but Trump thinks he can build over their sacred lands. For what? He claims it will lead to many jobs, but the long-term jobs after building the pipelines will be about 20. Also, the oil it ships is some of the dirtiest oil on the planet which is not only caustic to our environment, but also very costly to clean before refining and making available to the market. Even Trump's plan to use U.S. steel is receiving pushback from the companies responsible for constructing the pipeline.

Cutting the Trans-Pacific partnership was meaningless, because it had been dead for many months. Trump's repeated negotiation with businesses has caused shock waves in the stock market for these businesses. Overall, the market has done well, and some Democrats say they can work with Trump on international trade. The biggest threat is probably the likelihood of massive inflation if Trump institutes tariffs and penalties on imports. Mexico vowed they would never build the wall. Trump has suggested that he would tax remittances. Mexican citizens have responded that they would boycott U.S. businesses in Mexico, and Mexico has threatened tariffs on trade with the U.S. Trump would not actually be making Mexico pay for the wall – it would be paid for by raising prices on consumers – another example of inflation. The threats of inflation from tariffs and angering our trade partners threaten the buying power of the U.S. consumer; couple that with the promise to bring back manufacturing and push companies to buy from U.S. manufacturing means a likely inflation problem far worse than what plagued President Carter.

While many in Trump's cabinet promised congress they would not use torture even if Trump had ordered it, Trump still proclaimed that torture works and signed a decree suggesting it be used, along with promises to use Guantanamo Bay and hidden prisons around the world. Torture is against international human rights law, and against the U.S. military policy. Republican legislators have promised to start a campaign to stop Trump if he tries to reinstate torture.

Trump's immigration orders have caused considerable concern and criticism. In one order, Donald Trump proposed to deport all those undocumented immigrants suspected of criminal activity, which likely is unconstitutional given the right of all people to due process. He also asked agents to publish a special list of crimes committed by immigrants, and promised to punish sanctuary cities by rescinding all their federal funding. Another especially unpopular executive order popularly described as the "Muslim Ban" stopped refugee entry into the US for 120 days, suspended the Syrian refugee program indefinitely, and included a 90 day barring of citizens of Iran, Iraq, Libya, Sudan, Somalia, and Yemen. Trump said the order was meant to protect the U.S. from terrorism and even mentioned 9/11, but terrorism in the U.S. did not originate from these countries. While Trump and his team claimed it did not target Muslims, he did propose exceptions for Christian minorities from these countries, and the ban corresponds to his campaign promise to provide a "total and complete shutdown of Muslims entering the United States." The new restrictions caused confusion at airports across the country, as border agents detained refugees and permanent residents of the U.S. After only two days in existence, the ACLU and others already won injunctions against the executive order. Trump fired the acting attorney general for refusing

to enact the blocked executive order. The Attorney General was acting in accord with many judicial scholars who believe the immigration order is likely illegal or unconstitutional. It likely violates the First Amendment clause barring religious discrimination, and the equal due process clause of the Fifth Amendment. It also seems to contradict the laws passed by congress in 1952 and 1956, which barred immigration quotas based on race and national origin. We have already tried the quota immigration system and it was a shameful part of our history.

The latest controversial executive order, as of Feb 3, 2017, deregulates the banks and financial services industries. In his campaign, Trump criticized banks, said Hillary was doing the bidding of big banks, described himself as an enemy of Wall Street, and said he would transfer power back to the people. After the inauguration, he began appointing many industry insiders. This latest executive order reduces regulations on financial advisors and limits the 2010 Dodd-Frank financial-overhaul law, which promises to dismantle much of the regulatory system established after the financial crisis.

Overall, the Trump administration has been busy constructing executive orders, which some say give him the legitimacy of looking presidential. Critics of Obama's executive orders often suggested Obama was acting like a king without consulting congress, for overstepping his powers, and argued for states' rights. But they seem to have changed their tune now that a Republican president is producing even more radical executive orders that ignore the wishes of their own party in congress, and do even more to disenfranchise states' rights. It may be helpful to remember that Trump will not only face resistance to these executive orders but that they do not carry the force of law, and moreover, that he cannot implement many of them without funding appropriations from Congress. If he tries to transfer funding congress appropriated for a particular cause to one of his pet projects – such as building the wall – he will likely face congressional backlash and legal challenges. These challenges will not only face resistance from Trump, but also many of his supporters, including those that want to make America great/white again.

Make America White Again

It is widely stated that Trump has provided opportunities for White Nationalists and other racist groups to express themselves verbally, and increase their violence. The Southern Poverty Law Center has reported a massive increase in anti-Muslim hate crimes since the start of Trump's campaign. Some suggest that Trump's promise to "Make America Great Again" seems to be white supremacist code for "Make American White Again," harkening a "golden age" when whites ruled and people with darker skin obeyed in fear. A free press is an important tool in combating hate.

Free Press vs. Propaganda

Trump has always had a tumultuous relationship with the media. It may be easy for Trump to bash the media, given the low approval rating of the media, but many worry that Trump is limiting the free press. During his campaign, he repeatedly punished certain outlets by limiting access, and he has shown that such behavior may continue during his presidency. His adviser Steve Bannon and the Trump team have repeatedly called the media liars and suggested the media should do nothing more than report what the Trump administration tells them to report. Bannon recently said the media should shut up, and both Bannon and Trump described the media as "liars" "horrible people" and "the opposition party." Obviously, these were attempts to discredit and silence the media, and many journalists took these statements with offense rather than a badge of honor. Some would argue that statements such as those made by Bannon and Trump are signs that the media is doing its job in speaking truth to power. While many journalists have pushed back against the criticisms, many others have fallen in line and promised to report only what the Trump administration says, without asking critical questions or completing investigations. Of course, reporting only what the administration wishes without criticism or investigation transforms the media from a free press into a massive propaganda machine. This propaganda machine gains credibility if there are few competing outlets, which further explains Trump's use of social media, his avoidance of press conferences, denying interviews to critical media outlets, and the ban he placed on many government bureaucrats that bar them from speaking to the media or writing on social media. Support (independent) media, it is one of our best tools in supporting resistance!

When Life Gives You an Orange, You Impeach

Many critics suggest Congress must begin an impeachment investigation based on the violations of the emoluments clauses, the foreign emoluments clause and the domestic emoluments clause. The presidency is established for a public servant not as a personal profit-making enterprise. Trump has refused to divest from his businesses, has refused to release his tax returns, and is engaged in businesses all over the world. His businesses are continuing to receive payments from domestic and foreign governments, which suggests there may be a violation of the constitution and grounds for impeachment.

The Legitimacy of Protest

One of Trump's most recent bouts with the fact checkers was his claim that his inauguration was the biggest in history. In reality, the protest crowds were much larger than the crowds supporting the inauguration were. Protests appeared all around the world, and some claimed that it was one of the largest days of protest in world history. I was proud that nearly all of my immediate family at-

tended the protest – either in their respective cities or in Washington, D.C. We all heard a common cry from critics: That our protest was illegitimate whining because we lost the election. On the contrary, we were among the hundreds of thousands of concerned citizens that happily sacrificed time and money to participate in the Women's March on January 21st. Some people in the media and elsewhere have wrongly maligned our motives as a simple bitterness from an electoral defeat. We were not mourning our past. We were energizing ourselves to fight for a better future. When we arrived at the protest, we found thousands of voices speaking loudly and forcefully against his presidency. We came back energized. We found many at the march who had never joined a protest or been politically active before, and many that encouraged us to continue the opposition by organizing at home, which we vow to do. In addition to the Women's march, a number of mass-mobilizations have occurred around the country since the inauguration. Beginning January 28th, thousands of protesters have gathered at airports in Los Angeles, New York, Washington D.C., Chicago, Dallas and other cities as immigration authorities blocked entry of refugees and immigrants from seven Muslim-majority nations. Scientists are organizing a march on Washington to occur in the coming weeks, and many others are organizing in local communities around the nation, such as a massive network of protests organized by the Answer coalition. Petitions abound from groups such as [move-on.org](#), [change.org](#), the Democratic Party, Daily Kos, Color of Change, [stophatedumptrump.com](#), and many other outlets. A [WhiteHouse.Gov](#) petition broke a record for receiving over 380,000 signatures asking Trump to release his tax returns. Over 250,000 signatures have asked for a Trump impeachment at [ImpeachDonaldTrumpNow.org](#).

State legislators are fighting back against the resistance. A North Dakota Republican has introduced a bill that would allow motorists to hit and kill people who protest on highways, and a statue was proposed in Iowa where protesters that block highways would be charged with a felony, five years in prison and over \$7,000 in fines. Proposed bills in Minnesota and elsewhere would fine protesters to pay for police attendance at their events.

These are tough times filled with many potential threats to our way of life. As we know from social movement research, threats are excellent motivators of protest, as long as there is the belief that the threats are not overwhelming to personal safety, and that change is possible.

Call for Proposals

California Sociological Association Annual Meeting

**Holiday Inn-Sacramento
November 17-18, 2017**

**Send proposals for sessions, panels, abstracts of papers to
Thea Alvarado, Pasadena City College tsweoalvarado@gmail.com**

Please copy and distribute.

California Sociological Association Council 2016-2017

President (2016-17)

Tim Kubal
Sociology
CSU, Fresno
tkubal@csufresno.edu

President Elect (2016-17)

Thea Alvarado
Sociology
Pasadena City College
tsweoalvarado@gmail.com

Vice President-South (2016-18)

Anne Marengo
Sociology
College of the Canyons
anne.marengo@canyons.edu

Vice President-North (2016-18)

Elvia Ramirez
Sociology
CSU Sacramento
eramirez@csus.edu

Executive Director (2015-18)

Ed Nelson
Sociology
CSU, Fresno
ednelson@csufresno.edu

Archivist/Newsletter Editor

Elizabeth Nelson
Sociology
CSU Fresno
elizn@mail.fresnostate.edu

Webmaster

Tim Kubal
Sociology
CSU, Fresno
tkubal@csufresno.edu

California State University (2016-17)

David Boyns
Sociology
CSU Northridge
david.boyns@csun.edu

University of California (2014-17)

Christopher Chase-Dunn
Sociology
UC Riverside
christopher.chase-dunn@ucr.edu

Community Colleges North (2014-17)

J. Vern Cromartie
Sociology
Contra Costa College
j_vern_cromartie@yahoo.com

Community Colleges South (2016-19)

Rebekah Villafana
Sociology
College of the Canyons
rebekah.villafanna@canyons.edu

Private College & Universities (2014-17)

Ed Clarke
Sociology
Vanguard University of Southern CA
eclarke@vanguard.edu

Practitioners (2015-18)

Robin Franck
Consultant
rfranck@swccd.edu

Students (2015-16)

Elizabeth Bogumil
Sociology
UC Riverside
elizabeth.bogumil@email.ucr.edu

Immediate Past President (2016-17)

David Smith
Sociology
UC Irvine
dasmith@uci.edu

E Nelson
1142 E. Menlo
Fresno CA 93710

