



# Comparative & Historical Sociology

Fall 2003

Newsletter of the ASA Comparative and Historical Sociology section

Volume 15, No. 3

## SECTION OFFICERS 2003-2004

### Chair

John R. Hall (2004)  
UC-Davis

### Chair-Elect

Jeff Goodwin (2005)  
New York University

### Past Chair

Eiko Ikegami (2003)  
*New School*

### Secretary-Treasurer

Ming Cheng-Lo (2005)  
*UC-Davis*

### Council Members

Elisabeth Clemens (2005)  
*Chicago*  
Rebecca Jean Emigh (2006)  
*UCLA*  
Fatma Muge Gocek (2006)  
*University of Michigan*  
Philip S. Gorski (2005)  
*Univ. Wisconsin-Madison*  
Mark Traugott (2004)  
*UC Santa Cruz*  
Viviana Zelizer (2004)  
*Princeton*

### Newsletter Editor

Rosemary L. Hopcroft  
*University of North Carolina at Charlotte*

### Webmaster

Mathieu Deflem  
*University of South Carolina*

## Greetings from the Chair

John R. Hall  
University of California at Davis

Two recent experiences have demonstrated to me, yet again, how important our section is as a vessel that navigates the mingled currents that Reinhard Bendix and Guenther Roth called scholarship and partisanship. First, I had the opportunity to review a number of books under the label of social science history. While many of them were excellent historical studies, very few demonstrated the comparative, theoretical, and methodological sophistication that has been the hallmark of our section members' scholarship over the years. Second, a graduate student in a history program approached me with what seemed an ingenious idea of using postcolonial theory to study European society. In a later conversation, he lamented that historians in his program had discouraged the approach. I submit that these are cautionary tales and challenges. Since 9/11, what we do has become all the more salient – certainly to sociology, but also to the historically oriented social sciences and humanities, and to the wider world. It is in that frame that I believe we should collectively carry our mantle of intellectual responsibility.

## In this issue...

- *2004 ASA sessions announced, see page 9*
- *Call for nominations, Bendix and Moore Awards, page 10*
- *2003 Bendix and Moore 2003 Award Winners announced, page 11*

I have served as chair of the Comparative & Historical Sociology section only for a few months, yet already much has happened. People who attended the CHS business meeting at ASA in Atlanta offered terrific suggestions for the 2004 CHS sessions in San Francisco – so many that we could not accommodate them all. To provide additional opportunities for talking historically and comparatively, we intend to offer an engaging and vital series of roundtables. (See the list of session and roundtable organizers elsewhere in this newsletter.) And there is a serious effort underway to organize a CHS miniconference to be held on Friday, August 13, just before the ASA meetings (stay tuned for details). In addition, we have the Barrington Moore prize, this year for the best book published 2002-2003, and the Reinhard Bendix prize for the best graduate student paper. I encourage you to plan to participate in these activities of the section. And I'm grateful to all – section members, members of council, and section officers – for the energy, commitment, and enthusiasm you've already shown.

Especially important, it seems to me, are the roundtables, which allow a flexibility of organization and topics ranging from informal discussions of emerging research topics to discussion of a book or article to short presentations of research in progress around selected themes. Please contact Brian Gran <bkg2@po.cwru.edu> to float proposals and trial balloons.

Another concrete action I'd encourage you to recruit a few good new section members (to help them join, give them the weblink <http://www.asanet.org/sections/general.html>). CHS section membership is stable and growing. Council and participants at the business meeting want to build on that, and it seems to me vital to encourage appropriate younger scholars and graduate students to become members of the section, so that comparative and historical sociology can play a central role in shaping how scholarship by the emerging generation will be framed. This enterprise, I believe, is in these times one of real significance to sociology as a discipline and to sociohistorical inquiry more widely.

\*\*\*\*\*

## Bringing Culture into Macro Structural Analysis in Historical Sociology

Eiko Ikegami  
New School for Social Research

*Keynote Address for the Comparative and Historical Sociology Section (the Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association, 17 August 2003, Atlanta)*

The theme of the 2003 annual meeting, "The Question of Culture," is an invitation for the section of comparative and historical sociology to assess the ways in which the issue of culture is used in our field. The remarkable revival of historical sociology over the last three decades has been driven primarily by the incorporation of organizational analysis into macro-sociological questions, which is usually labeled a structural approach. What roles, then, does the question of culture play in studies of long-term and large-scale social change? I would like to share my thoughts with you today regarding this question by focusing on some fundamental epistemological issues.

In American sociology, the two central notions of culture and social change have had an uneasy relationship for the last three decades. This current situation is closely linked to the decline of Parsonian functionalist modernization theory in the early 1970s. The earlier emphasis of Western researchers on the functional equivalents of the Protestant work ethic (or lack thereof) in non-Western societies, coupled with over-hasty analyses of the causal relationship between cultures and varying trajectories of economic development, has invited heavy criticism. More specifically, the critics were dissatisfied with the underlying assumptions of modernization theory, which presumed the teleological universality of Western models of modernity. More recently, many social scientists have engaged in projects intended to bring culture back into sociological research. The resurgence of cultural analysis in social change that asserts the constitutive role of culture is one of those instances. This effort has been a necessary corrective to the reductionist tendency to collapse

culture and discourse into the category of social organization. At the same time, we cannot neglect the fact that culture depends on specific kinds of social organization that undergird cultural production. When a view of culture as an agent of change takes us only as far as the discussion of an essentialized national culture or moral values, we are in danger of falling into the trap of modernization theory. The predictable result reduces culture to a watered-down version of morals and values, and laments the possibility of clashes between civilizations.

East Asian societies in general, and Japanese society in particular, have frequently been used to make the point that culture has an independent causal impact on economic developments. Modernization theorists' use of culture to understand East Asian success has tended toward an overly narrow focus on values and morals rather than situating culture within larger institutional developments in history. Robert Bellah's early work *Tokugawa Religion* (1959), at that time heavily influenced by Parsonian functionalism, devoted considerable attention to an early modern Japanese religion called Shingaku, a popular moral teaching, as the functional equivalent of the "Protestant work ethic" made famous by Weber's thesis. Bellah missed the point, however, by failing to recognize the different political and institutional contexts of Western Christianity and Shingaku respectively. Protestant as well as Roman Catholic churches in Western Europe were powerful public institutions that not only claimed to teach ultimate truths but also wielded sufficient institutional authority to compete with secular rulers. In contrast, no Japanese religion was ever strong enough to represent an independent counterbalance to state power. The position of religion within a matrix of social relations is clearly very different in Japan, a country in which no single religious sect has ever acquired the gatekeeping power of moral control.

Given this difference, in my book *The Taming of the Samurai*, I focused on the process of cultural transformation among the samurai elite by analyzing their culture of honor. Their cultural transformation was connected to the long-term result of their changing relationship with the Japanese state. While the medieval samurai were independent warrior lords shaped by an aggressive

military culture, the samurai of the Tokugawa period were quasi-bureaucrats who were required to cooperate with their rulers as disciplined individuals. As a result, traditional Japanese elite culture developed a dual cultural theme conducive to self-control as well as change. They elaborated cultural resources for self-discipline in the service of long-term ends while retaining motivation to pursue individual goals. This dual theme resembles the Protestant work ethic that Weber identified as the moving spirit of capitalism, but the Japanese version developed within a very different organizational and cultural matrix. The historical role of the samurai elite and the distinctive trajectory of Japanese state formation were primary incentives for the development of their distinctive disciplinary culture (Ikegami 1995).

Elusive similarities in the appearance and function of societies may have emerged from different structures and historical trajectories, which will become apparent only once we tease out these differences from below the surface of their similarities. My point here is not to assert that religious beliefs and moral convictions are less important than political and organizational factors. Rather, I find that meanings take shape through individual actions situated within the structural institutional relationships of a society.

### **Culture and Structure: Revisionist Efforts**

For the last three decades in historical sociology, the cross-fertilization of organizational analysis and studies of social change has proved to be fruitful in analyzing such diverse topics as comparative state formation, revolution, and democratization. As a result of this heavily organizational structural analysis in historical sociology, however, culture is still often treated as a residual category in the mainstream of the discipline. More recently, however, the proliferation of new thematic dimensions such as gender, sexuality, race and ethnicity have brought new analytic interest in culture and identities into our field. These topics by nature recognize the fluidity and multiplicities of categories and identities that point toward phenomenological and process-oriented views. As such, this orientation conflicts with the dominant organization-based structural analysis. Furthermore, the rising vitality

of cultural history in historical scholarship in general has also encouraged sociologists to take culture more seriously; in fact, many historical sociologists are engaging in research in which culture plays a significant role. In contrast to the modernization perspective that tends to work with essentialized versions of macro-cultures, the new research focuses more on micro dynamics of actual cultural practices. This inevitably brings us to the question of macro-micro links, an old but formidable theoretical challenge.

Consequently, the question of bringing culture into macro structural analysis in historical sociology is not simply an issue of bringing in "more" cultural topics and themes, but it is essentially related to our ontological understanding of structures, actions, and meanings. Fortunately, on this epistemological level, there have been a number of useful corrective attempts to take the question of culture more seriously while differentiating it from modernization theory. I can touch upon only a few of these attempts here. For example, the metaphor of culture as a "tool kit," as proposed by Ann Swidler (1986), has been influential because it neatly underscores the agency of actors. Unlike functionalist modernization theory, which regards culture as a coherent value system, a tool kit perspective assumes that individuals use symbols and beliefs to achieve personal strategic goals. As originally devised, the metaphor can be of great use, as long as we recognize its limitations-- a task we face when using any metaphor. In this particular case, there is a danger of regarding actors as using cultural tool kits freely for their own ends regardless of their cognitive network contexts. This is not the case. Getting one's message across with any effectiveness requires the cooperation of many others. We might say that an actor with situational advantages resembles the captain of an ocean liner who requires the collaboration of other crew members but who can still exercise considerable control and initiative in pursuit of his or her goal. (See, Hilary Putnam:1997) Furthermore, culture is continuously remade, in the very acts of using it. Instead of viewing culture as a material tool box, I see culture more as an informational tool box. When you borrow a material tool, you can put it back again unchanged, as long as you don't break it. But when you borrow information, in human

discourse at least, you cannot help but pass it on in subtly changed ways. From the lowest forms of gossip to the highest elite opinions, each and any form of information exchange is in flux.

How is the structure of culture created and transformed? What are the relationships between the structural dimensions and tool kit aspects of culture, and between nonhuman structures and social relations? William Sewell, Jr. (1992) confronted these questions using Anthony Giddens's theory of structure. Sewell contends that the dual aspect of structure, which simultaneously constrains and empowers the course of human action, is the most useful part of Giddens's theory. Structures as rules, which Sewell prefers to call schemas, refer to the regulations of social life, "including all the varieties of cultural schemata that anthropologists have uncovered in their research,...the various conventions, recipes, scenarios, principles". In contrast, resources include the preeminent vehicles of powers which people are able to use in flexible ways to achieve their ends. This duality is the mechanism, Sewell argues, that makes structural change possible. Sewell provides a useful perspective that simultaneously recognizes the agency of actors while also underscoring the power of social structures. Yet it is problematic that Sewell makes a sharp dichotomy between conceptual linguistic structures as virtual schemas and inhuman materials and human capacities as actual resources.

As recent developments in the field of collective actions amply demonstrate, actors' use of rhetoric is not simply the application of an accepted cultural system to persuade others, but is also a creation and recreation of the interacting actors' identities at the sites of contentious actions. Clearly, structures as such are infused with meanings while symbolic domains are embedded in social relations. The question is how to recognize this intimate mutual embeddedness while not reducing the one to the other.

### **Culture as Emergent Property: A Public-Centered View**

Trying to answer this theoretical question led me to what I have called elsewhere a "public-centered analysis" (Ikegami:2000. Ikegami: forthcoming). I consider the locations and spheres

of communicative activities as the primary sites of cultural production and transformation, and I call these sites of communicative activities "publics." In addition to social and cognitive structures and the activities of individual actors, I would like to propose that the sites of human interactions constitute a third critical element for theoretical construction.

As I use the term, "publics" are communicative sites that emerge at the points of connection among social and/or cognitive networks. (See, White:1992. 1995 ) Each individual carries with him or her an amalgamation of cognitive, social, and symbolic networks. The "public" is the sphere (actual-physical and/or imagined-virtual space) in which the actions of switching-connecting and decoupling of networks take place. Understood phenomenologically in the spirit of Erving Goffman, a "public" emerges on the smallest scale as the site of a temporary intersection of two individuals. In its larger and more organizational form, a public may emerge on the basis of concrete institutionalized associational networks and communicative infrastructures that facilitate and sustain durable mechanisms for bringing interacting agents into the condition of a public. However, union rallies, the rituals of religious worship, and political demonstrations can also be seen as cases of more institutionalized publics than "Goffman publics." Schools and business firms are also examples of institutionalized sites of publics that provide regular organizational and physical environments for recurrent communicative activities. Prescribed network structures--the formal organizational structures of a school or firm--would by their very nature influence the structures of publics that occurred there.

Starting with this understanding, I wish to emphasize three main characteristics of publics. First: meanings and identities are emergent properties in publics; therefore, culture is context-dependent in publics. Second: publics must be understood as sites in which actors switch identities and make new social and cognitive network connections; hence, publics are sites for change. Third: macrosocial structural and cognitive relational constraints influence hierarchies, interrelationships and types of publics in society.

#### 1) Emergent Properties

By focusing on the sphere of communicative actions that affect social relations and their attendant meanings, I propose that meanings and representations as such are "emergent properties" arising in publics. The notion of emergent properties is a concept derived from complexity theory in the natural sciences. For example, the human body offers some striking examples of "more is different"(Anderson 1972), or what might also be termed "emergent properties." The body contains many different levels of emergence: at one and the same location in the body, we can focus on the organization that is present there on the level of organs, tissues, cells, organelles, molecules, atoms, quarks, or vacuum fluctuations. A human body thus entails not just one complex network, but an intricate assemblage of many complicated networks, each of which displays many different emergent properties. "Emergent properties" are phenomena that can be understood retrospectively based on the properties of the individual constituents but that are very hard to predict from those properties alone. To complicate matters, the details of emergent properties are often sensitively dependent on historical trajectories, and as such are unpredictable even in principle. If and when we could achieve a complete molecular description, would that mean that we had "explained" the workings of a living cell, and that we thereby fully "understand" what the living cell is "all about"? Clearly not: the paradoxical aspect of emergent properties lies precisely in the fact that they are at the same time "nothing more" than what is already given at a lower level of description, yet simultaneously "completely different," and in that qualitative sense "far more" compared to the lower level.

In a similar manner, once they are manifested as an emergent property, cultural outcomes--including religion, value systems, literature, arts, and various forms of popular culture--can exercise a "thing-like" independent influence over the course of socio-cultural developments insofar as individuals use the repertoire of cultural resources and idioms to their own ends.

#### 2) Publics in Motion

Publics are also sites that usher change into social life. Publics are spheres in which individuals interact, and networks intersect with other

networks. Individuals have the ability to create new associational networks and to make a choice of publics in which to participate. For example, at an ASA meeting, participants purposively switch from one session to the other; the whole pattern of switching and encountering various communicative sites constitutes the experience of attending such a convention, which helps us to reconstitute our perceptions toward “what is going on in sociology”. Individuals do not ordinarily confine themselves to participation in a single public, but switch from one to another. In other words, an individual actor or group's purposeful action can make a significant difference in social structures by intentionally generating the sphere of a new public or by making a choice of participating in a public. I consider that the power of human agency lies in people's creative ability to form meta-cognitive connections between separate or even radically different kinds of network domains. People also leave behind pre-existing network connections--sometimes intentionally, sometimes unconsciously. It is in a public that such a shift of network connections occurs. In this sense, publics are spheres for action, the location in which changes, evolution, and shifting of identities take place.

### 3) Structuring the Interrelationships of Publics

I conceptualized the notion of publics, as stated earlier, in order to identify a new theoretical medium for connecting the macrostructural analysis of historical sociology with cultural domains. Social-structural constraints influence cultural production primarily through structuring publics and influencing their interrelationship. The types, varieties, and formats of publics in a society may be conditioned by the interrelationships among large-scale network structure—macrosocial structural environments. In concrete terms, structural constraints influence the locations and ways that people meet and associate with each other, and these constraints thus affect the locations, hierarchies and interrelationships of publics. For example, the structure of the institutional field of publics in a society is profoundly affected by the organizational structure of the state. The types, shapes, and hierarchies of publics in turn affect the contents of the emerging discursive and cultural properties. The state's influence on cultural production has been often described as ideological

and moral control or legal and political enforcement. The state's most significant effect on cultural spheres, however, lies in its indirect influence on the shaping and sustenance of a durable organizational-institutional field that affects the structures, hierarchies and interrelationships of publics. This understanding has immediate implications for the literature on comparative state formation. Macrostructural factors that affect the interrelationships of publics are not limited to the state. The structures of market networks as well as those of associational networks may also influence the ways that interactional sites are organized.

Consequently, the theoretical advantage of the public-centered view is twofold. By describing human interactions as a continuous process of co-dependent emergence of publics and identities, we can recognize the fluidity of social processes in creating and revising meanings. This view allows actors to carry out their own strategic actions in creating their identities and culture in publics. On the other hand, it recognizes the power of macro organizational structures on cultural domains that influences kinds, hierarchies, and interrelationships of publics. Once it emerges as a stable and widely recognized associational map, the view of cultures as emergent properties can constitute a cause in social processes.

### The Case of Japanese Aesthetic Culture

Let me use a brief example from the Japanese experience to illustrate how defining publics in this way helps us to understand the patterns of long-term social change. In my forthcoming book, *Bonds of Civility: Aesthetic Networks and Political Origins of Japanese Culture* (2004), I focus on the transformation of Japanese aesthetic culture and its unexpected role in creating a national identity. Contemporary Japanese, as well as outside observers, often associate Japan with distinctive aesthetic traditions in the arts and literature. This cultural image of Japan is usually explained as a simple by-product of the pervasive presence of rich and distinctive forms of art and literature. This is, however, a tautological explanation. The fact that aesthetic traditions rooted in the medieval period are still popular in modern Japan without being subsidized by the government itself requires explanation.

One curious aspect of tracing the history of Japanese organizational developments is that one finds the Japanese search for horizontal and voluntary social associations intersecting at a number of points with the cultivation of beauty. In order to explicate the origins of aesthetic Japanese culture, I decided to focus on a kind of publics that were most vital as spheres for civic communicative activities. By forming connections among people from different economic and status backgrounds, the art and poetry circles and associations of early modern Japan produced what I have called aesthetic publics-- sites of aesthetic socialization. Why did aesthetic socialization become so popular in premodern Japan? I examined aesthetic publics' relationships with macropolitical, social, and economic networks. The fact that aesthetic publics became centers of civilized socialization was closely connected with the idiosyncratic nature, trajectory, and structure of the state. The main governing strategy of the Tokugawa state can be described as institutional segmentation of its population through a decentralized, indirect control system. The Tokugawa shoguns repeatedly issued edicts prohibiting "the formation of parties" because they feared that private networks of horizontal alliances among individuals that cut through such carefully prescribed segmented boundaries would eventually threaten the Tokugawa system. It was under these conditions that aesthetic publics became "enclave publics", safe-heavens for forming horizontal associations.

The constant experience of identity-shifting from a feudal formal identity to an aesthetic enclave identity made individuals realize that feudal boundaries set by the Tokugawa order determined just one of many modes of socialization. Unlike feudal identities that put them into categorized boxes, the self as a poet or an artist was seen as linked to an individual in a more universalistic world. Through this process, unintentionally, large segments of the Japanese population began to partake in and assimilate aesthetic cultures that were rooted in Japan's past.

Historians and social scientists have often probed the reasons for the swiftness of Japan's emergence as a modern nation in the late-nineteenth century. The Tokugawa people's aesthetic socialization unintentionally generated an image of

aesthetic Japan as if it were the natural description of the space called Japan. This image was resilient and useful; it allowed the Meiji Japanese to regard their cultural identity as a given. It helped the Meiji leaders to explore various options for mobilizing the loyalty of Japanese citizens for their successful effort of nation-building.

I have proposed earlier that the relationship between social or cognitive network dynamics and culture and identity practices that issue from them should be understood as a form of emergent property. In summary, emergent properties are paradoxical: "nothing new" from an ontological point of view, since they are constructed from existing building blocks, yet "altogether new" from an epistemological point of view, since they involve qualitatively new structures that cannot even be defined in terms of the old building blocks. Therefore, once consolidated as a set of relatively stable cognitive associational maps, culture and identity emerged through actions in publics may acquire a more reified, thing-like effect in the social world.

### References

- Anderson, P.W.: "More is Different," *Science* 177 (1972): 393.
- Ikegami, Eiko *The Taming of the Samurai; Honorific Individualism and the Making of Modern Japan*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1995
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Sociological Theory of Publics: Identity and Culture as Emergent Properties in Networks". *Social Research*. 67(4): 989-1029
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Bonds of Civility: Aesthetic Networks and Political Origins of Japanese Culture*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press forthcoming Fall, 2004
- Putnam, Hilary . "A Half-Century of Philosophy, Viewed from Within," *Daedalus* 126.1 (1997): 175-208.
- Sewell, William H., Jr. 1992. "A Theory of Structure: Duality, Agency and Transformation". *American Journal of Sociology* 98(1) :1-29.
- Swidler, Ann. 1986. "Culture in Action: Symbols and Strategies" *American Sociological Review*. 51:273-86.

White, Harrison C., *Identity and Control. A Structural Theory of Social Action*: Princeton, Princeton University Press. 1992  
 Harrison White. "Network Switchings and Bayesian Forks: Reconstructing the Social and Behavioral Sciences," *Social Research* 62 (1995): 1035-63.

## **Future Trends in the World System?**

Mike Sobocinski  
 Independent Scholar, Lansing, Michigan  
 SobocinM@michigan.gov

Immanuel Wallerstein's World Systems Theory sorts nations into core, semi-periphery, and periphery status based on the nature of their relationship to the expanding capitalist system. Some interesting tests and applications of this theory might be useful and appropriate as they relate to incidents of current international turmoil.

One interesting hypothesis concerns the proportion of the population that is involved in this global stratification system. Some rough calculations that I have done suggest that the percentage of persons in the semi-periphery, periphery, and external areas will of course shift over time as a general pattern of economic development occurs. Today, this means that there are really no longer any "external areas" as there were when the world-system started, centuries ago. The number and size of peripheral nations has also decreased, mainly as China has become semi-peripheral. But what I notice is that for the last decade or two, the core countries have accounted for roughly 10-15% of the world's population. I wonder if this proportion remains fairly stable as a capitalist system develops. The new nations that get added to the core (such as Ireland or Spain, as the EU has continued to expand) seem to be only those for which there is "room" in which they can be accommodated within that 10-15% ratio. If this is indeed the case, then forecasts of global economic development would have to take this into account. A nation like Brazil, later Argentina, (and now China?) that has enjoyed "miraculous" growth rates can rise from peripheral to semi-peripheral status under favored conditions, but then stagnates

or suffers economic problems that may seem to hinder its further growth indefinitely. The exceptions seem to be those that are small enough to be accommodated in the core (Taiwan, for example) or those that throw about their power to demand an exalted status. The World War II axis is now in the core, and it appears that parts of the old Soviet Bloc will eventually gain core status as well. A consideration of global stratification structure (and population proportions within each world system classification) might be revealing when studying which countries are successfully able to achieve upward mobility in this system over time.

It also raises questions about concerns some have expressed about global capitalism being (again) in a state of crisis. Since capitalism needs to expand, the nature of this expansion logically needs to shift as external areas, and even peripheral areas, continue to disappear and become proletarianized. Once all populations are proletarianized, the world-system itself will doubtlessly change and new forms of expansion may necessitate a reformulation of the categories into which nations can still be sorted. The 10-15% ratio of persons in core nations is interesting in that it conveniently parallels the 10-15% ruling class and professional class proportions that are typical in so many countries. If hegemony is now being established by core nations over the semi-peripheral or peripheral West Asian area (or at least the suppression of anti-systemic movements) and China and India continue to be nurtured into at least semi-peripheral status, then a new period in which capitalist hegemony is effectively unchallenged may arise, and new divisions form in the global system. The social classes that are still noted within countries would become truly globalized in a mature world-capitalist system. The various factors (economic, environmental, technological) that permit and encourage a global system to emerge also are appropriate to the original Marxian analysis of socialism emerging from a more advanced stage of capitalism.

When all the social classes recognize themselves as part of a global stratification system, the framework will be in place in which progressive movements (i.e. toward greater equality) would finally be able to shape the entire system, without the apparatus of "separate" states to help conceal



and defend exploitation and injustice. When production has thus expanded, a few decades from now, the Marxian precondition for socialism will exist, in which all of people's basic needs can be met with very little work expended in a given day. If enough people are satisfied with leisure and "getting by" then perhaps many socialist conditions will be seen without a revolution or continued movements for greater equality. Equal access to health care might be the key concern 20 or 30 years hence, and if that sector of the economy has been socialized, the rest might remain fully stratified, and of course one of the pressing social dilemmas will revolve around how people can achieve meaning and set goals for their lives in a world that no longer requires much work to allow their survival. The divisions between nations may become more rooted in culture than in economics.

A problem that we already see as possible in this new century is whether new profits (for an expanding capitalist system) will come through non-productive, contradictory sectors of the economy such as a "War on Drugs" or increasing surveillance and controls over the populace. If a global economy creates an expansion of a correspondingly global anti-terrorist system, one that requires continual monitoring of individuals, then we may discover that ideals of socialist utopias are merely a progressivist delusion. It seems to me that some of these questions can begin to be explored in advance, however.

\*\*\*\*\*

## **ASA Comparative and Historical Sociology 2004 Sessions**

### **1. "States, Critical Turning Points, and World History."**

Organizers: Rosemary L. Hopcroft and James Mahoney

Open submission.

Contact information:

Rosemary L. Hopcroft  
Department of Sociology  
University of North Carolina at Charlotte  
Charlotte NC 28223  
rlhopcro@email.uncc.edu

James Mahoney  
Department of Sociology  
Box 1916  
Brown University  
Providence, RI 02912  
James\_Mahoney@brown.edu

### **2. "Historical sociologies of slavery: problems of continuity and change"**

Organizer: Orlando Patterson

Open submission

Contact information:

Professor Orlando Patterson  
Department of Sociology  
William James Hall  
33 Kirkland Street  
Harvard University  
Cambridge, MA 02138  
617-495-3707  
op@wjh.harvard.edu

### **3. "Religion and the State: Preconditions of Tolerance and Violence, Past and Present"**

Philip S. Gorski

Open submission.

Contact information:

Professor Philip S. Gorski  
Director, Center for Comparative Social Analysis  
Department of Sociology  
University of Wisconsin--Madison  
1180 Observatory Dr.  
Madison, WI 57306  
608-262-4436  
pgorski@ssc.wisc.edu

### **4. Comparative and Historical Sociology roundtables**

Organizer: Brian Gran

Open submission.

Contact information:

Professor Brian Gran  
Department of Sociology  
Case Western Reserve University  
10900 Euclid Avenue  
Cleveland, OH 44106  
(216) 368-2694  
bkg2@cwru.edu

## New Publications and Awards of Section Members

Joppke, Christian and Ewa Morawska, eds.  
*Toward Assimilation and Citizenship in Liberal Nation-States*. Macmillan/Palgrave Press, 2003.

Morawska, Ewa. "Disciplinary Agendas and Analytic Strategies of Research on Immigrant Transnationalism: Challenges of Interdisciplinary Knowledge," *International Migration Review*, 37(3), 2003.

Morawska, Ewa and Michael Bommers, eds.  
*Reflections on Migration Research: Promises of Interdisciplinarity*. Ashgate Press; Forthcoming.

Morawska, Ewa. "Immigrant Transnational Entrepreneurs in New York: Different Types, Different Outcomes," *International Journal of Entrepreneurship*; Forthcoming.

Christian Smith. *The Secular Revolution: Power, Interest, and Conflict in the Secularization of American Public Life*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003.

----- *Moral, Believing Animals: Human Culture and Personhood*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Smith has also been awarded in 2003 the Stuart Chapin Distinguished Professor Chair at the University of North Carolina Chapel Hill.

\*\*\*\*\*

## Call for Nominations

### Reinhard Bendix Student Paper Award

Every year the section presents the Reinhard Bendix Award for the best graduate student paper. Submissions are solicited for papers written by students enrolled in graduate programs at the time the paper was written. Students may self-nominate their finest work or it may be nominated by their mentors. A paper may be nominated no later than

March 1, 2004, by mailing THREE copies of it to the chair of the award committee, Jeff Goodwin, Dept. of Sociology, New York University, 269 Mercer Street, Rm. 446, New York, NY 10003. The other members of the committee are Simonetta Falasca-Zamponi (University of California - Santa Barbara) and Ho-fung Hung (Johns Hopkins University), the winner of last year's Bendix award.

### Barrington Moore Book/Article Award

The section awards the Barrington Moore Award every year to either the best book or the best article (in alternating years) in the areas of comparative and historical sociology. Nominated publications should have appeared in the two years prior to the year in which they are nominated. Books and articles may be nominated by authors or by other section members. For 2004, the prize will be awarded for a book published in 2002 or 2003. Non-authors may nominate a book by sending a letter or email to the chair of the Moore prize committee, who will contact the publisher to request that books be sent to committee members. Authors may nominate their book by sending a letter of nomination to the Moore prize committee, and making arrangements for members of the Moore prize committee to receive copies. Nominations must be dated no later than March 1, 2004. The committee members and their email and mailing addresses are:

Jack Goldstone, Moore Award committee chair  
[jagoldstone@ucdavis.edu]

Department of Sociology  
UC-Davis  
One Shields Avenue Davis, CA 95616

Mabel Berezin [mmb39@cornell.edu]  
Department of Sociology  
354 Uris Hall  
Cornell University  
Ithaca, NY 14853

Dr. Toby E. Huff [thuff@UMassD.edu]  
Visiting Scholar  
Center for Middle Eastern Studies  
Harvard University  
Cambridge, Ma 02138

**Comparative Historical Webpage**

The webpage has the following: section information, awards & history, an online version of the newsletter, research tools, teaching aids, notices of institutes & meetings, a members area, a student center, a publications corner and an online library.

**If you have a new publication or award you would like to have posted, please send it to the Webmaster (below).**

Mathieu Deflem, Assistant Professor, University of South Carolina, is Webmaster:  
<http://www.comphistsoc.org>

**The Comparative and Historical Sociology Section** would like to congratulate  
**Ho-fung Hung**

Johns Hopkins University

*Winner of 2003 Bendix Award For Best Student Paper*

"Orientalism and Social Theory: China, Europe, and the Comparison of Civilizations from the Jesuits to Weber."

**The Comparative and Historical Sociology Section** would like to congratulate  
**Jack Goldstone**

George Mason University

*Winner of 2003 Barrington Moore Award For Best Article*

"Efflorescences and Economic Growth in the World History: Rethinking the 'Rise of the West' and the Industrial Revolution." *Journal of World History* vol. 13, no. 2., 2002

&

**Michael P. Young**

University of Texas at Austin

*Honorable Mention*

for "Confessional Protest: The Religious Birth of U.S. National Social Movements"  
*American Sociological Review* vol. 67, October 2002

*The Comparative & Historical Sociology Section* would like to congratulate

**Richard Lachmann**

on winning the

*Distinguished Scholarly Publication Award of the ASA 2003*

For his book *Capitalists in Spite of Themselves*

\*\*\*\*\*

**DON'T FORGET TO RENEW YOUR MEMBERSHIP IN THE COMPARATIVE AND HISTORICAL SOCIOLOGY SECTION! INVITE YOUR STUDENTS AND COLLEAGUES TO JOIN!**

**Go to:**

**<http://www.asanet.org/sections/general.html>**

\*\*\*\*\*

## Job Announcement

### UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT SAN ANTONIO DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

The Department of Sociology at The University of Texas at San Antonio invites applications for a tenure track position, pending budgetary approval, beginning Fall 2004. Rank is open and salary is competitive. **Responsibilities** of the successful candidate will be to pursue an active research and publishing agenda; to teach, advise, and mentor undergraduate and graduate students; and to serve the University and the profession. Teaching assignments will be at graduate and undergraduate levels at both the 1604 and Downtown Campuses. **Required Qualifications:** a Ph.D. in Sociology or a related field is required for appointment as Assistant Professor or higher; ABD, on or before 15 August 2004, will be considered for appointment at an Instructor level. Candidates must demonstrate a strong commitment to quality research and teaching. To qualify for Associate or Full Professor Rank, candidates must demonstrate a clear record of success in securing external grants, research, and publication in the field. The candidate must reflect an interest and expertise in **EITHER** the area of Globalization - Comparative/Historical Sociology, particularly with an industrial or economic emphasis, **OR** open specialization, with special consideration given to candidates with interests in Community Health/Health Disparity. **Preferred Qualifications:** Ability to teach research methods in addition to their area of interest; Grant writing experience and proven track records of research and publication in their specified area. Applicants must submit an original signed letter of application that should indicate the level of position for which they are applying. Applicants must also send a curriculum vitae, examples of scholarly work, teaching evaluations (if available), a list of at least three references, and a copy of graduate transcripts. Electronic applications will not be accepted. Applications should be sent to: Chair, Search Committee; Department of Sociology; The University of Texas at San Antonio; 6900 N. Loop 1604 West; San Antonio, Texas 78249-0655. Review of applications will begin on December 1, 2003 and will continue until position is filled.

UTSA is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Employer. Women and minorities are encouraged to apply. Applicants who are not United States citizens must state their current visa and residency status.

### New Website Editor Sought

The homepage of the Comparative & Historical Sociology Section of the ASA ([comphistsoc.org](http://comphistsoc.org)) is now looking for a new Website Editor. The tenure of the new editor will begin in the Fall of 2004. Only minimal computer skills are needed (Netscape composer, Frontpage, or higher). Editing and maintaining the website will be enhanced by a knowledge of comparative and historical sociology, particularly in terms of its presence and value on the internet. Please consider taking up this fun position. Contact Mathieu Deflem, Website Editor ([deflem@gwm.sc.edu](mailto:deflem@gwm.sc.edu)), or John Hall, Section Chair ([jrhall@ucdavis.edu](mailto:jrhall@ucdavis.edu)), for further information.