



Comparative & Historical Sociology

Spring 2005

Newsletter of the ASA Comparative and Historical Sociology section

Volume 16, No. 2

SECTION OFFICERS 2004-2005

Chair

Jeff Goodwin (2005)
New York University

Chair-Elect

Richard Lachmann (2006)
SUNY-Albany

Past Chair

John R. Hall (2004)
UC-Davis

Secretary-Treasurer

Ming Cheng-Lo (2005)
UC-Davis

Council Members

Miguel A. Centeno (2007)
Princeton

Elisabeth Clemens (2005)
Chicago

Rebecca Jean Emigh (2006)
UCLA

Fatma Muge Gocek (2006)
University of Michigan

Philip S. Gorski (2005)
Univ. Wisconsin-Madison

James Mahoney (2007)
Brown

Newsletter Editor

Rosemary L. Hopcroft
University of North Carolina at Charlotte

Webmaster

Dylan Riley
University of California, Berkeley

From the Chair Against Anosognosia: Toward a Collective Discussion of the Great Issues of Our Times

Jeff Goodwin
New York University

We seldom have a chance to reflect collectively about our work as comparative and historical sociologists. For this reason, among so many others, we should all shout out a collective thanks (if you haven't already) to the editors of and Contributors to two fabulous recent volumes on the state of the art: *Remaking Modernity: Politics, History, and Sociology*, edited by Julia Adams, Elisabeth Clemens, and Ann Shola Orloff (Duke, 2005), and *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences*, edited by James Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschemeyer (Cambridge, 2003).

These volumes belong on the bookshelves of every serious comparative and historical sociologist. Among their many virtues, they detail the key contributions that historical sociologists have made to our collective understanding of a wide range of important macrosocial processes, including transitions to capitalism, the consolidation of state bureaucracies, democratization, revolutions, wars, the rise of nationalisms, and the creation of social policies and associated bureaucracies (including "welfare states"), among others. Think how impoverished our grasp of these processes would be had we left them to economists, political scientists, and, yes, non-historical sociologists! Think how impoverished our understanding of the social worlds we currently inhabit would be without this body of work!

Together, the volumes mentioned above are very helpful in explaining and evaluating both the theoretical perspectives and methods that we now have at our disposal for studying macrosocial dynamics. But where do we go from here? I'm not asking how we should go about our work so much as what we should be studying – the historical processes we should now be analyzing. In other words, what are the great issues of our day? Many of us, after all, were drawn to comparative and historical sociology because it seemed to be tackling the big, macrosociological questions that mainstream sociologists either would not or could not address, given their theoretical or methodological commitments. Of course, some of us are still fascinated with the classic questions of the origins of capitalism, democracy, revolutions, etc. But have the events of, say, the past couple decades thrown into relief new questions and issues that we ought to be addressing?

Perhaps there's no need for a collective discussion about such matters. If the past is any guide, sociologists will simply gravitate, willy-nilly, toward the study of a handful of key macrosocial processes that strike us as the most existentially important or intellectually challenging. And, even if we tried, it may simply not be possible to arrive at even a rough consensus as to what these key processes might be. But I think the effort is eminently worthwhile. First of all, learning what other scholars believe to be the most important and challenging contemporary historical processes seems likely to sharpen – and in some cases radically challenge – our own individual evaluations. Articulating our beliefs about the great issues of the day, moreover, cannot help but clarify our theoretical presuppositions about what “really matters” – whether as cause or consequence – in social life. We obviously cannot claim to understand how modern societies work if we have no sense of which macrosocial processes are fundamental, and which comparatively trivial, in the historical present. Yet the daily routines of academic life, including even broad comparative and historical research, tend to induce among us a type of collective or social anosognosia – a psychological term for a lack of awareness of one's own condition.

And so, with the hope of generating a modest collective dialogue about the work ahead of us, I offer my own short list (undoubtedly idiosyncratic)

of the great issues of our times – the questions that at least some and hopefully many comparative and historical sociologists ought now to be exploring. Some of these issues have already attracted considerable scholarly attention, but historical sociologists as a group have been slow to analyze these issues as thoroughly as they undoubtedly deserve:

The Neoliberal Revolution (aka “globalization”). Old regulations on investment and trade around the globe are being swept away, albeit not without resistance (see below). In the process, a great deal of power, actual and potential, has been taken out of the political sphere and concentrated in private hands. What led to this momentous global movement? Who stands to benefit from it, and who to lose?

The New U.S. Militarism. The United States stands today as the most powerful economic and especially military power in world history. In recent years that power has been liberally employed around the globe – most palpably in Afghanistan and Iraq – and the U.S. now controls an archipelago of hundreds of military bases. Does recent U.S. militarism reflect the policy preferences of the Bush administration or of broader elites? Is it a blip, or a harbinger? Is U.S. global power sustainable in the long run? And how does U.S. hegemony compare to that of previous powers, e.g., Britain?

The Emergence of New Internationalisms. The global justice (“anti-globalization”) movement, the World Social Forum, transborder union organizing, the proliferation of transnational NGOs – these are just some of the new forms of internationalism that have emerged in recent years, mainly in response to the neoliberal revolution. What are the long-term possibilities for these new forms of transnational association? What are the main obstacles that they confront? Are national social movements a thing of the past?

The Rise of Religious Fundamentalisms/Orthodoxies. In the United States, Israel, India, and many Muslim countries, so-called fundamentalist religious movements have become powerful cultural and political forces. What explains this – and this striking coincidence? Are these movements also a reaction, in some way, to

“globalization”? And what are the long-term consequences of these movements?

The Rise of Asia. After a detour of a couple centuries, China will soon count among the most powerful economic and military powers in the world. Will India be far behind? What stands behind this resurgence? Why did it take so long?

The Crisis in Africa. While Asia rises, Africa falls. Great hopes attended the independence of African nations in the 1960s and 1970s, but, despite a few local success stories, the continent has recently suffered economic stagnation (or worse), murderous civil wars, ethnic conflict, and genocide. How are Africa’s various crises linked? Why has so much of Africa taken this tragic turn? Was it preventable?

The Persistence of Racial Inequalities. People of African descent lag behind most other racially and ethnically defined groups in the United States, Europe, and Latin America. Why do these inequalities persist? How can they be eroded? Have descendants of Africans fared better in some societies than in others? Why?

The Population Implosion. The populations of Europe and Japan are stagnant or declining. They also include a growing proportion of elderly people and immigrants. What are the social, economic, and political implications of this demographic shift? How will the elderly be cared for, and who will pay the bill? And how will immigrants be absorbed (if at all) in these societies?

The Rise of New Family Forms. The “traditional” nuclear family is dead, or at least on the ropes. What accounts for the rapid growth of cohabiting couples (including same-sex couples), with and without children; one-parent households; and individuals living alone? Why did the nuclear family prove so ephemeral – or will it hold on? And what are the economic, cultural, and social-psychological consequences of these new family forms?

I could go on, but won’t. In any event, what do you think? What’s missing from this list? What doesn’t belong? Might some of these questions be reframed in a more helpful way? Are some too narrowly framed? Are some overly broad? Perhaps

a future issue of this newsletter might include alternative suggestions or lists. In any event, let the discussion begin!

My previous “from the chair” message discussed the connection, real and potential, between comparative and historical sociology and public sociology, i.e., sociology written for nonsociologists (see the exchange between myself and Mathieu Deflem in this newsletter). The ASA Task Force on the Institutionalization of Public Sociologies has set up a new website to “support and advance the practice of Public Sociology.” The Task Force would like ASA members to enter information at the website on their public sociology activities. The Task Force wants to develop the site as a repository of public sociology projects in order to increase the visibility and variety of existing public sociologies and to promote networking among sociologists interested in public sociology. The URL for the website is coserver.uhwohio.edu/pubsoc.

I look forward to seeing everyone in Philadelphia this summer at the ASA meeting. Our “section day” will be the last day of the meeting, Tuesday, August 16. Most of our activities will fall on this day. Section members, led by chair-elect Richard Lachmann, have organized a number of very interesting panels and roundtables (see the listing in this newsletter). Thanks again to all the organizers and presenters, and to everyone who submitted a paper! As usual, we’ll be handing out prizes at the section’s business meeting, so be sure to attend. (This year, for the first time we’ll be handing out three prizes – for the best book, the best article, and the best student paper in the field.) I’ll be passing the chair’s baton to Richard, who I know is already thinking about the program for the 2006 meeting in San Francisco (previously scheduled for New York City).

This will be the last newsletter edited and produced by Rosemary Hopcroft. On behalf of the section officers and membership, I’d like to express our sincere appreciation for the work that she has performed on behalf of the section! Well done, Rosemary!

Sociologists, One More Effort! A Propos Goodwin

Mathieu Deflem
University of South Carolina
deflem@gwm.sc.edu

It has become increasingly difficult, because of time and other constraints, to respond to the copious amounts of writings praising or representing so-called public sociology. It has also become increasingly difficult not to write a satire about these developments. But I will make another effort in light of the previous newsletter's From the Chair message by our current section Chair Jeff Goodwin (2004). Goodwin encourages comparative and historical sociologists to contribute to public sociology, and furthermore informs us that many of them have already done so.

It will not be necessary here to repeat in detail my criticisms of the project of public sociology, which I have clarified—and will continue to clarify while time and energy permit—in various publications (Deflem 2005a,b, 2004a,b,d) and online activities.¹ Suffice it to reiterate that I not only object to the mission of public sociology as it is commonly understood these days, and not only do I question the basis of public sociology and its stated objectives.² I reject the very demarcation of public sociology from other made-up types of sociology as well as the pluralization of assorted public sociologies. Amongst other reasons, these labels are to be rejected because they presume that there can be or is a sociology that is not public, and are introduced for strategic reasons to seek to legitimize activities that are ideological in nature and never can be, and should not be accepted to be, on equal footing to contributions in sociological scholarship.

To be sure, sociologists ought to conduct their work always as public intellectuals, and we can and, I believe, should inform societal interventions—as I do so myself, at least to the best of my abilities. Yet public sociologists do not advocate sociological activism, but instead promote an activist sociology, which is informed by a particularistic political agenda, denying the pluralist nature of morality in contrast to the universal appeal of science. Witnessing the thoughtlessness of public sociology's popularity, there is not only widespread

misunderstanding about its epistemological void, questions about its effectiveness are conveniently overlooked as well. Sadly, in view of these developments, I doubt it that sociology has ever been less relevant to society than it is today.

In the interest of plain speaking and clear understanding, my criticisms are threefold: 1) Goodwin misunderstands the nature and rise of public sociology; 2) he distorts comparative and historical sociology; and 3) he has conflated his scholarly and professional roles.

Firstly, contrary to Goodwin, the theme of public sociology at the ASA meetings in San Francisco did not provoke a “great deal of discussion, debate, and introspection.” In fact, I cannot, in my admittedly but a decade-long experience of attending ASA gatherings, think of a meeting that provoked less thought of any sociological kind. The 2004 ASA President Michael Burawoy (2004b, p.10) had by his own admission organized the meetings in a narrow frame on the basis of a “mandate” he proclaimed to have received from the ASA membership by virtue of his election—something along the lines of President Bush after his re-election reaching out to those ‘who share our goals.’ Instead of inviting sociologists to speak about and from their sociology at the San Francisco meetings, activists were invited to speak from a political platform that had passed the scrutiny of public sociology. Public sociology speaks with one voice which only its adherents can hear.

Goodwin contributes the rise of public sociology to the leftist political orientation of many sociologists. But I am left wondering on what grounds Goodwin concluded that “most sociologists by far are liberal (in that distinctly American sense).” Not being an American citizen, but an American sociologist nonetheless, I may be challenged to address this matter. Yet, did Goodwin measure our political attitudes? Is he interested in doing so, and does he have a thought police at his disposal to help him? Will he stamp an ‘L’ on those found to be liberal, a ‘C’ perhaps on those who are not? Sadly, this is not mere satire. On the occasion of two recent resolutions, the ASA included opinion questions without any basis in policy.

The argument that sociologists' political orientation is related to the rise of public sociology is not new. Burawoy (2004a) made the same comment with respect to the ASA Iraq War

resolution. Like Goodwin, he offered no proof. Yet, it is striking that in suggesting the hypothesis, Burawoy and Goodwin have admitted that they do not conceive of public sociology as an open debate but as a singular position. It is not my concern that this position is leftist. What is remarkable is that political dissent and normative pluralism are not an option. Alternatively, a sociological hypothesis might suggest that the widespread embrace of public sociology relates to the excessive proliferation of graduate programs in sociology, the resulting deterioration of the state of sociological research and teaching, the culturally induced transformation of the profession of sociology from a skill to a right, and the continued separation between center and periphery in the professional sociological enterprise. Public discourse in the U.S. is not all that is “fairly wretched”, as Goodwin claims, so is that which passes for public intellectual culture among sociologists these days (and which ought to be our primary concern). My hypotheses also have to be tested, but at least they are sociological.

Second, Goodwin informs us that many comparative and historical sociologists already engage in public sociology by investigating the origins of the present, drawing lessons from history, and showing that things could be different. I agree that many of us engage in at least two of these things. What else but the origins of the present could we be studying when we engage in historical work without being historians? What else but lessons could be drawn from history when we study the past in the present? And the same could be said for comparativists in terms of the variable contrasts, similarities, and linkages that exist across dispersed societies. But why would this be public sociology?

Goodwin’s framing of others’ works for his purposes is not particularly original, as they mirror Burawoy’s (2004a; Burawoy and VanAntwerpen 2001) similar boxing-in exercises. It is audacious for public sociologists to lay claim to sociological accomplishments that have developed very well without them and that will continue to do well within the established and evolving paradigms of sociological scholarship. Perhaps I ought to be grateful at least that Goodwin does not know my work and did not box it into his framework. But do those colleagues whose names were included feel comfortable to be told that theirs are works in public sociology? And what about the comparative

scholars whom Goodwin all subsumes under the utopian heading? Are they now all, like Goodwin, sudden converts to public sociology? What purpose can such conversion serve? Maybe we can learn from history indeed. We can learn from the fact that the ASA Iraq War resolution did not save a single life in the senseless destruction that is taking place in Iraq, while it did serve to resolve for organized sociology important questions of analysis and functioned self-servingly as feel-good exercise and impression management. In that light, it is not surprising that the rise of public sociology has gone hand in hand with the commercialization of sociology in the ASA (Deflem 2004c).

Third, in the spirit of promoting public sociology, Goodwin ends his statement with a call for submissions to the magazine, *Contexts*, which he and his friend Jim Jasper now edit. I regret that Goodwin and his friend have decided to exclude from *Contexts* those of us who do not adhere to public sociology. In the context of his message as Chair of our section, I also question the conflation of professional roles. Perhaps nothing else could be expected from the advocate of a position that differentiates itself from what is called ‘professional sociology,’ when comparative and historical sociologists have been at the forefront of the study of professionalization, and they above all should know the difference between sociology as discipline and as profession. Maintaining such a distinction and recognizing its value, I will continue this response beyond the context of this newsletter.

Footnotes

(1) See my campaign website, www.savesociology.org, and related blog, mathieudelfem.blogspot.com. Copies of my publications are also available online via www.mathieudelfem.net.

(2) My comments concern the version of public sociology popularized by Michael Burawoy (2004). The term was originally coined by Herbert Gans in a different meaning that does not fit Burawoy’s cells of public, policy, critical, and professional sociology (Gans 2002, 2004; Hausknecht 2002; Burawoy 2003).

References

- Burawoy, Michael. 2004a. “Public Sociologies: Contradictions, Dilemmas, and Possibilities.” *Social Forces* 82(4):1603-1618.
- _____. 2004b. “Democracy in Question: Reply to Deflem” *Footnotes*, July/August, 32(6):9-10.

_____. 2003. "Public Sociologies: Response to Hausknecht." Footnotes, January. Available online: <http://www.asanet.org/footnotes/jan03/fn10.html>

Burawoy, Michael, and Jonathan VanAntwerpen. 2001. "Public Sociology at Berkeley: Past, Present and Future." Available online: http://sociology.berkeley.edu/faculty/burawoy/burawoy_pdf/PS.Berkeley%20Sociology.pdf

Deflem, Mathieu. 2005a. "Comment" (on public sociology). *Contemporary Sociology* 34(1):92-93.

_____. 2005b. "Southernizing Social Forces." *The Southern Sociologist, Newsletter of the Southern Sociological Society*, Winter 2005, 36(3):12-15.

_____. 2004a. "The War in Iraq and the Peace of San Francisco: Breaking the Code of Public Sociology." *Peace, War & Social Conflict*, ASA section newsletter, November, pp. 3-5.

_____. 2004b. Letter to the Editor ("The Proper Role of Sociology in the World at Large"). *The Chronicle Review*, October 1, p. B17.

_____. 2004c. "Large Mug, Mousepad, Infant Creeper, Bib, Dog T-Shirt: The Professional Group Revisited." *Perspectives*, ASA Theory section newsletter, 27(4):15.

_____. 2004d. "There's the ASA, But Where's the Sociology?." *Public Forum* letter. *Footnotes*, July/August, 32(6):9.

Gans, Herbert. 2002. "More of Us Should Become Public Sociologists." *Footnotes*, July/August. Available online: <http://www.asanet.org/footnotes/julyaugust02/fn10.html>

_____. 2004. "Public Action and Public Policy." *Footnotes*, July/August. Available online: <http://www.asanet.org/footnotes/feb04/fn14.html>

Goodwin, Jeff. 2004. "From the Chair." *Comparative & Historical Sociology* 16(1):1-2.

Hausknecht, Murray. 2002. "Models of Public Sociology." *Footnotes*, December. <http://www.asanet.org/footnotes/dec02/fn9.html>

Response

Dear Mathieu,

"Public sociology," for me, is any sociological research that reaches audiences beyond our own discipline. In this view, public sociology has no essential or singular political slant, theoretical standpoint, or methodology. The point of my "From the Chair" message in the previous

newsletter was simply that many comparative and historical sociologists are doing sociology that would greatly interest nonsociologists, despite the stereotype that we spend all our time debating the causes of the French Revolution.

I'm not quite sure how you would define public sociology, but you seem to view it as a unitary movement – in fact, as an evil, intolerant, and exclusionary conspiracy. You are of course free to view matters this way, but you shouldn't assume that anyone who merely utters the term "public sociology" is part of this nefarious conspiracy, if one actually exists.

You are half right about the hypothesis I offered to account for sociologists' growing interest in public sociology in recent years. I attributed this interest to the feeling among many sociologists, who are overwhelmingly liberal, that the country has been moving in the wrong direction (i.e., to the right) and that public discourse about issues of concern to sociologists has indeed been rather wretched, if not simply absent altogether.

You seem to think, Mathieu, that there are no good grounds for believing that "most sociologists by far" (my words) are liberal. I assume you are unaware of the classic work of Seymour Martin Lipset and his collaborators on just this question. More recent studies by Rothman et al. (2005) and Klein and Stern (forthcoming) leave little doubt about the liberal leanings of sociologists. Rothman et al. found that 77 percent of sociologists consider themselves liberal as opposed to 9 percent who consider themselves conservative. And Klein and Stern's study found that the ratio of sociologists who tend to vote Democratic as opposed to Republican is 28 to 1.

You somehow seem to think that it logically follows from my view that most sociologists are liberal that I "do not conceive of public sociology as an open debate but as a singular position," and that for me "political dissent and normative pluralism are not an option." I must admit that I don't at all see the logic in these claims. Can't one believe that most sociologists are liberals (or, for that matter, conservatives, radicals, or fools) and simultaneously value open debate and political dissent? There's no reason why conservatives or socialists can't be public sociologists, challenging the liberal complacencies of the discipline in the process. In any event, to accuse a teacher and scholar of opposing open debate and dissent is a

very serious matter. I hope you will think long and hard before you make such accusations in the future, Mathieu. By the way, aren't we having a debate right now?

Finally, you seem to think that it was inappropriate for me to invite readers of this newsletter to contribute to Contexts magazine, which Jim Jasper and I edit. (Contexts, of course, is the ASA magazine written for nonsociologists. It is, therefore, a venture in public sociology, at least as some of us employ the term.) But is it really inappropriate to use an ASA newsletter to invite contributions to an ASA journal? Don't calls for papers routinely appear in ASA newsletters? What exactly is the conflict of interest here? And I have absolutely no idea why you believe that Jasper and I "have decided to exclude from Contexts those of us who do not adhere to public sociology." Anyone can contribute to Contexts. We don't care what you think about public sociology, the war in Iraq, or anything else. There are no political or ideological litmus tests for getting published in Contexts, which of course would be an unethical as well as a stupid editorial policy for an ASA publication. So don't feel excluded, Mathieu. In fact, I hope you'll be sending a paper to Contexts in the near future!

Sincerely,
Jeff

References

Klein, Daniel B. and Charlotta Stern. Forthcoming. "How Politically Diverse Are the Social Sciences and Humanities? Survey Evidence from Six Fields." Forthcoming in *Academic Questions*. Available online at http://www.ratio.se/pdf/wp/dk_ls_diverse.pdf.

Rothman, Stanley, S. Robert Lichter, and Neil Nevitte. 2005. "Politics and Professional Advancement Among College Faculty." The Forum, Manuscript 1067. Available online at <http://www.bepress.com/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1067&context=forum>.

Language, Signs and CHS: The Utility of Semiotics

J. I. (Hans) Bakker,
University of Guelph

Recently David Crystal (2004) has written about the different "stories" of the English language. His main point is that there are different narratives of English. They all have a grain of truth. Since English is not my native language I have always been fascinated by the story of the development of English. The study of Old English (Anglo-Saxon) is fascinating. In the older discipline of Philology there was an attempt to provide rigid classifications. The typologies we are familiar with (e.g. Indo-European languages) were heavily influenced by nineteenth century evolutionary thinking. The changes that took place in dialects were explained in essentially Structural ways. Crystal attempts to move beyond philology to a more comparative linguistics. He emphasizes socio-linguistic variety. For example, place names in England provide intriguing evidence of the processes which took place in the fifth and sixth centuries, with the Saxon invasions, and then in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, after the Norman conquest of 1066. Celtic, Saxon and Norman words are all intermingled in Angli Saxones or Engla lande. What we now think of as standard English emerged along with modern capitalism in the sixteenth century. The basis of the various forms of English spoken in North America was laid at the same time as the nation-state principle. The study of language change can reveal a great deal about social change in any society.

But even more than that, the study of all forms of human communication can be heuristic for sociologists. One way to think about the ways in which human beings interact is to consider semiotics.

There has not been much interest in semiotics within Comparative-Historical Sociology (CHS, as a sub-disciplinary field of study within sociology). But without paying attention to the literature on semiotics and hermeneutics it is difficult to see how we can study other time and other places. Good interpretation of power and culture (Barrett 2002) in other societies requires knowledge of the sign systems that were characteristic of power relations

and cultural norms and values. One clear example of a sign system is a language. I will restrict myself here to human language and printed books, even though zoo-semiotics studies communication among all animals and hermeneutics can be applied in a general way to all processes of semiosis that have been recorded in some way (e.g. video tape).

Human beings interact with one another through the use of languages in complex ways. Languages come in an amazing variety of forms, including dialects and lingua francas (Wardhaugh 1986: 1 – 85). We rely on “euphemism” and “jargon” (Goshgarian 1998: 483-517). There are many distinctive national languages in the world. Of the approximately 5,500 currently still viable languages the most commonly spoken are Mandarin Chinese, English, Arabic, Spanish and Hindi. Several “dead languages” are nevertheless in use, including Medieval Latin and Sanskrit.

Of course, not all languages are naturally-occurring languages. In computer science there have been a number of artificial program languages which are based on mathematical logic. The field of symbolic logic in philosophy also uses artificial signs, much like mathematics and statistics in general.

Language can be broadly conceived of as a system of “signs” which constitute a “code” or semiotic system (Hall 1997). Such codes can affect our ways of seeing other human beings and classifying them as “others” in terms of their sex-gender, race-ethnicity, and class-status. It is often argued that language has an important impact on how we think. The stronger form of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis is rejected today, but it is widely recognized that a weaker form of that theory is valid. Edward Sapir and his student Benjamin Lee Whorf were struck by how subtle distinctions found in one language might be difficult to convey into another language. Moreover, the structure of a language largely determines common sense notions of time, space, and causation. In standard European languages there is, for example, a notion of events as discrete and countable, while in Native American languages that may not be the case (Wardhaugh 1986: 215).

The linguist Ferdinand de Saussure (1857-1913) constructed a view of language that stresses the importance of “the signifier” (the form) represents “the signified” (the concept). When we use language, de Saussure argues, we make

differentiations. For example, we can differentiate between the signs “mother” and “father.” When signs can be interpreted in a meaningful way we have a language that is meaningful. Hence, the sign system and its usage constitute a social construction of reality. Our cultural codes are linguistic systems which we use in various ways and constantly modify as we apply them. Hence, language is constantly changing and always somewhat imprecise.

There are many kinds of signs that are important to human languages, but perhaps the most important are “symbols” such as words and phrases. A set of such symbols, perhaps supplemented by iconic or indexical signs, can constitute a “text.” Any piece of recorded symbolic communication is a kind of text, but when we think of language we think primarily in terms of written language and the formal “ground” of such a language, what Ferdinand de Saussure refers to as *la langue*. That underlying “structure” is manifested in terms of speech, spoken language (*parole*).

Langer (1979) argues that “true language” is always discursive. Hence, she rejects such metaphorical constructs as a “language of musical tones” or a “language of colors.” For Langer a discursive language can be broken down into analytical units and those units can be conceptualized as having a syntax. Without a true syntax to create composite structures, she argues, it is difficult to conceive of a true language. In human languages the basic unit may be the “word” as an elementary aspect of meaning. At the same time, it is also possible to have logical categories that are derived from immediate bodily experience which are “presentational.” That is, we are “presented” with feelings and emotions which cannot be expressed in any language. This is similar to Maritain’s (1986) notion of “the language of angels” suggesting spiritual meaning.

Complex hypothetical and deductive linguistic theories have been postulated by many thinkers, including those who have emphasized the importance of “semiotics” (Deely, Williams and Kruse 1986). Writers A. J. Greimas (1966) have utilized insights from thinkers like Ferdinand de Saussure, Maurice Merleau-Ponty, Claude Levi-Strauss, Georges Dumezil, Roland Barthes, Georges Dumezil, Jacques Lacan, Roman Jakobson and Vladimir Propp to develop arguments concerning the relationship between language and

communicative symbols in general. Such “structural” views tend to postulate the existence of a narrated universe of “deep semantic structures” that are reflected in the underlying grammar of all human languages. The surface “narrative” is viewed as “syntagmatic.” That is, the syntactical rules, such as “linear succession,” tend to determine the fundamental semantic structures. This can be seen as a further refinement of de Saussure’s distinction between parole (the spoken language) and langue (the underlying structure) which utilizes ideas from Propp and others to give a more complete account of the way in which such semantic structures exist in human emotions, dreams and passions, as well as in the rigor of scientific reason and the precision of technological design.

The study of semiotic processes can be very useful in CHS. Paying attention to the literature on language, and signs generally, is an important aspect of being truly comparative and historical. We cannot assume that signs mean the same things to people in China in the 8th century or India in the 10th century as they mean to Europeans subsequent to the Renaissance, Reformation and Enlightenment. With Globalization impacting on all cultures to some extent there is a certain degree of homogenization. It is easier every decade to forget that things are not necessarily the way we see them and talk about them. Sociologists interested in societies other than their own should always remain aware of the powerful way language can shape reality, even if we do not necessarily subscribe to the strong version of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis.

Selected References

Barrett, Stanley R. 2002. *Power Meets Culture*. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger.

Crystal, David. 2004. *The Stories of English*. Woodstock, New York: Overlook Press.

Deely, John, Brooke Williams and Felicia E. Kruse (eds.) 1986. *Frontiers in Semiotics*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Goshgarian, Gary. 1998. *Exploring Language*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman.

Greimas, Algirdas J. 1966. *Structural Semantics*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Hall, Stuart (ed.) 1997. *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*. London, U.K.: The Open University.

Langer, Suzanne K. 1979. *Philosophy in a New Key*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Manguel, Alberto. 1996. *A History of Reading*. Toronto: Knopf Canada.

Maritain, Jacques. 1986. “Language and the Theory of Sign.” Pp. 51-62 in Deely, Williams and Kruse (1986).

Pinker, Steven. 1994. *The Language Instinct*. New York: William Morrow & Co.

Wardhaugh, Ronald. 1986. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. London: Basil Blackwell.

Comparative Historical Sociology Section Sessions at the 2005 ASA in Philadelphia

1. The Framers and the Construction of the Post-Independence Order in the United States [joint with political sociology]

Organizers: Jason Kaufman and John Noakes

2. Author Meets Critics on Remaking Modernity: Politics, History and Sociology, edited by Julia Adams, Elisabeth S. Clemens and Ann Shola Orloff
Organizer and Presider: Richard Lachmann, University at Albany

Panel: Andrew Abbott, University of Chicago
Mounira Maya Charrad, University of Texas, Austin

James Mahoney, Brown University
Jack Goldstone, George Mason University
Discussion: Julia Adams, Yale University
Elisabeth Clements, University of Chicago
Ann Shola Orloff, Northwestern University

3. 100 Years of Sociology on Race and Ethnicity: Comparative and Historical Perspectives [joint with racial and ethnic minorities section]

Organizers: Scott Leon Washington and Ashley Woody Doane, Jr.

4. The Consolidation and Fragmentation of Historical and Contemporary Empires.

Organizer: Rebecca Jean Emigh

5. Roundtables (one hour)

Organizer: Brian Gran

6. Political Violence and Terrorism: Comparative Perspectives

Organizer and Presider: Jeff Goodwin; New York University

Thematic Session

Competing Perspectives on Comparative Explanations: Area Studies vs. Comparative Sociology

Organizers: Julian Dierkes, University of British Columbia, and Marion Fourcade-Gourinchas, University of California, Berkeley

“Transcending the Comparative Studies/Area Studies Divide: Globalization, Transnational Ties, and the Challenge to Sociology” Susan Eckstein, Boston University

“Japan and the Comparative Analysis of Welfare States” Aya Ezawa, Swarthmore College

“The Sociological Imagination and Africa: Why Research on Africa Needs Sociology, and Vice Versa” Ronald Kassimir, Program Director (Africa Program), Social Science Research Council

“Discipline and Public: Area Studies and Comparative Sociology” Michael Kennedy, University of Michigan

Call for Papers

Political Power and Social Theory is a peer-reviewed annual journal committed to advancing the interdisciplinary understanding of the linkages between political power, class relations, and historical development. The journal welcomes both empirical and theoretical work and is willing to consider papers of substantial length.

Publication decisions are made by the editor in consultation with members of the editorial board

and anonymous reviewers. Potential contributors should submit manuscripts in electronic format to ppst@mit.edu. Potential contributors are asked to remove any references to the author in the body of the text in order to preserve anonymity during review.

Email: ppst@mit.edu

<http://web.mit.edu/dusp/ppst/>

Diane E. Davis, Editor

Professor of Political Sociology

Massachusetts Institute of Technology

77 Massachusetts Avenue #9-521

Cambridge, MA 02139

Research in Political Sociology is accepting manuscripts for volume 15, which will focus on ‘Politics and Globalization.’ The primary objective of *Research in Political Sociology* is to publish high quality, original scholarly manuscripts that advance the understanding of politics in society. *Research in Political Sociology* publishes research that represents a wide array of substantive areas, different methods, and a range theoretical perspectives. Manuscripts submitted for volume 15 should be directed toward understanding and explaining the relationship between ‘Politics and Globalization.’ Four copies of the manuscripts should be submitted to Harland Prechel, Department of Sociology, 4351 Academic Building, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843-4351. The tentative deadline for submission of manuscripts for volume 15 is June 1, 2005.

Travel, Tourism, and Resorts

27th ANNUAL CONFERENCE

OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY STUDIES ASSOCIATION

Salisbury University, Salisbury, Maryland, March 16-18, 2006

Tourism and the rise of resorts reflect nineteenth-century economic, social, and cultural developments which brought about increased time for leisure, sport, entertainment, and vacation activities beyond prescribed hours of “work.” While both the nature of the Grand Tour (formally restricted to the wealthy) and desirable destinations for travel evolved over time, sport, leisure, and vacation activities also extended to various levels of society: resort businesses boomed, exotic locales drew tourists, advances in transportation opened

new destinations, and tourism became an attractive and widespread diversion. Other travel, however, was inspired by the desire to map space, to explore new territories and gather species of plants or animals there, to engage in missionary work or to study other peoples, to flee famines, and to migrate to a new home. Travel and tourism altered conceptions of home, nation, and progress as people adapted to (or even resisted) the demands and/or pleasures of their journeys and destinations.

For our 27th Annual Conference, NCSA encourages proposals that explore the meanings of travel, tourism, and resorts from a variety of disciplinary perspectives. Possible topics include but are not limited to the following:

- Travels through time and space
- Travel of the mind/inward
- Travel companions/solitary or group travelers
- The laws of travel
- Economies/Business of travel
- Travel destinations—city/walking/boat tours
- Tours/Travels with children
- Mysterious, quiet, indiscreet travelers
- Traveling spectacles
- Traveling secrets
- Journeys East or West/home or abroad
- The Middle Passage
- Means/Modes of Travel
- Travel innovations and progress
- Traveling artists, preachers, teachers, & librarians
- The distance we've traveled
- Migration, immigration, emigration
- Getaways and hideaways
- Resort architecture; architecture of sport & leisure
- Architectural sites as travel destination
- Representation of travel in art & literature
- Representation of sport and leisure in art/lit

Papers may come from the fields of architecture, art history, ethnic or race studies, history, literature, medicine, museum or library studies, music, or the social sciences. NCSA was founded to promote interdisciplinarity; proposals which approach the theme of the conference from an interdisciplinary basis are especially encouraged.

The conference will be held in Salisbury, on Maryland's Eastern shore, within thirty minutes of the Chesapeake Bay to the west and the Atlantic Ocean to the east. Plans to tour 19th century sites in Berlin, Maryland, and the summer resort of

Ocean City, Maryland (founded 1875), are in development.

Direct flights serve Salisbury from Charlotte, NC and Philadelphia, PA.

Proposals should consist of a one-page, single-spaced abstract (12-point font), with the title of the paper and author as heading; the paper must be able to be presented within 20 minutes. Proposals should be accompanied by a one- to two-page vita. Please send materials to both Program Directors, Heidi Kaufman and Lucy Morrison. The deadline for submissions is October 14, 2005. Acceptances will be sent by mid-December, 2005.

Email: kaufman@udel.edu and

lxmorrison@salisbury.edu

Post: Heidi Kaufman, 212 Memorial Hall, University of Delaware, Newark, DE 19716

Lucy Morrison, English Department, Salisbury University, 1101 Camden Avenue, Salisbury, MD 21801

Fax: Kaufman 302-831-1586 /

Morrison 410-548-2142

Further information about registration and accommodations will be available in the Fall from Local Arrangements Director Lucy Morrison (contact details above).

Call for Papers

Innovative Techniques for Teaching Sociological Concepts

Submissions are invited for inclusion in the 4th edition of Innovative Techniques for Teaching Sociological Concepts. This collection presents innovative ways to teach a variety of concepts in sociology. Each short description (1-2 pages) consists of 1) the concept being taught, 2) the teaching objective or student learning outcome, 3) references, 4) material needed, 5) estimated time, 6) a short description of the procedure, 7) interpretation, 8) possible pitfalls, 9) information about the person who wrote the description, and 10) courses in which it might be used.

This edition will cover concepts from all sub fields in sociology. One goal is to include a range of concepts linked with the recommendations for the undergraduate major found in Liberal Learning and the Sociology Major Updated: Meeting the Challenge of Teaching Sociology in the Twenty-First Century (see Footnotes, December 2004, pp.

4-5). Thus, descriptions of concepts related to sociological theory, research methods, statistics, race/class/gender, and multicultural/cross-cultural/cross-national issues are particularly encouraged.

For more information, including a sample concept description in the appropriate format, please contact:

Edward L. Kain

Department of Sociology and Anthropology

Southwestern University

PO Box 770

Georgetown, TX 78627-0770

kaine@southwestern.edu (512) 863-1967

or

Sandi Nenga

Department of Sociology and Anthropology

Southwestern University

PO Box 770

Georgetown, TX 78627-0770

nengas@southwestern.edu (512) 863-1412

Submission deadline: September 15, 2005

SSHA Graduate Student Prize

The Social Science History Association is pleased to offer a \$500 prize, to be awarded biennially, for the best article by a graduate student published in the Association's official journal, *Social Science History*. The prize, to be awarded at the annual fall meeting of the Social Science History Association, also includes a stipend of up to \$250 to cover the recipient's travel expenses to the conference as well as a one-year subscription to *Social Science History*.

Social Science History Association 2005 President's Book Award

The Social Science History Association announces the annual President's Book Award of \$1000 for a new manuscript. The prize rewards an especially meritorious first work by a beginning scholar. Scholars who have a previously-published book are not eligible for this award. Entrants will be judged on the criteria of scholarly significance, interdisciplinary reach, and methodological innovativeness, within the broad category of monographs analyzing past structures and events

and change over time. SSHA invites studies of family and demography, popular mentalities, political economy, state-society relationships, electoral and legislative behavior, and the history of the social and behavioral sciences; other substantive realms may also be represented. The Association includes in consideration theoretically-informed accounts examined from quantitative, interpretive, and other perspectives.

Manuscripts can be under consideration by a press at the time of submission to the award committee but must not be in print before the prize is awarded (this year, in November). A letter from the press stating that the manuscript would not be published before December, 2005 will be required.

The deadline for submission is June 15, 2005. A copy of the manuscript should be sent to EACH member of the committee at the addresses given below, along with a current CV. You may contact the Committee Chair Anne McCants at amccants@mit.edu with any queries.

The 2005 Sharlin Memorial Award in Social Science History

The Allan Sharlin Memorial Award is presented annually for an outstanding book in social science history published in the previous year (2004). The amount of the annual award is \$500. Entries are judged by a committee of the Social Science History Association. Individuals and publishers wishing to submit or nominate books should write to the committee. You may contact the Committee Chair Steve Ruggles at ruggles@hist.umn.edu with any queries. Submissions should include a copy of the book sent to each of the persons named above. Books arriving after the deadline will not be considered by the committee.

Only books with a 2004 publication date are eligible for the 2005 award. The deadline for submissions is June 15, 2005.

Websites of interest

small-N/comparative methods website:

<http://www.compass.org/News.htm>

<http://www.compass.org/COMPASS%20activities.htm>

New Book Synopsis

America's Crisis of Values: Reality and Perception
(Princeton University Press, 2005)

Wayne Baker

Professor of Management & Organizations
Professor of Sociology

Faculty Associate, Institute for Social Research
Ross School of Business at the University of
Michigan

Is America bitterly divided? Has the nation lost its traditional values? Many politicians and religious leaders believe so, as do the majority of Americans, based on public opinion polls taken over the past several years. But is this crisis of values real?

This book explores the moral terrain of America today, analyzing the widely held perception that the nation is divided and in moral decline. It looks at the question from a variety of angles, examining traditional values, secular values, religious values, family values, economic values, and others. Using unique data from the World Values Surveys, the largest systematic attempt ever made to document attitudes, values, and beliefs around the world, this book systematically evaluates the perceived crisis of values by comparing America's values with those of over 60 other nations.

The results are surprising. The evidence shows overwhelmingly that America has not lost its traditional values, that the nation compares favorably with most other societies, and that the culture war is largely a myth.

The gap between reality and perception does not represent mass ignorance of the facts or an overblown moral panic, Baker contends. Rather, the widespread perception of a crisis of values is a real and legitimate interpretation of life in a society that is in the middle of a fundamental transformation and that contains growing cultural contradictions. Instead of posing a problem, the author argues, this crisis rhetoric serves the valuable social function of reminding us of what it means to be American. As such, it preserves the ideological foundation of the nation.

New Publications of Section Members

Wayne Baker, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, *America's Crisis of Values: Reality and Perception*. Princeton University Press 2005.

Luiz A. Castro-Santos and Lina Faria, "A Cooperação Internacional e a Enfermagem de Saúde Pública no Rio de Janeiro e São Paulo", *Horizontes* (a journal of the History Program of the Universidade São Francisco, EDUSF, Bragança Paulista, Brazil) Vol 22 (2), 2005 (forthcoming). (A historical-comparative piece on the beginnings of public health nursing in two regions in Brazil, from the 1920s to the 1950s).

David Fitzgerald. "Nationality and Migration in Modern Mexico," *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 31(1):171-91. 2005.

David Fitzgerald. "Transnationalism in Question" (with Roger Waldinger). *American Journal of Sociology* 109(5):1177-95. 2004.

David Fitzgerald. "Beyond 'Transnationalism': Mexican Hometown Politics at an American Labor Union," *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 27(2): 228-47. 2004.

Stephen Kalberg, ed., *Max Weber: Readings and Commentary on Modernity*. Blackwell, 2005.

Laczko, Leslie S. 2004. "Canada's Pluralism in Comparative Perspective", in Athena S. Leoussi and Steven Grosby (eds.), *Nationality and Nationalism* (4 volumes), London: Palgrave Macmillan/I.B. Tauris, vol. 3, pp. 289-307.

Laczko, Leslie S. "Minority Nationalism and Welfare State Attitudes: Quebec and Scotland Compared", in Colin Coates and Ailsa Henderson (eds.), *Quebec and Scotland: An Evolving Comparison*. Edinburgh: Tuckwell Press, 2005 (in press; forthcoming).

Joachim J. Savelsberg and Ryan D. King. 2005. "Institutionalizing Collective Memories of Hate: Law and Law Enforcement in Germany and the

United States." Forthcoming in *American Journal of Sociology* 111.

Joachim J. Savelsberg. 2005. "Punitiveness in Cross-national Comparison: Toward a Historically and Institutionally Founded Multi-Factorial Approach." Forthcoming in *International Journal of Comparative Criminology* 4.

Joachim J. Savelsberg. 2004. "Religion, Historical Contingencies, and Criminal Punishment: The German Case and Beyond." *Law and Social Inquiry*, Vol. 29, No. 2, pp. 373-401.

Joachim Savelsberg and Sarah M. Flood. 2004. "Period and Cohort Effects in the Production of Scholarly Knowledge: The Case of Criminology, 1951-1993." *Criminology*, Vol. 42, No. 4, pp. 1009-10041.

Joachim J. Savelsberg, Lara L. Cleveland, and Ryan D. King. 2004. Institutional Environments and Scholarly Work: American Criminology, 1951-1993." *Social Forces*, Vol. 82, No. 4, pp. 1275-1302.

Joachim J. Savelsberg. 2004. "Fear of Crime and the Punitive State: American Experiences and European Concerns" (in German). *Kuckuck—Notizen zur Alltagskultur* Vol. 19, No. 2.

Veljko Vujacic, "Perceptions of the State in Russia and Serbia: the Role of Ideas in the Soviet and Yugoslav Collapse," *Post-Soviet Affairs*, 2004, 20, 2, pp.164-194.

Balazs Vedres, Laszlo Bruszt, and David Stark. "Organizing Technologies: Genre Forms of Online Civic Association in Eastern Europe." In Eric Klinenberg, ed., *Cultural Production in a Digital Age* special issue of the *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 2004, {PAGES}

Daniel Beunza and David Stark, "How to Recognize Opportunities: Heterarchical Search in a Trading Room." (with Daniel Beunza). In Karin Knorr Cetina and Alexa Preda, eds., *The Sociology of Financial Markets*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Frederick Wherry. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*. (forthcoming). "The Nation State, Identity Management, and Indigenous Crafts: Constructing Markets and Opportunities in Northwest Costa Rica," *Ethnic & Racial Studies*. The article was accepted in December 2004 and is expected to appear late in 2005.

Robert D. Woodberry and Timothy S. Shah. 2004. "Christianity and Democracy: The Pioneering Protestants." *Journal of Democracy*. 15(2): 47-61.

People

E. C. Ejiogu recently completed a Ph.D. here in the department of Sociology, at the University of Maryland, College Park. My dissertation is entitled "the Roots of Political Instability Amongst Indigenous Nationalities and in the 'Nigerian' Supra-National State, 1884-1990: A Longitudinal and Comparative Historical Study"

David Fitzgerald is finishing his dissertation, "A Nation of Emigrants? Nation-State Building in Mexican Migrant Sending Communities" this summer at UCLA and will then take up residence as a 2-year post-doctoral fellow at the Center for Comparative Immigration Studies and Center for U.S.- Mexican Studies at the University of California, San Diego.

LaDawn Haglund will be completing her dissertation, entitled: "Right to Water, Right to Light: State Autonomy, Accountability, and Utility Privatization In Central America, 1980-2002," this summer

LaDawn Haglund
International Center for Advanced Studies
Project on the Authority of Knowledge in a Global Age
53 Washington Square S., #401E
New York, NY 10012-1098

Ming-Cheng Lo Received an ASA /NSF FAD (Funds for the Advancement of the Discipline) Grant for project "One Science Does not Fit All: The Social Processes of Culturally Competent Healthcare."

Enid Lynette Logan is completing a dissertation on marriage, religion, and race in Cuba, 1901-1940, entitled "Holy Sacraments and Illicit Encounters: The Catholic Church, the Nation-State, and the Regulation of Marriage in Cuba, 1901-1940." My name is Enid Lynette Logan, and I am doctoral candidate at the University of Michigan, in Ann Arbor. In Fall 2005, I will begin as assistant professor of sociology at the University of Minnesota, where I am currently a pre-doctoral fellow. My email address is elogan@umn.edu.

In Feb. 2005 **Robert D. Woodberry** received a \$500,000 "Spiritual Capital Grant" from the Templeton Foundation to study the cross-national impact of religion on the economy. The project will study the national-level impact of 150 years of Protestant and Catholic missionary activity, education and medical work on nonwestern societies; the community-level effect of religious transformations in Brazil (using 5 waves of the Brazilian census); and the individual-level consequences in Malawi (using 4 waves of the the Malawi Diffusion and Ideational Change Project Survey).

Note from the Newsletter Editor

I am stepping down as newsletter editor of the comparative and historical sociology section newsletter as of August, 2005. Monica Prasad of Northwestern University will be taking over as newsletter editor at that time. I have served as newsletter editor for three years and feel that is enough. In addition, recently I have been involved with establishing a new section of sociology, evolution and sociology, and I want to devote more of my time to this enterprise. Despite the transfer of my attention to microsociological issues, my heart remains in macrosociology. Macrosociology, more than anything, can keep microsociology on the straight and narrow by keeping microsociologists aware of all the possibilities of human social behavior in the real world. Sociology as a discipline was founded in macro, comparative and historical sociology – it is there that our critique of the economic approach to human behavior was fully established. I hope that more of you in comparative and historical sociology will begin to realize, as I have, the potential of better microsociological foundations, namely, an evolutionary approach to human behavior, for sociology in general. By improving our theoretical base and providing a comprehensive, unifying paradigm for all sociology, such a microsociological foundation can also improve comparative and historical sociology. I firmly believe that with improved theoretical foundations the 21st century will be the century of sociology, and that comparative and historical sociology will remain as important and relevant to the discipline as it always has been.

So as I sail off into that microsociological beyond, my hat's off to you who labor so hard in the scenic and fascinating trenches of comparative and historical sociology!

-Rosemary Hopcroft