

**1998 SECTION PRIZES:
Call for Nominations**

The Comparative-Historical Section will award two prizes at the 1998 ASA meetings:

- 1) The Reinhard Bendix Prize for best graduate student paper and 2) The Barrington Moore Prize for best book published in 1996-97.
- For details on nominations and deadlines, see page 3.

**1997 SECTION PRIZES
Awarded to Ermakoff, Pfaff,
Stryker and Zaret**

1) Reinhard Bendix Prize:

After lengthy deliberation, the Prize Committee (Robin Stryker, Chair, Edwin Amenta and Sandra Harding) awarded the 1997 Reinhard Bendix Prize for best graduate student paper to Iwan Ermakoff, of the University of Chicago, and to Steven Pfaff, of New York University. Because the Comparative & Historical Section had awarded no graduate student prize in 1996, the Section gave the 1997 prize a longer submission window and chose two recipients.

2) Barrington Moore Prize:

This year, the Prize Committee (Kathleen Blee, Chair, Elisabeth Clemens and Bill Moore) selected two co-winners: Robin Stryker of the University of Iowa and David Zaret of Indiana University. Honorable mention goes to Jack Goldstone of UC, Davis.

For details see page 2.

Feminist Theory and Historical Sociology: Two Views from the Field...

GROUNDS FOR RAPPROCHEMENT

by Julia Adams, University of Michigan

Over a decade has elapsed since Judith Stacey and Barrie Thorne wrote "The Missing Feminist Revolution in Sociology." Recently the ASA Theory Section Newsletter, *Perspectives*, reexamined the topic, in a 1996 exchange kicked off by the authors. Stacey and Thorne now disavow the very concept of a feminist revolution in sociology. Feminist ideas have become a trans-disciplinary force in the academy, they note, eroding disciplinary boundaries. No doubt! Yet Michael Burawoy responds that feminist contestation within the disciplines is still important, especially because resistance to feminism increases with a discipline's proximity to state power. This holds, it seems to me, of sub- and trans-disciplines too -- and historical sociology aspires to be both.

The historical sociology of state social provision certainly continues to resist the incursion of feminist theory, whether by insisting that welfare states are gender-neutral structures or by treating gender (if it's included in the analysis) as a causal variable with two values corresponding to bipartite notions of biological sex. Feminist work shows that these approaches won't wash. As Ann Orloff (1993) emphasizes in her challenge to Esping-Andersen and the "power-resource" school, gender plays a tacit role in constituting the institutional dimensions and the variables that power-resource analysts rely on. Maybe Theda Skocpol's influential *Protecting Soldiers and Mothers* (1992) will help widen the breach in the mainstream ramparts. (Continued on page 4)

PROSPECTS FOR COURTSHIP

by Ava Baron, Rider University

What kind of relationship exists between historical sociology and feminism? How we represent this relationship influences the kind of engagement that will take place and the ways we map out the work that lays ahead. Clearly space within historical sociology has been carved out for research on women and gender. Feminists sometimes have turned to historical sociology to engage issues central to their research and feminists have held important organizational positions in the ASA Comparative & Historical Sociology Section. As well, a particular project in historical sociology may enable a practitioner to see how gender is central to the ways social institutions operate, as Theda Skocpol (1992; 1993; but see Gordon, 1993) claims was the case in the making of her recent book. But the "engagement" of feminism and historical sociology has been marked by neither romance nor passion. Their relationship has not effected a paradigmatic revolution. (Stacey and Thorne, 1996)

Despite their overlapping intellectual and political footings there has been relatively little cross fertilization. The differences in their concerns and approaches have meant that they also have been somewhat incompatible. The Comparative-Historical Sociology (Continued on page 5)

Comparative & Historical Sociology, published quarterly, is the official newsletter of the Section on Historical and Comparative Sociology of the American Sociological Association.

Section Officers:

Chair

John Stephens
University of North Carolina-
Chapel Hill

Chair-Elect

David Stark
Cornell University

Past Chair

Jack A. Goldstone
University of California-
Davis

Secretary-Treasurer

Elisabeth Clemens
University of Arizona

Council

Edwin Amenta
New York University

Karen Barkey
Columbia University

Bruce Carruthers
Northwestern University

Michelle Lamont
Russell Sage Foundation

Kim Voss
U. of California-Berkeley

Webmaster

David Zaret
Indiana University

Newsletter Editor

Philip Gorski
University of Wisconsin--
Madison

BENDIX AWARDS TO ERMAKOFF AND PFAFF

Ivan Ermakoff's prizewinning paper is published in the *American Sociological Review* (June, 1997) and is entitled "Aristocratic Marriages and Canon Law Prohibitions: Shifts in Norms and Patterns of Domination in the Central Middle Ages." The article examines the processes through which European aristocrats came to acknowledge the Church's prohibitions on divorce and close kin marriage. The Committee was especially impressed by the theoretical clarity and analytic rigor with which Ivan set up his research problem and developed his explanation. Ivan's article shows us that elegantly simple game-theoretic models sometimes can have historically useful and sensible applications. In this case, use of these models allows Ivan to account for a major normative shift that historians had not yet adequately explained, and to show that the normative shift can be explained by a combination of: 1) changes in the value to nobles of Church certification of matrimonial legitimacy; and 2) change in enforcement costs to the Church of its regulatory policies.

Steven Pfaff's prizewinning paper is published in *Social Forces* (September, 1996) and is entitled "Collective Identity and Informal Groups in Revolutionary Mobilizations: East Germany in 1989." The article provides us with a fascinating case study of the peaceful and spontaneous revolution that toppled the Communist regime. Steve first shows why this revolution could not be fully explained by our extant theories of revolution and collective action. He then uses his case study as a vehicle to propose what he terms a "synthetic, historically specific approach in which collective identities are situated within small scale social networks." The Committee was especially impressed with the careful, extensive primary data collection that went into this article. We were also impressed by the article's equal attention to, and juxtaposition of, historical specificity with a more general conceptual and theoretical apparatus.

The Committee would also like to note the large number of strong submissions this year and thank all those who submitted their papers for the competition.

MOORE AWARD TO STRYKER AND ZARET; HONORABLE MENTION TO GOLDSTONE

Robin Stryker's "Beyond History Versus Theory: Strategic Narrative and Sociological Explanation", published in *Sociological Methods and Research* (1996) provides a valuable exposition of the use of strategic narrative as a method by which historical sociologists can concurrently construct and mutually adjust history and theory, select and construct history in response to a clearly developed theory, and construct phased comparative research designs. Particularly useful is Stryker's detailed example of the use of a strategic narrative in her studies of the politics of social science in regulatory law.

The co-winner, David Zaret's "Petitions and the 'Invention' of Public Opinion in the English Revolution" was published in the *American Journal of Sociology* (May, 1996). In this provocative article, Zaret traces the origins of the public sphere to practical, communicative developments during the English Revolution rather than to Enlightenment philosophy or Protestant theology and argues convincingly that the communicative tradition of petitioning and the development of print cultures were vital to the development of a liberal-democratic public sphere.

(Continued on page 3)

MOORE AWARD, continued from page 2.

Honorable mention is awarded to Jack Goldstone's "Gender, Work and Culture: Why the Industrial Revolution Came Early to England But Late to China", which was published in *Sociological Perspectives* (Spring, 1996). Goldstone demonstrates that neither technological limitations nor imbalances between resources and population can explain China's late entry into industrialism. Rather, he argues, it was restrictions on female employment outside the home, enforced by Confucian ethics and state policies, which prevented the widespread adoption of machine manufacture.

1998 AWARDS: CALL FOR NOMINATIONS, continued from page 1.

The Comparative-Historical Section will award two prizes at the 1998 ASA meetings:

1) **The Reinhard Bendix Prize for the best graduate student paper.** Papers written during the last two years are eligible and may be submitted by the authors or other members of the ASA. Please send three copies of the paper to: Julia Adams, Dept. of Sociology, 3012 LSA Building, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48104, email: jpadams@umich.edu. The other members of the committee are Steven Pfaff (NYU) and Mabel Berezin (UCLA). The deadline for receipt of papers is March 1, 1998.

2) **The Barrington Moore Prize for best book** published in 1996-97. Books published during the past two years are eligible and may be submitted by the authors, publishers, or members of the ASA. Copies of the book and a letter explaining why it should be considered for the award should be sent to: Jeff Goodwin, Department of Sociology, New York University, 269 Mercer St., Room 446, New York, NY, 10003; email: goodwin@socgate.soc.nyu.edu, Bill Mirola, Department of Sociology, Marian College, 3200 Cold Spring Road, Indianapolis, IN46222-1997, email: mirola@marian.edu; George Steinmetz, Dept. of Sociology, 3012 LSA Building, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48104, email: geostein@umich.edu; and Sandra Harding, Acting Dean, Faculty of Business, Queensland University of Technology, GPO Box 2434, Brisbane Qld. 4001, Australia, email: s.harding@qut.edu.au. Please note that the books and nominating letter should be sent to ALL members of the committee. The deadline for receipt of nominations is February 1, 1998.

**Call for Submissions,
Journal of Historical Sociology**

An interdisciplinary journal published quarterly by Basil Blackwell. Interested authors should submit six copies of their manuscript to: Leon Zamosc, Department of Sociology, University of California, San Diego, 9500 Gilman Drive, La Jolla, CA, 92093-0533.

Recent Publications:

Alex Inkeles ed., *National Character: A Psycho-Social Perspective* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction, Publishers, 1997).

Robert Schaeffer, *Understanding Globalization: The Social Consequences of Political, Economic and Environmental Change* (Rowman and Littlefield, 1997)

Power to the People: Democratization Around the World (Westview, 1997).

Travel Seminar in Cuba:

The Center for Development Studies at Presbyterian College and the Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales are sponsoring a travel and research seminar in Cuba from July 5 to July 28 for professors and graduate students in the social sciences and history. For more information concerning either program, send mailing address to Dr. Charles McKelvey, Center for Development Studies, 210 Belmont Stakes, Clinton, South Carolina, 29325; phone: (864)833-8385; FAX: (864)833-8481; e-mail: cemck@csl.presby.edu.

**VISIT THE SECTION WEB-SITE
AT:**

<http://ezinfo.ucs.indiana.edu/~zaret/comph.htm>

Adams, Grounds for Rapprochement, continued

But I want to make the opposite case, too, and argue that feminist theory should pay more attention to historical sociology. The most fruitful approach to studying state formation depends on forging a tactical alliance between historical sociology and feminist theory: one that acknowledges the tensions between each complex intellectual formation, but insists that each can learn from the other.

Take my own area of research, the sociology of European state-building, where feminism has made even less impact than on the mainstream welfare state literature. It's not that it has nothing to offer. Feminist theorists like Carole Pateman (1988) are rereading classical commentaries by theorists of state power in brilliantly subversive ways as they reconstruct the bases of the modernist theoretical canon. These texts have been scoured to reveal the lineaments of political discourse, as well as the patriarchal nature of early modern monarchical power, a source of legitimacy that hinged on perceptions of order and appropriate gender hierarchy in royal families. These arguments haven't made much of a dent in the sociology of state formation, but they've been eagerly expanded in some superb feminist historical scholarship, particularly associated with France (e.g. Hunt 1992). I'm convinced that if historical sociologists read this work carefully, they will see that early modern states cannot be understood apart from the discursive dimension of gender.

For all their virtues, though, feminist theoretical analyses have problems. They often reduce states to writings about states, building broad claims about politics on that rickety foundation. Concepts of states and politics are habitually folded into the category of political culture. Finally, states tend to figure as a single father or royal family. By mistaking the monarch (at most the court) for all of early modern European high politics, they substitute one node for a whole network of governance. They miss, for example, the potential political importance of corporate coalitions of, and struggles among, male officeholders lineally implanted in state apparatuses in their capacity as family heads (Adams 1994). None of this may matter if feminist theorists simply want to emphasize one discursive dimension (gender) of a particular institutional space (the court) in early modern states. But existing feminist accounts must be expanded and reworked if our goal is also to make sense of patterns of state formation and large scale historical change.

Early modern European states were patchworks of power. Many corporate bodies exercised piecemeal claims

to sovereignty, as they negotiated or stumbled into uneasy relationships with one another. At the same time, and sometimes in the same patch, rational-legal bureaucratic styles of administration and appropriation coexisted with the patriarchal, patrimonial principles that had extended over generations. Contra Pringle and Watson (1992) and other postmodern feminist analysts, these states -- or any state or interstate system -- simply cannot be approached solely as a diverse set of discursive arenas. For these sprawling states were variably coherent, variably contradictory formations, resource-laden as well as discursively constructed, and should be studied with methodological tools adequate to their complex character. This goes double for the new political forms in today's highly developed countries, in Europe and elsewhere, which are now moving away from central statist structures of rule and redistribution.

Promising methodological paths are being explored by historical sociologists and merit the attention of feminist theorists interested in this topic or in any large-scale social change. First are approaches that take temporality seriously (Aminzade 1992). Large-scale processes can be broken down into narrative elements and reassembled in analytical sequences that are historically contextualized (Sewell, ed., 1992). Equally important is the synchronic side, for these processes inhabit bounded institutional sites and can be grasped by system-specific mechanisms -- pieces of theoretical reasoning that are independently verifiable and help us understand a part of other, higher level theories (Stinchcombe 1991). Current "feminist methodologies" -- from the discourse theoretic to standpoint variants -- are too narrow to grasp the sorts of social and cultural transformations that interest historical sociologists.

Feminism is not about to lose its vanguard position in historical sociology, intrinsically tied to its subversive disciplinary and trans-disciplinary role, and that's a good thing. For its part, feminist analysis could benefit from opening up to greater substantive and methodological advances in "gender blind" historical sociology. It is crystal clear that historical sociology needs feminist theory, and more of it -- but the converse is also the case.

----- References

Adams, Julia. 1994. "The Familial State: Elite Family Practices and Statemaking in the Early Modern Netherlands." *Theory and Society* 23 #4: 505-39.

Aminzade, Ronald. 1992. "Historical Sociology and Time," *Sociological Methods and Research* 20 #4: 456-80.

Burawoy, Michael. 1996. "The Power of Feminism." *Perspectives: The ASA Theory Section Newsletter* 18 #3.

(Concluded on page 6)

Baron, Courtship, continued from page 1

Section. As well, a particular project in historical sociology may enable a practitioner to see how gender is central to the ways social institutions operate, as Theda Skocpol (1992; 1993; but see Gordon, 1993) claims was the case in the making of her recent book. But the "engagement" of feminism and historical sociology has been marked by neither romance nor passion. Their relationship has not effected a paradigmatic revolution. (Stacey and Thorne, 1996)

Despite their overlapping intellectual and political footings there has been relatively little cross fertilization. The differences in their concerns and approaches have meant that they also have been somewhat incompatible. The Comparative-Historical Sociology Section sessions have concentrated on macro-political sociology of the nation-state giving little attention to gender issues. Many historical sociologists continue to employ theories of power and social change that prioritize class and consider gender auxiliary. Not surprisingly those with multiple section memberships in the Comparative and Historical Sociology Section of the ASA are heavily concentrated in Political Sociology, Political Economy and Marxist Sociology. Feminists have long had difficulty incorporating women and gender into class analysis. They have pointed to the ways traditional theories of economic and political changes mask the ways gender is implicated in these processes and have challenged the significance of class as an overarching identity. Like the "unhappy marriage" of marxism and feminism (Hartmann 1981), the marriage of feminism and historical sociology has been an uneasy and unequal one. As a result, feminism's impact has been segregated and limited. (Abbott, 1994)

To be sure, many historical sociologists have moved away from Marxist determinist explanations and mechanistic formulations. But the "marriage" of Marxism and feminism has not become more congenial in many "post-Marxist" analyses. Gender issues often remain subsidiary to what are considered the "really important" issues of class formation, struggle and consciousness, and the "big" questions concerning politics, war, revolutions, urbanization and industrialization (e.g., in Biernacki 1995). Therefore despite the proliferation of feminist projects within historical sociology, many still wonder: "what difference does gender make?"

A better "marriage" between feminism and historical sociology would require historical sociologists to examine the field's foundational categories and to explore how they create the subjects they write about. By accepting as transparent categories such as "the worker," or "the citizen," or the separate "private" and "public spheres," historical sociologists have codified and reproduced the categories used by those with power in the past. (Baron, 1994)

Promising new directions are being forged by sociologists, historians and anthropologists who have experimented with new forms of writing and have become

more self-conscious of the ways they represent their subjects of investigation. Historical sociologists need to explore their own discursive rules, the metaphors they depend on for analysis, and the ways their rhetorical strategies mask how gender operates or mark social processes as gendered in particular ways.

There are signs that historical sociology has become more "internally tolerant." (Skocpol 1988). It has been able to accept under its banner a variety of approaches, including various forms of neo-marxism, symbolic interactionism, microsociology as well as narrative analysis and "non-narrative presentations." Many have moved away from attempts to construct "grand theory" based on "big case comparisons" and atemporal general social models. It also is encouraging that historical sociologists have been engaging in reflection about the nature of their project. Ann Orloff (1995) has sought ways to encourage a "serious retrospective of where the [Comparative-Historical Sociology] section has been and where it is going."

But with a few notable exceptions (e.g., Ewa Morawska, Judith Stacey and Barbara Laslett) historical sociologists typically have been reluctant to relinquish their authority to make "truth claims" by considering the ways they create stories. Resisting the "linguistic turn" they have largely eschewed the idea that how we construct "truth" is political. While such reflection could mean the end of the field as we know it, an end to the notion that knowledge is "innocent," it would not, as Steven Seidman (1994) explained, mean the end of a human studies that entail "a commitment to an open, ongoing, inclusive conversation about society" based on an awareness of the power issues involved in the construction and uses of knowledge.

Traditional disciplines have been justifiably wary of feminism. The "feminist project" in the academy continually unmask the workings of power embedded in prevailing disciplinary methods. If feminism has any "essential" meaning at all it is as a critical practice. Using its position as an "outsider," feminists have interrogated categories of analysis and provided reminders of what the disciplines have left out -- the excluded and silenced. Feminism's marginality has provided a position from which women could speak qua women. Integration, then, threatens the very foundation and basis for feminist critical inquiry.

Should feminists try to find a "home" in the disciplines? Is historical sociology a good place to "settle down"? If feminists continue to engage in "disciplinary warfare" as Michael Burawoy (1996) advocates, feminism risks losing its critical edge. There are limits to feminism's ability to continue to play a critical role from within the disciplines. Even if integration does not dull its critical edge, as some fear, there is danger in the "routinization" of feminist criticism. Feminism borders on being dismissed as the proverbial "nag"; and in the conventional comic scenario, this becomes: "she nags, he stops listening, nothing changes, she nags." (Morris, 1988) Herein lies another "feminist paradox" in the academy. It is no wonder (Continued on page 6)

Adams, Rapprochement, continued from page 4

Hunt, Lynn. 1992. The Family Romance of the French Revolution. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Orloff, Ann Shola. 1993. "Gender and the Social Rights of Citizenship: The Comparative Analysis of Gender Relations and Welfare States." American Sociological Review 58: 303-28.

Pateman, Carole. 1988. The Sexual Contract. Cambridge, England: Polity Press.

Pringle, Rosemary and Sophie Watson. 1992. "Women's Interests and the Post-Structuralist State." Pp. 53-73 in Destabilizing Theory. Contemporary Feminist Debates, ed. M. Barrett and A. Phillips. Oxford/Cambridge, England: Polity Press.

Baron, Courtship, continued from page 5

that feminists express a deep ambivalence about their positions within their disciplines and the prospects for paradigmatic disciplinary changes.

Even if feminism cannot establish a "home" for itself within historical sociology as a place where it is safe, comfortable, and secure, a romance may still be possible. The tension in the relationship between feminism and historical sociology may be constructive, indeed necessary. While "marriage" may not be possible, feminism should continue to "court" the disciplines. Feminism's subversive potential lies in challenging disciplinary boundaries even as it exposes its own contradictions rooted in the paradoxical character of sexual difference. (Scott, 1996; Lorber, 1994) The feminist project is multifaceted. Some of it necessarily takes feminists outside of the disciplines as an interdisciplinary enterprise. Some of it takes feminists out of the academy and into the streets. But part of its project is to engage in debate within the disciplines and to continue to strive for a feminist revolution.

REFERENCES

Abbott, Andrew. 1994. "History and Sociology: The Lost Synthesis," in Eric Monkkenon, ed. Engaging the Past: The Uses of History Across the Social Sciences. Durham: Duke University Press: 77-112

Baron, Ava. 1994. "Gendered Subjects: Re-presenting "the worker" in history." Paper presented at the School of Social Science, The Institute for Advanced Study (March)

Biernacki, Richard. 1995. The Fabrication of Labor: Germany and Britain, 1640-1914. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Burawoy, Michael. 1996. "The Power of Feminism." Perspectives: The ASA Theory Section Newsletter. 8, #3 (Summer): 4-7.

Sewell, William Jr., ed. 1992. Symposium on Narrative. Social Science History 16 #3-4.

Skocpol, Theda. 1992. Protecting Soldiers and Mothers. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Stacey, Judith and Barrie Thorne. 1996. "Is Sociology Still Missing its Feminist Revolution?" Perspectives: The ASA Theory Section Newsletter 18 #3.

Stinchcombe, Arthur L. 1991. "The Conditions of Fruitfulness of Theorizing About Mechanisms in Social Science." Philosophy of the Social Sciences 21 #3: 367-88.

Gordon, Linda. 1993. "Gender, State and Society: A Debate with Theda Skocpol, Contention. 2, 3 (Sp): 139-156; and "Response to Theda Skocpol," 185-190

Hartmann, Heidi. 1981. "The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism: Towards a More Progressive Union," in Lydia Sargent, ed. Women and Revolution: A discussion of the Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism. Boston: South End Press.

Lorber, Judith. 1994. Paradoxes of Gender. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Morris, Meaghan. 1988. The Pirate's Fiancee: Feminism, Reading, Postmodernism. London & NY: Verso.

Orloff, Ann. 1995. "Message from the Section Chair," Newsletter of the Comparative and Historical Sociology Section of the ASA. (Summer): 2.

Scott, Joan W. 1996. Only Paradoxes to Offer: French Feminists and the Rights of Man. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Seidman, Steven. 1994. Contested Knowledge: Social Theory in the Postmodern Era. Oxford: Blackwell.

_____. 1992. Protecting Soldiers and Mothers. Harvard University Press.

_____. 1988. "An uppity generation and the revitalization of macroscopic sociology," Theory and Society 17: 627-43.

Stacey, Judith. and Barrie Thorne. 1996. "Is Sociology Still Missing Its Feminist Revolution?" Perspectives: ASA Theory Section Newsletter, 18, 3 (Summer): 1-3.