

RUSSELL SAGE FOUNDATION

Working Paper # 206

Social Theory, Modernity, and the Three Waves of Historical Sociology

Julia Adams, Elisabeth Clemens and Ann Shola Orloff

Date: April 14, 2003

Russell Sage Working Papers have not been reviewed by the Foundation. Copies of working papers are available from the author, and may not be reproduced without permission.

Social Theory, Modernity, and the Three Waves of Historical Sociology

Julia Adams, Elisabeth Clemens and Ann Shola Orloff

[forthcoming as the Introduction to Julia Adams, Elisabeth Clemens and Ann Shola Orloff, eds. Remaking Modernity: Politics, History and Sociology, Duke University Press, 2004]

“We shall set to work and meet the ‘demands of the day,’ in human relations as well as in our vocation. This, however, is plain and simple, if each finds and obeys the demon who holds the fibers of his very life.” (Max Weber 1958: 156)

“Discontinuity is freedom.” (Harold Bloom 1997: 39)

Sociology as a discipline is intimately entwined with modernity, both as lived and theorized. Sociologists have galvanized distinctive mechanisms of social rationalization and technical regulation (not least statistics and surveys) and authored ideas of the modern social space as a realm that we denizens inhabit and control. Sociologists have also helped define modernity’s significant Others, including the categories of tradition and post-modernity. They have applied their intellectual energy to formulating what might be called the “sociological modern”: situating actors and institutions in terms of these categories, understanding the paths by which they develop or change, and communicating these understandings to states, citizens, all manner of organizations and social movements – as well as vast armies of students. On this basis, sociologists have helped build and manage today’s sprawling, globally extended social edifice, while simultaneously trying to diagnose and dismantle its disciplinary aspects and iron cages. The discipline is itself a product of modernity, not simply in its institutions but, as we will argue, in its theoretical core.

The formation of modernity now figures as a place of disorder as well as dynamism – troubled, fissured, perhaps even in civilizational crisis. This is all the more ironic now that capitalism – surely a core constituent of modernity – is thought by some to have arrived at a point of triumphant stasis, the highest stage and culmination of history.¹ In this unsettled time, the discipline of sociology finds itself in an interesting position. It is prey to heightened theoretical dispersion and home to a confused array of possible stances toward the place of the “modern” in ongoing global transitions, reconfigurations and cataclysms. Many sociologists still embrace the familiar contrast between tradition and modernity and assume that a directional development from the former to the latter is underway.² They may celebrate or

¹See for example Francis Fukuyama’s neo-Hegelian meditation The End of History and the Last Man (New York: Avon, 1993) and Samuel P. Huntington’s controversial The Clash of Civilization and the Remaking of World Order (New York: Touchstone, 1998). Both books have sparked much debate. For many in the human sciences, these worries have taken on fresh urgency in the wake of the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. See Craig Calhoun, Paul Price and Ashley Timmer, eds. Understanding September 11 (New York: New Press, 2002).

²The stubborn persistence of modernization theory in demography and family sociology is critically discussed in Arland Thornton’s 2001 Presidential Address to the Population Association of America (Thornton 2001: 449-465). Ian Roxborough’s “Modernization Theory Revisited: A Review Article” finds modernization theory to be “alive and

mourn the modernist rationalization and disenchantment of the social world against which romantic or neo-traditional energies are aimed and from which “we moderns” cannot turn back. Others, particularly of a more cultural studies bent, insist on the plasticity of all such distinctions or celebrate the viability of alternative modernities.³ And so on. Yet what is often missing in the stew of sociological discussion, research and political prescription is a sense of history as more than a vague preamble to the current moment.

Historical sociology is one place for reflection about theory in the broader discipline, its connections to other academic and intellectual formations and to the quandaries inherent in the “sociological modern” as it plays out in the social world. In part that is because historical sociologists have offered analyses and narratives of how people and societies became modern or not – what was it that changed in the series of Great Transformations, and how these manifold processes are continuing to reshape the contemporary world.⁴ At times historical sociologists have done even more. “Doing justice to the reality of history is not a matter of noting the way in which the past provides a background to the present,” as Philip Abrams (1982: 8) eloquently put it: “it is a matter of treating what people do in the present as a struggle to create a future *out* of the past, of seeing the past not just as the womb of the present but the only raw material out of which the present can be constructed.” In this Introduction, we offer an archaeology and analysis of the three waves of historical sociology specifically in order to inform these reflections about theory, doing sociology and the future scholarship that might emerge from present debates.

Sociology’s Historical Imagination

For much of its own history, sociological theory has evinced a deep concern for historical thinking. Attention to history has been tightly coupled to theoretical exploration as sociologists addressed the central questions of the discipline: how did societies come to be recognizably “modern”? how did selves come to be understood as individuated, coherently centered and rationally-acting human subjects? From Thomas Hobbes through Karl Marx, Emile Durkheim, Max Weber, Georg Simmel, W. E. B. DuBois, Thorstein Veblen and Norbert Elias, various lines of theory developed as an effort to understand the processes by which social structures and social actors were created and transformed over the course of the transition from “traditional” or feudal societies to some distinctively “modern” social life.⁵ How

well” after a comeback in studies of development (1988: 753). These are but two of many possible examples. Immanuel Wallerstein’s valedictory “Modernization: Requiescat in Pace,” which begins with the words “when a concept has died,” was a tad premature (1976: 131-135). See also Reinhard Bendix, “Tradition and Modernity Reconsidered,” Comparative Studies in Society and History 9 (1967): 292-346.

³The notion that “modernity is not one, but many” is explored in Dilip Parameshwar Gaonkar’s “On Alternative Modernities,” as well as the other essays in Gaonkar’s edited volume Alternative Modernities (2001). In historical sociology, Paul Gilroy’s contribution to a vision of “alternative modernities” has been particularly influential, especially his The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness (1993). See the section below on “World Systems, Postcoloniality, and Remapping the World after the Second Wave.”

⁴Karl Polanyi, The Great Transformation (Boston, MA: Beacon, 1957 [1944]).

⁵There are of course multiple lines of theory that can be identified in the sociological canon, and multiple readings of theorists. And people change. The Durkheim of The Division of Labor in Society was closer to the stylized evolutionary models of Auguste Comte and Herbert Spencer than was the Durkheim of the Moral Education, especially

modernity was understood varied, of course: it might involve the rise of capitalism and class-structured actors, as in Marx; the formation of the disciplined bourgeois subject and his confinement in the iron cage of rationalized collective life, as in Weber; the twinned inventions of Enlightenment individualism and a new order of racial subordination, as in DuBois, or still other broad evolutionary visions.⁶ The proposed mechanisms of change were framed differently as well, whether in terms of political revolutions; the growth of the division of labor; colonialism and empire; pressures to manage the manifold anxieties of the self; opportunities for group cultural distinction, and so on. Yet within this diverse intellectual landscape, social theorists converged on a fundamentally historical project.

Sociological theory, however, has been marked by striking shifts in just how it has attended to history. As sociology was institutionalized in this century, particularly as it took shape in the United States, this historically-informed theoretical vision gave way to more ahistorical models of social and cultural change.⁷ Structural-functionalism and other allied approaches invoked highly general and abstracted characteristics, processes or sequences while claiming to explain change over time. These approaches paid little or no attention to the temporally-bound logics of particular social and cultural configurations. Moreover, they lacked an emphasis on critical turning points, and tended to assume that many constituent and possibly disjoint processes could be coherently collapsed or fused under one general and rather vague heading – “modernization.” Ironically, these approaches either deployed the concepts of “modern,” “modernity” and “modernization” in unreflective ways, with minimal explicit substantive content, or aligned the “modern” with a roster of associated static concepts.⁸ Yet by the 1970s and 1980s, these ahistorical approaches served as the foil for a resurgence of historical inquiry. Of course this arid, desert background is partly fictive. A certain reading of one master theorist, Talcott Parsons, came to stand for, to signify, a broader and more complicated intermediary epoch. Intellectual lineages are constructed out of many materials, including people’s desire to claim forebears who will lend them academic credibility; the dynamics of disciplinary competition and collaboration, and authors’ conscious and unconscious desires and identifications (Bloom 1997; Camic 1992; Gieryn 1995; Latour and Woolgar 1979). We all interpret our predecessors, polishing some and vilifying others.⁹ Nevertheless we think the general point still stands. The mid-20th century was the apex of presentism in U.S. sociology as well as the moment of highest confidence in modernity.

in his analysis of the reciprocal relationship between the modern state and the category of the individual.

⁶While “modernism” generally designates an aesthetic movement, coined in 1890 by a Nicaraguan poet Ruben Dario (Anderson 1998: 3), “modernity” is a messier congeries of categories with Wittgensteinian family resemblances. See below for further discussion of this point.

⁷For the provenance of those ahistorical models, see George Steinmetz’s essay in this volume.

⁸See for example Talcott Parsons, Societies: Evolutionary and Comparative Perspectives (Engelwood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1966). Parsons actually oscillated among different ways of melding history and sociology. In the System of Modern Societies, for example, he is at times carefully historical in his claims in what is a “directional” argument that explicitly seeks to update Weber (1971: 139). At other points the historical materials are awkwardly subordinated to an overly-abstracted taxonomic impulse. See David Zaret, “From Max Weber to Parsons and Schutz: The Eclipse of History in Modern Social Theory,” American Journal of Sociology 85 (1980): 1180-1201.

⁹“Every forgotten precursor becomes a giant of the imagination. Total repression would be health, but only a god is capable of it.” (Harold Bloom. The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997 [1973]: 107). Too bad – it would save on footnotes.

Luckily, not all sociologists in the United States – and sociologists working in the U.S. were the most enthusiastically encamped in this presentist desert – were captured by modernization theory or its more sophisticated cousin structural-functionalism, even in their palmiest days. One immediately thinks of Barrington Moore Jr., Reinhard Bendix, Seymour Martin Lipset or the early work of Charles Tilly among others.¹⁰ They were in dialogue both with like-minded scholars outside the United States, and with colleagues from more presentist persuasions.¹¹ Thus there were always a few engaged by fundamentally historical questions, particularly with respect to politics and political transformations. Their work nourished the next generation of historical sociologists – a “second wave” of the 1970s and 1980s – and helped inspire programmatic calls for a return to historical inquiry.¹² The “second wave”¹³ was a “theory group” and a system of signs bound together by continuing engagement with questions

¹⁰See Seymour Martin Lipset, Agrarian Socialism: The Coöperative Commonwealth Federation in Saskatchewan (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1950) and The First New Nation: The United States in Historical and Comparative Perspective (New York: Basic Books, 1963); Barrington Moore, Jr., Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy: Lord and Peasant in the Making of the Modern World (Boston: Beacon Press, 1966); Charles Tilly, The Vendee (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1964). Among Bendix’s many writings, see, for example, Nation-Building and Citizenship (New York: Wiley, 1964). Robert King Merton’s Science, Technology and Society in Seventeenth-Century England (New York: H. Fertig, 1970), was originally published in Belgium in 1938.

¹¹In different ways, some of Lipset’s work, as well as Robert Neely Bellah’s Tokugawa Religion: Cultural Roots of Modern Japan (Glencoe, IL: Free Press, 1957); Neil Smelser’s Social Change in the Industrial Revolution. An Application of Theory to the British Cotton Industry (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1959); and S. N. Eisenstadt’s The Political System of Empires (Glencoe, IL: Free Press, 1963) attempted more or less successfully (opinion is still divided!) to bridge the perceived gap between the exigencies of doing justice to history and mapping structural-functionalist taxonomies. For a negative evaluation, consult Michael Anderson’s Family Structure in Nineteenth Century Lancashire (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971). Yet what is often forgotten is just how “historical” these works were in the context of prevailing sociological practice.

¹² See, for example, Phillip Abrams, Historical Sociology (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1982); Peter Burke, Sociology and History (Boston: Allen & Unwin, 1980); Theda Skocpol, “Sociology’s Historical Imagination,” pp.1-21 in T. Skocpol, ed., Vision and Method in Historical Sociology (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1984); Raymond Grew, “The Case for Comparing Histories,” The American Historical Review 85 #4 (October 1980): 763-778; Arthur Stinchcombe, Theoretical Methods in Social History (New York: Academic Press, 1978); Charles Tilly, Big Structures, Large Processes, Huge Comparisons (New York: Russell Sage, 1984) and As Sociology Meets History (New York: Academic Press, 1981).

¹³We are not the first to use the terminology of “waves” when describing the development of historical sociology. In The Rise of Historical Sociology, Dennis Smith discusses two (long) “waves” of historical sociology, the first comprising writers who now occupy the canon of the discipline (including Tocqueville, Marx, Durkheim and Weber) and the second partially overlapping what we are calling the second wave. Smith divides the second wave into three “phases,” encompassing the scholars who carried the torch of history in sociology during the ahistorical dominance of structural functionalism, and those who we identify as leading the resurgence of historical sociology in the late 1970s and 1980s; he also identifies a “third phase” (“partially overlapping” the second phase of the second wave) which comprises scholars he sees as responding to the conservative political shifts of the 1980s and the decline of Marxism. We find it more useful to classify these latter two groups together, for they share theoretical and methodological proclivities which divide them from more recent scholars. Written in 1991, Smith’s book could not have commented on more recent intellectual developments in historical sociology, such as the influence of rational choice theory or the cultural turns. Rather, his work described the intellectual contributions of various key second-wave scholars’ major works. It does not address – as we do – the theoretical contradictions which helped to create challenges to this work. From the vantage point of 2003, the movement that was still “young” at Smith’s writing has consolidated and begun to break up, as we discuss further below, producing rebellious intellectual progeny who may or may not come to share a single paradigm. Dennis Smith, The Rise of Historical Sociology. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991.

inspired by Marxism.¹⁴ It was also a social movement. (The sense of a movement was nourished both by interdisciplinary activity and by the spread of historical methods to a large number of core sociological topics, and perhaps also by the influence of historians of, for example, the Annales school, who had earlier borrowed social scientific concepts and orientations.) This is not to say everyone was then a Marxist, but that even those who were not debated on largely Marxist terrain. Indeed, most of the best-known works of the comparative-historical renaissance of the 1970s and early 1980s – even those that did not explicitly embrace a Marxist theoretical stance – take off from puzzles within the Marxian tradition to which Marxism itself could not provide satisfactory answers. To resolve these puzzles, analysts had to draw on intuitions and concepts from other theoretical traditions.

Any such characterization necessarily simplifies along two lines. First, many of those who contributed to the consolidation of the initial resurgence of historical sociology have continued to grapple with the new intellectual currents that challenge contemporary work.¹⁵ They have moved on after having created (and surfed) the second wave. For example, Charles Tilly is now engaged in the lively interdisciplinary work on “social mechanisms,” Theda Skocpol moved from revolutions to the emergence of the U.S. welfare state, in the process making a major contribution to the understanding of gendered politics and institutions, and Craig Calhoun has emerged as one of the leading voices of the cultural turn.¹⁶ The analytic contribution of a scholar in a field at one time does not exhaust her or his intellectual persona. Second, although the second wave was a broad, eclectic movement, sheltering a variety of actors who contributed to the resurgence of theoretically-informed history in sociology and allied disciplines, it was quickly typecast in terms of some of its members, and only some of their ideas. The canonical second wave was a system of signs as well as a movement of actors, and macroscopic, comparative scholars of revolution, state building, class formation became the synecdochal representative of the whole. Why should this have been so? First, the macro-political sociologists put forward programmatic statements and self-consciously forwarded historical approaches against the prevailing orthodoxy (see Abbott 2001, chapter 4). They also had a well-defined theoretical agenda which put them in dialogue with thriving marxist-inspired debates across history, anthropology and (to some extent) political science. And let us not forget the *Zeitgeist*, and the worldwide audience for radical politics and Marxist theory.

¹⁴We believe that the “second wave” was not primarily a generation of Young Turks engaged in the recurring ritual of overthrowing its academic predecessors (as, for example, Andrew Abbott’s witty *Chaos of Disciplines* [2001, 23-25] would have it), although surely Abbott is right to argue that the dynamic helped constitute it as an intellectual formation. *Chaos* links this to a broader argument regarding the fractal patterns of sociological knowledge. See also Craig Calhoun, “The Rise and Domestication of Historical Sociology,” in *The Historic Turn in the Human Sciences*, Terrence J. McDonald, ed. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996, 306-7. The general concept of a “theory group” derives from Nicholas C. Mullins, with the assistance of Carolyn J. Mullins. *Theories and Theory Groups in Contemporary American Sociology*. New York, New York: Harper and Row, 1973.

¹⁵Most commentators on this era of scholarship underline the generational character of the movement. Yet age alone does not determine membership in any “wave.” Senior scholars as well as precocious PhDs-in-the-making took part in the second wave resurgence, while we find among the *students* of the second wave “delayed” PhDs, some of the contributors to the present volume included, who took time out from academia to participate in 1970s politics before completing their degrees. Thus someone’s graduate school cohort might be one proxy for her or his “risk of participating” in various waves – but not a perfect one.

¹⁶Craig J. Calhoun, *Critical Social Theory: Culture, History and the Challenge of Difference* (Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1995); Theda Skocpol, *Protecting Soldiers and Mothers: The Political Origins of Social Policy in the United States* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1992); Charles Tilly, *Durable Inequality* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1998).

Those who worked on key intellectual questions that intersected with that theoretical formation were most likely to be seen as central.

In what follows, we walk an analytic tightrope. We discuss the second wave in terms of its canonical version, which came to represent comparative historical sociology in the academic eye. But we will also insist that during the very period of its ascendancy in the 1970s and early 1980s, a number of historical sociologists were publishing important research that fell outside the hegemonic analytic framework. One might instance Andrew Abbott, Charles Camic, David Zaret, Viviana Zelizer among others.¹⁷ One of the nicer ironies of the present moment – reflected in many of the chapters that follow – resides in the ongoing rediscovery of some of the substantive contributions of these and other iconoclastic historical sociologists, some of whose work was marginalized during the moment of canonical second wave dominance, and some of which represented the leading wedge that helped explode it.

As an emerging paradigm, then, second wave historical sociology was defined by a shared set of commitments: a substantive interest in political economy centered on questions of class formation, industrialization, and revolution along with a (usually implicit) utilitarian model of the actor. While motivating a forceful line of inquiry into the transformations associated with modernity, these core assumptions reproduced many of the exclusions and repressions of modernist social theory. Certain subjects – in the double sense of both topics and actors – tended to be marginalized or excluded: colonial peoples, women, and groups that we would now call people of color and queers. The analytic dimensions of gender, sexuality, race, and nation were downplayed in parallel fashion. Moreover, culture, emotion, religion, the informal aspects of organization and more were repressed by the powerful political-economic analytic framework undergirding the resurgence of historical sociology. And, in proper dialectic form, they returned. In the process, recent scholarship has greatly enriched historical sociology while shredding many of the core assumptions of second wave scholarship.

Take, for example, the combination of structural determination and the utilitarian model of action that informs canonical second-wave analyses of the influence of economic position on political action. This double reductionism has been questioned as attention to culture and identity has unearthed the complex and contingent ways in which selves and discursive positions are formed. So what count as key substantive elements of “structure” or psyche is analytically open, and getting more open all the time.¹⁸ The once-robust combination of structural determination and comparative methods is also deeply contested. Thinking historically, it is increasingly acknowledged, undermines comparative strategies that isolate distinct events in an empty “experimental time.”¹⁹ Some see salvation for explanatory claims in

¹⁷See for example Andrew Abbott, “Sequences of Social Events” (Historical Methods 16: 129-47, 1983); Charles Camic, Experience and Enlightenment: Socialization for Cultural Change in Eighteenth-century Scotland (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983); David Zaret, The Heavenly Contract: Ideology and Organization in Pre-revolutionary Puritanism (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984); Viviana Zelizer, Morals and Markets: The Development of Life Insurance in the United States (New York: Columbia University Press, 1979).

¹⁸We will have more to say about this below, and about the vigorous rational-choice theoretic counter-attack, which replaces the implicit rational-actor assumptions of earlier work with a much more explicit and sophisticated utilitarianism.

¹⁹See for example Andrew Abbott, Time Matters: Theory and Method (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2001); Michael Burawoy, “Two Methods in Search of Science: Skocpol versus Trotsky.” Theory and Society 18 (1989): 759-805; Philip McMichael, “Incorporating Comparison within a World-Historical Perspective,” American

terms of “mechanisms” that may be identified across diverse temporal and social settings.²⁰ Others pin their hopes on a more thoroughgoing reconstruction of sociology’s own categories of analysis, now themselves under the historicizing microscope.²¹ The latter approach owes something to post-structuralism and post-modernist critiques of Enlightenment universalism and the grand narratives of modern historical development, including those deployed by sociologists. Some sociologists have drawn on this postmodern repertoire to destabilize organizing imageries of progress and modernity in productive ways. But because these organizing imageries are constitutive of our discipline, post-modernist and post-structuralist modes of thought are anathema to many sociologists, including the many historical sociologists who get twitchy when they see the very ideas of progressive social and cultural change being put into question. Thus a congeries of lively debates and oppositions -- sometimes friendly, sometimes antagonistic -- have replaced the relatively cohesive theory group that initially reestablished historical sociology in professional associations, streams of syllabi and publications.

There is a great deal of legitimate uncertainty about what sort of claims can be made and sustained at this juncture. The open-endedness and fragmentation of the present academic moment evokes intellectual anxiety, over-determined by the epochal events of 1989 and the subsequent revitalization of liberalism, the vagaries of globalization, fundamental challenges to the order of nation-states, and the collapse of Marxism as a mode of imagining a future beyond capitalist modernity. If, as Abrams argued, a fully historicized sociology explores the construction of futures out of pasts, recent events shift figure and ground in our understanding of trajectories of social change. The present problematizes the past in new and challenging ways. Yet we also see grounds for hope: a new intellectual openness associated with this unsettled moment, a willingness to forsake old antagonisms and to experiment with new ways of thinking sociologically and historically, while drawing on the theoretical and analytical resources bequeathed by the sociological pioneers, our predecessors and their critics. We see this moment as an opportunity to examine some crucial questions: Is there a distinctive theoretical project (or projects plural) for historical sociology in informing approaches to social and cultural transformation? What are we to make of the irony that the programmatic calls for a more historical sociology have inspired much better sociological history and rather less consensus on theory? To what extent can newer varieties of historical sociology contribute to a reconsideration, perhaps a reconstruction, of theories of social and cultural change, and of modernity or modernities?

Sociological Review 55 (1990): 385-397; William G. Roy, “Time, Place, and People in History and Sociology: Boundary Definitions and the Logic of Inquiry,” Social Science History 11(1987): 53-62; James Mahoney, “Nominal, Ordinal, and Narrative Appraisal in Macrocausal Analysis,” American Journal of Sociology 104(1999): 1154-1196; Lynette Spillman, “Causal Reasoning, Historical Logic, and Sociological Explanation,” in Jeff Alexander, Gary Marx, and Christine Williams, eds. Self, Social Structure, and Beliefs: Explorations in the Sociological Thought of Neil J. Smelser (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2002).

²⁰Doug McAdam, Sidney Tarrow and Charles Tilly offer one definition of “mechanism”: “Mechanisms are a delimited class of events that alter relations among specified sets of elements in identical or closely similar ways over a variety of situations” (McAdam, Tarrow and Tilly, Dynamics of Contention, New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2001: 24). See also Peter Hedström and Richard Swedberg, eds., Social Mechanisms: An Analytical Approach to Social Theory (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998). See also Arthur Stinchcombe in “The Conditions of Fruitfulness of Theorizing about Mechanisms in Social Science” (Philosophy of the Social Sciences 21 #3 (September): 367-87). As a social science signifier, “mechanism” is fast becoming as messy and capacious as “modernity.”

²¹Craig Calhoun, “Domestication of Historical Sociology,” pp.306, 313 (see footnote 4).

These are hard questions, but tackling them will propel sociological and cross-disciplinary conversations about social theory. No one person can successfully address them, and no one approach will do. We gathered a diverse group of sociologists, first at a conference and then as contributors to this volume, to assess the accomplishments of the resurgence of historical inquiry and to peer into the future, delineating the challenges to come. We editors made certain choices, among several possible strategies, in assembling the group. We chose to limit ourselves to sociologists currently working in the U.S. (although some in the group originally hail from other countries). This decision wasn't just a matter of money! Historical sociology, as international as it was and is, has clearly had its own history in the American academy; the concept of "historical sociology" itself was adopted most enthusiastically in the United States, for reasons including the "brain drain" of historical sociologists to the U.S. from abroad.²²

We deliberately included people who reflect a wide range of theoretical orientations and a broad spectrum of understandings of what constitutes historical sociology. Some would sign onto what Craig Calhoun calls a minimalist list of inherent historical sociological objects: "rare but important sociological phenomena (e.g., revolutions); critical cases – particular events or cases which bear on theory, or have intrinsic interest (e.g., Japanese capitalism); phenomena that occur over extended period of time (e.g., industrialization, state formation, creation of "modern" family forms); phenomena for which changing historical context is a major set of explanatory variables (e.g., changing international trade opportunities, political pressures, technologies shape the conditions for economic development)" (Calhoun 1996: 313-14). Other members of our group still understand historical sociology as it was defined by Theda Skocpol in Vision and Method: works that "ask questions about social structures or processes understood to be concretely situated in time and space ... address processes over time, and take temporal sequences seriously in accounting for outcomes ... attend to the interplay of meaningful actions and structural contexts, in order to make sense of the unfolding of unintended as well as intended outcomes in individual lives and social transformations ... [and] highlight the *particular* and *varying* features of specific kinds of social structures and patterns of change [author's emphasis]" (Skocpol 1984: 1). And still others would insist that even this is too limiting a frame, and that the rightful province of historical sociology is the "problematic of structuring" – and therefore all of history and sociology. Here is Phillip Abrams again: "Sociology must be concerned with eventuation, because that is how structuring happens. History must be theoretical, because that is how structuring is apprehended." (1982: p. x) We aren't fully satisfied with any of these definitions. But since what historical sociology *is* is now sharply contested, we sought to reflect rather than constrain the diversity of understandings.²³

We editors also elected to bring together sociologists, rather than a cross-disciplinary group. This may at first seem surprising. Historical sociologists are enthusiastically interdisciplinary. In examining any particular historical event or transformation, our own work – and that of all the contributors – has been deeply engaged in conversations with historians, political scientists, literary theorists, economists

²²In his "They Do Things Differently There, Or, The Contribution of British Historical Sociology" (The British Journal of Sociology 40 #4, December 1989: 544-564), for example, John A. Hall describes the lineage of British historical sociology and laments the impact of the "brain drain" of historical sociologists from Britain to the United States (p. 564).

²³For that reason, we editors invited members of our own mid-career and younger cohorts, rather than scholars who were originally the leading lights of the official or unofficial second wave. We expected this decision to create a conversation that was freer from people's (including our own) stock assumptions about representative figures and canonical intellectual positions. The intention was not to create or police new intellectual boundaries, but to take collective temperatures and open further space for thought, discussion and action. As should be obvious, the scholars assembled in this book compose a loose and contingent coalition rather than a theory group.

and anthropologists. And we recognize that the “historic turn,” or the move to historicize social inquiry, is decidedly a cross-disciplinary project.²⁴ The contributors to this volume are joining with a broad range of scholars responding to the classics of social theory, and to the problems of modernity, post-modernity or alternative modernities, however understood. Political theorists interrogate the classical canon for its textual silences or rhetorics; ethnographers in the “new ethnography” incorporate the situated nature of anthropology and sociology in the construction of the distinction, still alive and kicking, between the “modern” self and the “traditional” other, to cope with problems of power and modernity.²⁵ Sociologists have much in common with these categories or groups of scholars, but they also make distinctive contributions. Those of us who pursue a historicized sociology can tackle the processes conventionally grouped under the heading of “transitions to capitalist modernity” on empirical as well as theoretical ground. Of course, historical sociology is about not only the past, but also the ways in which the past shapes the present and future, inviting our remaking of modernist social analysis and the concept of modernity itself, which has significant disciplinary specificities. So perhaps we even have an intellectual responsibility, born of our middleman position, both to our own discipline and to others.

Disciplines – like any structure – provide both distinctive constraints and capacities embedded in theoretical and methodological orientations, transmitted through graduate education, hiring, the tenure process, and the gate-keeping of fellowship, research proposal and manuscript review. We can illustrate this point with reference to the treatment of “race” in U.S. historical sociology versus historical political science.²⁶ Why is it that historical work foregrounding race and ethnicity has been less typically found among the most-cited works of historical sociology, while it has been central to studies of American political development, a core constituency in historical political science? In the historical study of American politics, the problems of race, slavery and political freedom have loomed large, motivated both by the foundational position of liberalism in political theory and the national crisis of the Civil War. Given these theoretical and empirical foci, work on race could not be so easily marginalized. Yet in historical sociology, “race” has been one of the areas of scholarship that had to be “brought back in” in the current period (although work on racial formations and identities was flourishing in other areas of sociology). Key programmatic statements of historical sociology explicitly mention “race” as a keyword in the survey of current literature; for example, Skocpol’s Vision and Method includes in its survey,

²⁴See Terrence J. McDonald, ed. The Historic Turn in the Human Sciences (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1996).

²⁵ See, for example, Joan Landes, Women and the Public Sphere in the Age of the French Revolution (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1988); Linda Zerilli, Signifying Woman: Culture and Chaos in Rousseau, Burke, and Mill (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1994). See Stephen Tyler, “Post-Modern Ethnography: From Document of the Occult to Occult Document,” in Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography, James Clifford and George E. Marcus, eds. (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1986). Post-modern ethnography converges in interesting ways with “the extended case method” forwarded in sociology by Michael Burawoy and his students. See Michael Burawoy, Ethnography Unbound: Power and Resistance in the Modern Metropolis (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991) and Global Ethnography: Forces, Connections, and Imaginations in a Postmodern World (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000).

²⁶ We are grateful to Ira Katznelson and John Lie for helpful discussions on this issue.

among others, Orlando Patterson's work on slavery.²⁷ Yet the analysis of race was sidelined by the second wave's orientation to Marxian questions about the transition to capitalism, revolution, class conflict and the state in modern Europe. The larger point is that disciplinary specificity still matters. Trans-disciplinary intellectual projects – the historic, linguistic, or cultural turns, gender studies, Marxism, rational choice theory – attempt to reform or revolutionize knowledge and academic practices across these boundaries, yet their success will be reflected in their penetration of disciplinary canons and graduate training practices, and this requires engagement with the substantive, methodological and theoretical particularities of each discipline.

Sociology is also a symptomatic site where people from a variety of disciplines can get a bird's-eye view of processes of paradigm formation, contention and implosion. Historical sociology in particular lies at the crossroads of current intersecting trends in knowledges that touch all the social science disciplines – the rise of cultural analysis, neo-positivism, the revival of the mechanism metaphor, to name but a few. Other disciplines have experienced some of these developments, of course, but not simultaneously; political science has witnessed the juggernaut of rational-choice theory, while culturalist trends are almost entirely absent outside the subfields of political theory and constructionist international relations. Anthropology and history, on the other hand, have been most influenced by culturalist and poststructuralist trends, and have proved inhospitable to rational choice approaches. But all of these orientations are well-represented in sociology – and their representatives are fighting over claims to define the overall disciplinary field. Readers from many points in this range of contending perspectives, and from the other disciplines, should be interested in how these debates are progressing in the discipline where the alternative perspectives are most directly contending.

Finally, our group has given substantive pride of place to politics, broadly understood to include not simply forms of authoritative sovereign power but much of what, since Michel Foucault burst on the American academic scene, has come to be thought of as disciplinary power dispersed throughout the social landscape. The political focus has enabled participants to respond to a central legacy of historical sociology, while at the same time broadening its concerns in light of the developments we signaled above. In their essays for Remaking Modernity, the authors have engaged a range of analytic strategies and/or theoretical models in light of more recent sociological research on a process or dimension of historical change. In some cases, there is an obvious continuity between classical theory and contemporary research. Given that secularization – including the changing institutional relations between church and state and the making of a “bourgeois” and secular self – was identified by Max Weber and others as an important aspect of modernity, for example, how do these claims and assumptions inform recent research? How is current work revealing the limits of these claims and theories? For other themes, the redefinition of key processes is critical. State formation, the transition to capitalism and professionalization were originally theorized as European phenomena, so what happens when we widen our frame to take in post-socialist, colonial or post-colonial states as well? Finally, for some topics, the absence of attention in classical theory is an important feature: how should we reconceptualize theories of social and cultural change in light of research on race, gender, sexuality, nation and other concepts that were marginalized -- or simply unknown -- in earlier theoretical debates?

²⁷Theda Skocpol, “Emerging Agendas and Recurrent Strategies in Historical Sociology,” pp. 356-391 in Vision and Method, ed. Theda Skocpol. This particular citation is from p. 358 of Orlando Patterson, Slavery and Social Death: A Comparative Study. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990.

We think about these revisions and reformulations under the general heading of “remaking modernity.” The Oxford English Dictionary defines *modern* as “of or pertaining to the present and recent times, as distinguished from the remote past.” To be modern is to be in the now and (if the metaphor still has life in it) at the cutting edge of history. The concept remains eternally fresh because it is a moving index. It points to everything – and nothing. In the face of such slipperiness, the authors in this book have gravitated toward alternative responses. Some of our contributors try to endow “modernity” with fixed referential content that can be defended as a platform for generalization and explanation, usually with “capitalism” or “industrialism” at the conceptual and causal core.²⁸ “As Max Weber observed,” say Michael Lowy and Robert Sayre, “the principal characteristics of modernity – the calculating spirit (*Rechnenhaftigkeit*), the disenchantment of the world (*Entzauberung der Welt*), instrumental rationality (*Zweckrationalitat*), and bureaucratic domination – are inseparable from the advent of the ‘spirit of capitalism.’”²⁹ Others who want a stable and univocal definition gesture toward Marx, whether modernity is taken to signal “the cultural articulations that accompany processes of capital accumulation” (Pred and Watts 1992: xiii) or a “mode of vital experience – experience of space and time, of the self and others, of life’s possibilities and perils – that is shared by men and women all over the world today....To be modern is to be part of a universe in which, as Marx said, ‘all that is solid melts into air.’”³⁰ These various approaches may or may not be compatible: the arguments over problems and affiliated research are ongoing, and readers must judge.

Alternatively, one could abandon the whole family of concepts – modern, modernity, etc. – as social science concepts.³¹ This we think would be a mistake, if it’s even possible. We editors would advocate approaching “modernity” as a conceptually unstable historical concept. Our definitions should capture both people’s changing ideas of what is or isn’t modern (or traditional, or backward, or postmodern) and the valences of emotion and moral judgment that these mappings assume in varieties of discourse and institutions. Historical sociologists would be wise to at least think about why, in today’s world, the idea of the modern (and its associated practices) is invested with such desires and hatreds, and has such political force – and to do that, we need to better understand it.

²⁸“At its simplest, modernity is a shorthand term for modern society or industrial civilization,” p. 94 in Anthony Giddens and Christopher Pierson, *Conversations with Anthony Giddens* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1998).

²⁹Michael Lowy and Robert Sayre, *Romanticism Against the Tide of Modernity* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2001: 18).

³⁰Marshall Berman, *All That Is Solid Melts Into Air: The Experience of Modernity* (New York: Viking Penguin, 1976: p. 15).

³¹In a sharp and amusing broadside, Alan Knight writes that “modernity” is one of “a series of buzzwords that populate the new cultural history like drones in a hive...”; one of many redundant tropes that “take up space and claim attention out of all proportion to their semantic contribution” (Knight, “Subalterns, Signifiers, and Statistics: Perspectives on Mexican Historiography,” *Latin American Research Review* 37 #2, 2002: 149, 149 n. 10). But Knight greatly underestimates the extent to which the concept is unreflectively implanted in social science of all stripes. For one example, see Ronald Inglehart and Wayne E. Baker, “Modernization, Cultural Change, and the Persistence of Traditional Values,” *American Sociological Review* 65 #1 (2000): 19-51.

The theme of “remaking modernity” is far too grand to approach as an integrated totality; we do not want to reinstate a grand narrative of the present day, a new Key to All Mythologies³² that the very terms modernity and post-modernity may seem to invite. And in fact the contributors to this volume differ on many important questions -- together, they represent a range of responses rather than a single consolidated position. But we do imagine that our still-separate revisions will clarify our collective understanding of what is at stake in debates about modernity and post-modernity, perhaps even lead to a better grasp of what is entailed in fashionable claims that alternative or distinct modernities are possible, if they do not already exist. We see these questions and concerns as crucial not only for historical sociology but for the fabric of our discipline – and for the human sciences more generally.

The Second Wave and the Reappropriation of the Classics

In justifying their turn to history, the second wave latched onto the classics in a very particular way. The disciplinary canon with which they operated, filtered through Talcott Parsons, had enshrined Weber, Durkheim and latterly Marx as the major scholars of reference.³³ Second wave scholars wanted to bring to the fore class inequality, power and the conflicts these engendered, and Marx became the most important figure for them, as they cast themselves as the leading protagonists against the postulates of modernization theory, particularly the claim that all paths of development led from the “traditional” to the “modern.”³⁴ From Marx they took their emphases on the importance of the “material” (understood as separate from and determinative of the “ideal”) modes of production, class conflict as the basis of politics and the motor of history. The history that the second wavers drew out was one of conflict, particularly of class conflict, expropriation and bloody oppression. It was also one that was built around the tendential development of social structures and epochal transitions.³⁵ It is important to note that their Marx was leavened with an emphasis on elements of Weber’s writings, as we will see below, and laced with a strong refusal of Durkheim, who was understood as the patron saint of the twin evils of cultural values and structural functionalism.³⁶

The second wave – memorably described as an “uppity generation” by Theda Skocpol --

³²George Eliot. Middlemarch (New York, NY: Penguin, 1994).

³³Talcott Parsons, The Structure of Social Action, 2 vols.(New York: The Free Press, 1937). Marx was classified as a utilitarian in Structure, and therefore received short shrift.

³⁴ For example, Charles Tilly, the editor of The Formation of National States in Western Europe (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1975), the final volume in Princeton University Press’s “Studies in Political Development” series (under the leadership of Lucien Pye), used the volume to critique the argument of the preceding seven volumes and of the whole “political development” project.

³⁵ “Marxism is one of the theories most attuned to the need to specify clear breaks between epochs and to develop historically specific conceptual tools for understanding each.” Craig Calhoun, “ The Rise and Domestication of Historical Sociology,” p.322 (see footnote 4).

³⁶Charles Tilly, From Mobilization to Revolution (Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Pub. Co., 1978).

consigned modernization theory and structural-functionalism to the dustbin of intellectual history.³⁷ The radical political movements of the 1960s and 1970s had inspired many students to go on to graduate study, where they linked their political concerns to intellectual questions, and found guidance from that historically-inclined minority of senior scholars even as they rebelled against their more presentist colleagues. In sociology, Andrew Abbott notes that rebellious impulses helped to direct many younger sociologists to *historical* approaches, which allowed criticism of two then-dominant tendencies: Parsonian functionalism and atheoretical and ahistorical empirical work.

Theoretically, historical sociology was for them a way to attack the Parsonian framework on its weakest front—its approach to social change—and a way to bring Marx into sociology. Methodologically, historical sociology damned the status attainment model for its micro focus, its antihistorical and antistructural character, its reifications, its scientism.³⁸

Ensuing sociological debates arrayed second wave scholars against more orthodox Marxists of various complexions. Second wavers, who tended to prefer an eclectic theoretical approach, were nevertheless powerfully pulled into the current of the Marxist problematic.³⁹ Modes of production were the basic units of comparison, and transitions from one mode to another marked the significant historical transformations – that which was to be explained. Wallerstein’s world-systems theory, castigated as shockingly “circulationist” by many Marxists at the time, can in retrospect be seen as a close cousin and *marxisant* variant.⁴⁰ Scholars of the second wave found this broad tradition of work useful, but thought that it discouraged comparative work to explain variation across regions, countries, cities and other sites within the same mode of production or position within the world system. Even more problematically, it

³⁷Theda Skocpol, “An ‘Uppity Generation’ and the Revitalization of Macroscopic Sociology.” Theory and Society 17 (1988): 627-643. Unfortunately, this meant that the big phenomena that modernization theorists had tried to explain -- such as totalitarianism, or the relatively uniform rise of education, urbanization or democracy – disappeared from most second-wave scholarship. (We are grateful to Arthur Stinchcombe for helpful discussion of this point.) As we will see below, this disappearance set up opportunities for historically-oriented scholars – particularly John Meyer and his students – to retrieve these issues in the 1990s.

³⁸Andrew Abbott, Chaos of Disciplines. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001, p.94. Craig Calhoun, in “The Rise and Domestication of Historical Sociology,” p. 305, sees the battle with the quantitative empiricists as having been thrust upon the historical sociologists when the “dominant quantitative, scientific branch of the discipline dismissed their work as dangerously ‘idiographic,’ excessively political, and in any case somehow not quite ‘real’ sociology.” In any event, historicity split this intellectual movement from then-dominant forces.

³⁹Structuralist Marxism of the 1970s engaged in attempts to understand contemporary class structures (e.g., the work of Erik Olin Wright), state forms (e.g., Nicos Poulantzas) and ideological structures (e.g. Louis Althusser, Goran Therborn). See Erik Olin Wright and Luca Perrone, “Marxist Class Categories and Income Inequality,” American Sociological Review 42(1977):32-55; Erik Wright, Cynthia Costello, David Hachen, and Joey Sprague, “The American Class Structure,” American Sociological Review 47(1982):709-726; Louis Althusser, “Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses,” Lenin and Philosophy; Nicos Poulantzas, Political Power and Social Classes (London: Verso, 1973); Goran Therborn, The Ideology of Power and the Power of Ideology (London: New Left Books, 1980).

⁴⁰Immanuel Wallerstein, The Modern World System I: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World Economy in the Sixteenth Century (New York: Academic Press, 1974). By “circulationist,” insiders of the day meant market-based rather than the more orthodox production-focused orientation.

tended to consign history to the realm of the singular and idiographic, grist for the nomothetic mill of Marxist theory.⁴¹ Still, while second wave historical sociologists in the American academy appreciated Marx's *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* for the prominent role it awarded politics in nineteenth-century France, and excavated it as a meaty source of aphorisms on history as tragedy and farce, they had yet to appreciate its full potential as a source of anti-structuralist and cultural analysis.⁴²

The questions posed by the Second Wave derived from a Marxist theoretical agenda; their answers pushed beyond. The question of why revolutions didn't happen how and where Marxists expected them animated exciting work by authors including Theda Skocpol, who drew on the Weberian tradition in her discussion of the "great revolutions" of France, Russia and China, and Mark Gould, who recruited Parsonian theory in his work on the English Revolution.⁴³ Immanuel Wallerstein worried about why socialism could not succeed in one country, and if his "one world system" answer was novel, it was certainly addressed to an ongoing preoccupation of the Marxian tradition.⁴⁴ A different sort of challenge to Marxist thinking on states which also deployed the idea of a (cultural) system of states emerged from the collaborative work of John Meyer, Michael Hannan, George Thomas, Francisco Ramirez and John Boli.⁴⁵ Ronald Aminzade, Victoria Bonnell, Craig Calhoun, Jeffery Paige, Sonya Rose, William Sewell,

⁴¹In their now-canonical second wave article, Skocpol and Somers argued that this was similar to the way in which Neil Smelser had deployed history to illustrate modernization theory in *Social Change in the Industrial Revolution* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1959). See Theda Skocpol and Margaret Somers, "The Uses of Comparative History in Macrosocial Inquiry," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 22(1980):174-197. However, Smelser's choice of topic was itself a form of resistance to Parsons' mentoring.

⁴²Karl Marx, *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* (New York: International Publishers, 1973 [first printed as a book in 1869, printed as a series in the journal *Die revolution* in 1852]). Meanwhile, Stuart Hall was working through *The Eighteenth Brumaire* in exactly that kind of way. See his "Rethinking the 'Base-Superstructure' Metaphor," in Jon Bloomfield (ed.), *Class, Hegemony and Party* (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1977), pp. 43-72. It took a long time for Hall's work to reach historical sociologists working in the United States – another index of the uneven and nationally-specific rhythms of intellectual diffusion.

⁴³ Theda Skocpol, *States and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia, and China* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1979); Mark Gould, *Revolution in the Development of Capitalism: The Coming of the English Revolution* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987). See also Ellen Kay Trimberger's *Revolution From Above: Military Bureaucrats and Development in Japan, Turkey, Egypt, and Peru* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books, 1978). Maurice Zeitlin crafted a perfect, and perfectly symptomatic, second wave title. See his *The Civil Wars in Chile, or, The Bourgeois Revolutions that Never Were* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1984).

⁴⁴Wallerstein, *Modern World System*.

⁴⁵ George Thomas, John W. Meyer, Francisco O. Ramirez, and John Boli, *Institutional Structure: Constituting State, Society, and the Individual* (Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1987); John W. Meyer

Jr., Mark Traugott, Charles Tilly, and many others worked on the Marxian problem posed by the collective action of what were thought to be intermediary, transitional or surprising groups like artisans, counter-revolutionary peasants, women workers, intellectuals and so on.⁴⁶ Perry Anderson studied absolutism – a state form emerging from within an economic context where it “shouldn’t have” appeared.⁴⁷ This conundrum made sense within the space of Marxian theory, to which Anderson wedded fundamentally Weberian insights about state forms. Anthony Giddens, Michael Mann, Gianfranco Poggi, Theda Skocpol, Charles Tilly (to name just a few) interrogated the sources of state formation and dissolution, highlighting the dynamics of war-making and violence that were emphasized by Weber and Hintze but given short shrift in Marxian theory.⁴⁸ Randall Collins staged a “confrontation” between Weberian and Marxian theories of capitalism.⁴⁹ Michael Burawoy highlighted the “color of class” in a historical analysis of the Zambian copper mines; Michael Hechter studied the “Celtic fringe” and the puzzle of nation for issues of class formation; Judith Stacey’s pioneering analysis tackled the role of gender in the Chinese revolution, and John Stephens and Walter Korpi sought to understand the socialist potential of social democracy and the welfare state in capitalist countries.⁵⁰ This is, of course, just a

and Michael T. Hannan (eds.) National Development and the World System (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970).

⁴⁶Ronald Aminzade, Class, Politics, and Early Industrial Capitalism: A Study of Mid-nineteenth-century Toulouse, France (Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, 1981); Victoria Bonnell, Roots of Rebellion: Workers’ Politics and Organizations in St. Petersburg and Moscow, 1900-1914 (Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1984); Craig Calhoun, The Question of Class Struggle: Social Foundations of Popular Radicalism during the Industrial Revolution (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982); George Konrad and Ivan Szelenyi, The Intellectuals on the Road to Class Power (New York, NY: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1979); Jeffery Paige, Agrarian Revolution: Social Movements and Export Agriculture in the Underdeveloped World (New York: Free Press, 1975); Sonya Rose, “Proto-Industry, Women’s Work and the Household Economy in the Transition to Industrial Capitalism,” Journal of Family History 13 (Spring 1988): 181-193; William H. Sewell, Jr., Work and Revolution in France: The Language of Labor from the Old Regime to 1848 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1980); Charles Tilly, Louise Tilly, and Richard Tilly, The Rebellious Century, 1830-1930 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975); Mark Traugott, “Determinants of Political Orientation: Class and Organization in the Parisian Insurrection of June 1848,” American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 86, No. 1. (Jul., 1980), pp. 32-49.

⁴⁷ Perry Anderson, Lineages of the Absolutist State (London: Verso, 1974).

⁴⁸Anthony Giddens, The Nation-State and Violence (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985); John A. Hall, Powers and Liberties (London: Penguin, 1986); Michael Mann, The Sources of Social Power, volume 1 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1986); Gianfranco Poggi, The Development of the Modern State: A Sociological Introduction (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1978); Theda Skocpol, “Bringing the State Back In: Strategies of Analysis in Current Research,” In Peter Evans, Dietrich Rueschemeyer and Theda Skocpol, eds., Bringing the State Back In (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985), pp.3-43 ; Charles Tilly, Coercion, Capital and European States, AD 990-1990 (Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1990).

⁴⁹Randall Collins. Weberian Sociological Theory (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 1986, pp. 19-44).

⁵⁰Michael Burawoy, The Colour of Class on the Copper Mines: From African Advancement to Zambianization (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1972); Michael Hechter, Internal Colonialism: The Celtic Fringe in British National Development, 1536-1966 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975); Judith Stacey, Patriarchy and Socialist Revolution in China (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983); John Stephens, The Transition from

partial list of contributors to what was an incredibly exciting moment of intellectual ferment. When we explore these individual works, we find that they differ on many important matters. They also have distinctive takes that relate to national and regional genealogies of intellectual debate. But in retrospect there is also an incredible level of international conversation and convergence.

These trends extended across all the social sciences and history in the 1970s and early 1980s: one thinks of Louise Tilly and Joan Scott's ground-breaking research on women workers and David Abraham's class analysis of the breakdown of the Weimar Republic; Ira Katznelson's investigations of the ethnic and racial complications of working-class formation, or the interdisciplinary "Brenner Debate" on the transition from feudalism to capitalism.⁵¹ Indeed, this was also a period in which social scientists were avidly reading historians' work and forging interdisciplinary allegiances and ties, especially with the resurgent social history typified by the work of E. P. Thompson, Sheila Rowbotham and the *History Workshop Journal*,⁵² with the work of Fernand Braudel and the Annales school,⁵³ and *marxisant* historians who were pondering the intersection between family and economic forms.⁵⁴ Consequently, the historical turn in sociology was linked to the erosion of the boundaries between social theory, scientific method and historical research, exemplified by the changing contents of key journals such as Comparative Studies in Society and History, and by the growth of the Social Science History Association, incorporated in 1974. Reflecting the broader trends characterizing social science and history, the SSHA was at first a meeting place for historians ("cliometricians") wanting to learn methods

Capitalism to Socialism (London: Macmillan, 1979); Walter Korpi, The Working Class in Welfare Capitalism: Work, Unions and Politics in Sweden (Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1978).

⁵¹David Abraham, The Collapse of the Weimar Republic: Political Economy and Crisis (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1981); T. H. Aston and C. H. E. Philpin, eds., The Brenner Debate: Agrarian Class Structure and Economic Development in Pre-Industrial Europe. (New York, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988); Ira Katznelson, City Trenches: Urban Politics and the Patterning of Class in the United States (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981); Louise A. Tilly and Joan W. Scott, Women, Work, and Family (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1978).

⁵²See, for example E.P. Thompson, The Making of the English Working Class (London: Victor Gollancz, 1973); Sheila Rowbotham, Women, Resistance and Revolution: A History of Women and Revolution in the Modern World (New York: Pantheon Books, 1972); and the *History Workshop Journal*. This had a particular impact on some feminist historical sociologists, for example Sonya Rose, whose work includes "Gender at Work: Sex, Class and Industrial Capitalism," History Workshop Journal 21 (Spring 1986): 113-131; Limited Livelihoods: Gender and Class in Nineteenth-Century England (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992).

⁵³Many structuralist social scientists found particularly congenial the Annales school's broadly sociological approach and antagonism to an understanding of history as a "mere sequence" of events. See Francois Dosse (1997). One could also include, by the 1980s – before the American appropriation of the cultural turn had hit full force – work on *mentalites* (e.g., Natalie Davis, The Return of Martin Guerre (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1983), Carlo Ginzburg, The Cheese and the Worms: The Cosmos of a Sixteenth-century Miller (translated by John and Anne Tedeschi) (Baltimore : Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980), which was beginning to deal with the cultural, but in the context of "total history" and a still-materialist framework [see pp.204-05 in Geoff Eley, "Is All the World a Text? From Social History to the History of Society Two Decades Later," in T. McDonald, ed., The Historical Turn in the Human Sciences (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1996), 193-243.]

⁵⁴We are thinking, for example, of the debates over proto-industrialization, catalyzed by Kriedte, Medick and Schlumbohm (1981).

from social *scientists*, then in the 1980s and 1990s became the place for social scientists who wanted to do history, with a second wave twist, and for both social scientists and historians who wanted to explore the cultural and linguistic turns, the uses of narrative and network analyses, as well as substantive work that crossed the fields.⁵⁵

The Marxian heritage of the second wave functioned as an overall regime of knowledge. The second-wave comparative-historical sociologists varied in the extent to which they conceived their project as revising Marxism or as combining diverse theoretical insights to create fresh understandings of important processes and events, but they consistently read and argued with each other. Even as they challenged this tradition, they leaned on its coherence, especially in terms of what Geoff Eley calls “social determination” or the claims that collective action, subjectivities, politics and culture rested on “material interests,” themselves embedded in material life, however conceived.⁵⁶ And while it raised hackles from the very beginning and continues to be controversial today, the work of these sociologists and others working in allied disciplines is in our view of lasting significance. Their attention to politics opened up a tremendously fruitful vein of analysis, which gained force in the 1980s and early 1990s and continues today.⁵⁷ In fact, it is that impossibly cumbersome phrase, “the relative autonomy of the political,” that best characterizes both the promise and the limits of second wave work.

It is also true that the appropriation of classical theory by second wave scholars emphasized the political-economic and material, understood as opposed to the cultural and ideal, while the ironies and irrationalities of modernity hinted at by classical theorists disappeared from view. The enduring structuralist Marxist leanings of the second wave, emphasizing the necessary and sufficient conditions for transitions between modes of production, effaced the Marx who theorized the continuing cataclysm of

⁵⁵See Alice Bee Kasakoff, “Is There a Place for Anthropology in Social Science History?” *Social Science History* 23 #4 (1999): 535-559. Abbott (1991, 2001) points out that sociologists and historians approached the task of melding “history” and “sociology” from very different disciplinary starting points, and gravitated toward the Social Science History Association for different reasons. He also argues that there was a sharp distinction between two groups of historical sociologists, only one of which – the quantitative historical sociologists (which he calls HS2) – was active in SSHA and, in his account, friendly to an essentially historical and narrative approach. The other group (HS1), the macro-political comparativists, dominated the American Sociological Association’s section on Comparative and Historical Sociology (ASACHS). In the revised account of SSHA history in *Chaos of Disciplines*, Abbott indicates some ways in which the division between HS1 and HS2 has come undone. At this point, the two groups have pretty thoroughly commingled. In fact, by asking Ann Orloff to start the SSHA’s States and Societies Network as a focus for “HS1”-type work, Abbott himself helped organize this process of dedifferentiation. The States and Societies network is thriving, and there are more conversations between this group and political history scholars in SSHA. The ASACHS now incorporates both HS1 and HS2 (e.g., prizes have gone to macro-comparative, quantitative and narrative analysts, and people who mix these styles). ASACHS has now taken on questions of narrative -- in various panels about analytic approach, in debates among section-affiliated authors like Margaret Somers, Edgar Kiser and Michael Hechter, and so on. The institutional differences between HS1 and HS2, if they were ever as sharp as Abbott argued (which we doubt), have eroded.

⁵⁶ Eley (1996), p.194.

⁵⁷Note that vast majority of historical work on social movements published in *ASR* and *AJS* over the past two decades has been on the French revolution or the U.S. Progressive Era and New Deal period. Elisabeth Clemens and Martin Hughes, “Recovering Past Protest: Archival Research on Social Movements,” In S. Staggenborg and B. Klandermans, eds., *Methods in Social Movement Research* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, forthcoming).

capitalist development, including its contradictory impact on the individuals whom it continually reconstituted. “Constant revolutionizing of production, uninterrupted disturbance of all social conditions, everlasting uncertainty and agitation distinguish the bourgeois epoch from all earlier ones. All fixed, fast-frozen relations, with their train of ancient and venerable prejudices and opinions, are swept away, all new-formed ones become antiquated before they can ossify.”⁵⁸ Where was *this* modernist Marx in the second wave? Similarly, the second wave sociologists reached out to Weber’s writings on the specificity of the organizational and politico-economic, drawing on his analyses of ideal types of organization, of relations between rulers and staffs, of power politics. Yet this resurgence of politics in a debate dominated by material determinism came at the cost of excising the Weber of *The Protestant Ethic*, of complexes of meaning, the historical ironist who saw the personal losses and terrors instilled by processes of rationalization.⁵⁹ The second wave historical sociologists were by no means apologists for capitalism, and they clearly understood that the development of post-revolutionary states, democracy, social welfare, and so on, were not linear and progressive – but they also viewed these matters and processes as neatly contained, and often reducible to a single analytical principle. Certainly their own theoretical categories, and their position as analysts, remained serenely above the fray.

⁵⁸Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *The Communist Manifesto* (New York: Verso, 1998[1848]), pp. 38-39; the citation is from Marshall Berman’s *All That Is Solid Melts Into Air: The Experience of Modernity* (New York: Viking Penguin, 1976).

⁵⁹Max Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (New York: Harper Collins, 1930).

The legacy of the classical sociologists is more productive than the flattened 1950s version or the second wave reappropriation would indicate – and also more troubling. Weber offered a textured sense of the manifold ambiguities inscribed in elements of what came to be thought of as “the modern.” He traced one long-run counterintuitive result of people’s rational conduct in pursuit of a calling: the emptying of the world of subjective meaning.⁶⁰ The expansion of scientific rationality, he thought, would entrain “an ever more devastating senselessness... a senseless hustle in the service of worthless, moreover self-contradictory, and mutually antagonistic ends.” Following Weber and Freud, Norbert Elias thought that the fruits of the “civilizing process” could only be had at the price of internalized regulation, discipline and social repression. Marx and Engels wrote as apocalyptically (but with more hope for the future of humankind) when they celebrated the “most revolutionary part” played by the bourgeoisie in not only building the capitalist order but dialectically engendering the proletariat, “its own gravediggers.”⁶¹ “The development of modern industry, therefore, cuts from under its feet the very foundation on which the bourgeoisie produces and appropriates products.”⁶² Durkheim saw the rise of the modern state as instrumental in creating the individuated selves that would in turn raise fundamental challenges for and to the state itself.⁶³ The unintended consequences of human action could and did issue in the opposite of what was desired or envisioned. The classical sociologists made passionate arguments for the historical genesis and limits of social formations and selves – and of their own foundational concepts. They described paradoxes and ironies that worked themselves out historically – and this infused their intellectual and practical encounters with “modernity” with lasting grandeur as well as pathos.

For all its complexity, however, this theoretical heritage inscribed a potential conceptual dualism, assigning a whole series of subordinate concepts to the category of the “not modern.” This continued to be the case in second wave work and, as we will argue, still characterizes much contemporary historical sociology, particularly within the institutional and rational-choice approaches. On one side were grouped capitalism, rationality, bureaucracy, the public; on the other feudalism, traditionalism, and so forth. And these oppositions took on strikingly gendered and racialized meanings. Men were aligned with the “rational” and women with the “irrational” and “traditional,” while the “civilization of the metropole” was juxtaposed to “an Other whose main feature was its primitiveness.”⁶⁴ Of course this mode of dualistic and devaluative thought predated the classical sociologists, deriving from earlier lines of

⁶⁰Max Weber, The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism (New York: Harper Collins, 1930); “Science as a Vocation,” in H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills, eds. From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology (New York: Oxford University Press, 1958), 129-156.

⁶¹Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, The Communist Manifesto (New York: Verso, 1998 [1848]), pp. 37, 50.

⁶²Ibid., p. 50.

⁶³Emile Durkheim, Moral Education: A Study in the Theory and Application of the Sociology of Education (New York: Free Press, 1961), chapters IV-VI.

⁶⁴R.W. Connell, “Why is Classical Theory Classical?” American Journal of Sociology 102 (1997), pp. 1516-1517; see also Barbara Marshall, Engendering Modernity: Feminism, Social Theory and Social Change (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1994) and Configuring Gender: Explorations in Theory and Practice (Peterborough, Ontario: Broadview Press, 2000).

conservative and Enlightenment reasoning⁶⁵ and from the properties of modernity itself – for example, the separation of home and work in the rise of industrial capitalism; the disembedding of family and state; the impact on the metropole itself of the massive waves of European colonialism. These oversimplified oppositions embedded in core concepts of the classical sociological tradition functioned not only as a shared conceptual language but as both a source of theoretical closure and ideological consolation. It was all too tempting to juxtapose the supposed rationality of one's modernity to the irrationality of tradition – much more comfortable than analyzing the substantive irrationalities embedded in the process of rationalization itself. Herein lay the foundation for both the 1950s “pattern variable” version of what had been a great historical intellectual tradition, and the second-wave appropriations of sanitized concepts of modernization, industrialization, bureaucracy, and so on.⁶⁶ Nonetheless, what was expelled from the idea of the modern could not be easily excised, even in theory. It continued to structure, in a subterranean way, the conscious text of social theory itself. We will return to this point below, in our discussion of the theoretical challenges that beset -- and are remaking -- historical sociology.

The Second Wave Under Pressure

Like all significant intellectual innovations, the second wave courted its own upending. Theoretically, we claim, their hyper-structuralism invited assertions of agency and process. Their conceding modes of production such a role in determining social formations and intellectual problems⁶⁷ prompted counter-claims of the constitutive significance of culture. The apotheosis of the image of the coercive, central state apparatus provoked counter-imagery of productive capillary power. Moreover, their repressions of key aspects of modernity – religion, emotion, habit, the arational core of war and state violence – virtually invited work that would bring all of those elements “back in.”⁶⁸ And the exclusion of various subaltern subjects has been challenged by those who would speak in their name. We will turn to these theoretical issues below.

Methodologically and epistemologically, the combination of a language of Humean constant conjunction (if complicated and conditional constant conjunction) with a research program that called for comparative historical work was unstable at best.⁶⁹ Attempting to satisfy the requisites of positivistically-minded sociological gatekeepers did not (and perhaps cannot) mix easily with attention to history.

⁶⁵ Zerilli, Signifying Woman.

⁶⁶ See, for example, William Sewell's comments on modernization in his “Three Theories of Temporality,” in Terrence J. McDonald, ed., The Historic Turn in the Human Sciences (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996).

⁶⁷The argument that the economic was determinate only in the last instance did not go far enough, in our view. But for one influential attempt to spell out why, within a Marxian paradigm and inspired by some of Friedrich Engels' remarks, the “lonely hour of the last instance” never comes, see Louis Althusser's “Contradiction and Overdetermination: Appendix,” pp. 117-128 in For Marx (New York, NY: Verso, 1990 [1965]).

⁶⁸Two essays in this volume that frontally address this issue of repression are Gorski's (for religion) and Kestnbaum's (on war).

⁶⁹“If A then B” is the simplest and most general form of a Humean statement of “constant conjunction.” David Hume, 1975 [1748]. An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Moreover, second wave scholars ignored the textual foundations of their own practices at a time when distinctions between literary and scientific argument were coming under increased question, both from mavens of science studies and post-structuralists.⁷⁰ As we will see below, these characteristics of the approach itself articulated with pressures and pulls from other scholarly communities. Finally, second wave historical sociology proved ill-equipped to deal with key developments outside the academy including new social movements, innovative forms of political action, identity politics, and the partial displacement of nation-states as the central organizing nodes of politics.

From the outset, second wave historical sociology evolved methodological and epistemological practices that elicited challenges from both historians and more conventional social scientists. Second wave scholars were – and many of their intellectual descendants still are -- “interested in generalizing across multiple instances of a phenomenon under investigation – whenever this can be done with fidelity to conceptually defined contexts and with due attention to the causal complexities of historically embedded conjunctures and processes.”⁷¹ Early efforts to explain the distinctive methodological approaches and benefits of historical sociology usually began from the premise that this work was as scientific, or at least as systematic, as the positivist researchers’. Second wave scholars brandished John Stuart Mill’s *A System of Logic*⁷² to show how analyses of substantively-significant but relatively rare outcomes could still satisfy the requisites of conventional social science.⁷³ By insisting on historical sociology as preeminently rigorous comparative method, practitioners sought and gained some tenuous legitimacy vis-a-vis the mainstream of sociology, a point that many have made but that Craig Calhoun

⁷⁰Hayden White, *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press, 1973) has been particularly influential in this turn toward ferreting out the literary tropes active in historical analysis. In his *The Truth in Painting* (tr. Geoff Bennington and Ian McLeod. Chicago, 1987), Jacques Derrida questions our capacity to draw boundaries between texts and contexts. “And in the other corner...” Those that object to the aestheticization of analysis include Allan Megill *Prophets of Extremity: Nietzsche, Heidegger, Foucault, Derrida* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1985) and Jurgen Habermas, *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity. Twelve Lectures* (tr. Frederick Lawrence. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1987). Scott Lash tries to referee the fight in “Postmodernity and Desire,” *Theory and Society* 14 #1 (January 1985): 1-33.

⁷¹ Theda Skocpol, “Doubly Engaged Social Science: The Promise of Comparative Historical Analysis,” in Mahoney and Rueschemeyer, eds., *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2003, p. 515.

⁷² John Stuart Mill, *A System of Logic, Ratiocinative and Inductive, Being a Connected View of the Principles of Evidence, and the Methods of Scientific Investigation* (London: Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer, 1875).

⁷³For example, again, the now-classic Theda Skocpol and Margaret Somers, “The Uses of Comparative History in Macrosocial Inquiry,” *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 22(1980):174-197. Even the *comparative* dimension of historical sociological work has generated a great deal of scholarly controversy and commentary, for it is here that some principal figures of what got defined as the official second wave staked their claims for the scientific standing of historical sociology and for their leadership of the burgeoning social movement that was bringing history back into sociology. Skocpol and Somers (1980, 1995) identified three major analytic strategies within comparative history (that is, “explicit juxtapositions of distinct histories,” p.72): “comparative history as the *parallel demonstration of theory*,” as “the *contrast of contexts*,” or as “*macro-causal analysis*” (p.73). It was in connection with the last of these that Skocpol and Somers invoked the enormously influential use of John Stuart Mill’s methods of difference and agreement, a template that structured many an ensuing dissertation, but that has since become a particular target of critics.

captured best with his aphoristic reference to the “domestication” of historical sociology.⁷⁴ However, second wave scholars were also uncomfortable with what they took to be vague and general sociological concepts that hadn’t been built up from the ground of historical particulars, and they were absolutely allergic to covering laws. None was willing to consign history to the merely idiographic.⁷⁵ Second wavers overall embraced historians’ emphasis on sequence and timing.⁷⁶

⁷⁴Craig Calhoun, “Domestication of Historical Sociology” (see footnote 4).

⁷⁵On covering laws and history, see especially Maurice Mandelbaum, “Historical Explanation: The Problem of Covering Laws,” History and Theory 1 (3): 229-242. In his unjustly neglected Comparative Methods in the Social Sciences (Engelwood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall 1976), Neil J. Smelser points out that “[nomothetic and idiographic] approaches – insofar as both attempt to explain – do not necessarily differ substantively with respect to the nature of the causal forces invoked....do not call for different theoretical grounding points. The differences between them lie more in the mode of explanation, the mode of organizing variables, and the techniques of research employed” (pp. 204-205). Of course it is now the case that some historical sociologists (particularly those influenced by Foucauldian genealogical methods) would not see themselves as engaged in any version of an explanatory project.

⁷⁶Historical sociologists are collectively thinking through the implications of the interventions that seek to displace comparative method in favor of narrative, or couple the two in some way. This task that is made still more challenging by lack of agreement over what might be entailed in that move, already underway in some areas of our field (see special issues on narrative in Social Science History 1992). Are some forms of historical narrative more analytically acceptable, perhaps more “sociological” than others, and more easily integrated into accepted canons of social science research? (See Larry J. Griffin, “Narrative, Event-Structure Analysis, and Causal Interpretation in Historical Sociology,” American Journal of Sociology 98 #5 (March 1993), pp. 1094-1133.) Or is that too narrow a way to contemplate this important problem and opportunity? Roberto Franzosi provides a recent overview in “Narrative Analysis – Why (and How) Sociologists Should Be Interested in Narrative,” in pp. 517-54, John Hagan, ed., The Annual Review of Sociology, Palo Alto: Annual Reviews, 1998.

Whether they conducted archival historical work or drew from secondary sources, in the context of 1970s and early 1980s sociology, they were unusually respectful of the histories of the countries, regions and periods in which the processes at the center of their analyses unrolled.

Historical sociologists were attacking entrenched practices and violating disciplinary boundaries in sociology and history, and they stepped on some toes in the process. The response by mainstream sociologists has been heated, focusing on the supposed failure of comparative and historical sociologists to satisfy the requisites of social scientific method, as conventionally, positivistically, understood.⁷⁷ These critics have argued that the choice of a “small-n” research design is inherently flawed because it suffers from too few degrees of freedom to cope with large numbers of potential causal factors; that “selecting on the dependent variable” introduces unacceptable bias into conclusions; that the failure to seek universal knowledge in the form of covering laws means that comparative-historical researchers are really no better than hopelessly idiographic historians – in short, they’re not real social *scientists*. But the critics have no good answer to how we should better study relatively rare, over-determined but significant phenomena, or processes unfolding over the *longue duree*, with which so many historical sociologists are concerned.⁷⁸ Nor can they help us with dimensions of social processes that function more like a language and less like a set of billiard balls. To the extent that historical sociologists underline the fundamental historicity of the categories and concepts of social life, in any case, they will inevitably be at odds with social scientists seeking universal covering laws.

Comparative-historical researchers have in time grown less fond of Mill, and some claim to have found firmer ground for claiming methodological advantages – even if it is often unclear whether they are claiming to escape positivist methodological prescriptions or to better satisfy them. Some have moved into a less defensive position, arguing that conventional statistical analysis rarely satisfies the methodological requisites of its own favored quantitative techniques.⁷⁹ Historical sociologists have long

⁷⁷See especially Stanley Lieberson, “Small N’s and Big Conclusions: An Examination of the Reasoning in Comparative Studies Based on a Small Number of Cases,” *Social Forces* 70 (1991):307-320 and John Goldthorpe, “Current Issues in Comparative Macrosociology: A Debate on Methodological Issues,” *Social Research* 16(1997):1-26 and “The Uses of History in Sociology: Reflections on Some Recent Tendencies,” *British Journal of Sociology* 42 (1991): 211-30. One recent response is George Steinmetz, “Odious Comparisons: Incommensurability, the Case Study, and “Small N’s” in Sociology (forthcoming *Sociological Theory*, 2003). Wendy Nelson Espeland and Mitchell L. Stevens remind us to be sensitive to the social-psychological conditions under which claims to commensuration – including our own! – are made or refused. See their “Commensuration as a Social Process,” *Annual Review of Sociology* 24, 1998: 313-343.

⁷⁸Indeed, it is partly on these grounds that contemporary defenses of comparative and historical analyses are based. For example, see Lieberson’s critique of Orloff and Skocpol, in which he uses traffic incidents to illustrate his criticism of their analysis of the initiation of modern welfare programs in Britain and the U.S. (Lieberson, “Small N’s and Big Conclusions,” cited above in note 46; Ann Shola Orloff and Theda Skocpol, “Why Not Equal Protection? Explaining the Politics of Public Social Spending in Britain, 1900-1911, and the United States, 1880s-1920,” *American Sociological Review* 49(1984):726-750). For the concept of the *longue duree*, see Fernand Braudel, “History and the Social Sciences: The *Longue Duree*,” in Fernand Braudel, *On History* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980: 25-34).

⁷⁹Charles Ragin, *Fuzzy-Set Social Science* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000). “In Ragin’s view,” James Mahoney comments, “the challenge is for statistical researchers to adapt their research to the more demanding

insisted on the significance of the temporal dimensions of analysis.⁸⁰ Some, like Andrew Abbott and Roberto Franzosi, are also developing formal methods for analyzing sequences.⁸¹ Charles Ragin makes a strong case for a holistic, case-based logic of comparative research that addresses situations of multiple, conjunctural causation – the majority of “cases” that interest us – better than does the array of standard quantitative techniques.⁸² Some call our attention to the need for more systematic methods of discourse analysis.⁸³ Others emphasize “biography as historical sociology.”⁸⁴ Still others point to the ongoing debates among representatives of various post-positivist perspectives that have appeared across the human sciences.⁸⁵ The participants in all these debates and discussions certainly differ among themselves, but together they have revealed that the positivist empiricism that characterizes much mainstream sociology rests on shaky ground. These debates take on additional urgency because they are occurring in virtually every discipline with any scientific aspirations, at a time when the growing

standards of qualitative analysis rather than the reverse.” James Mahoney, “Beyond Correlational Analysis: Recent Innovations in Theory and Method,” Sociological Forum 16 (2001): 575-593, p. 584.

⁸⁰For example, Ronald Aminzade, “Historical Sociology and Time,” Sociological Methods and Research 20(1992):456-480; Eviatar Zerubavel, Time Maps, Collective Memory and the Social Shape of the Past (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2003); Theda Skocpol, “Sociology’s Historical Imagination,” in T. Skocpol, ed., Vision and Method in Historical Sociology (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 1-21. See also the references in Footnotes 76 and 81.

⁸¹Andrew Abbott, Time Matters: On Theory and Method (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001) and Andrew Abbott and A. Tsay, “Sequence Analysis and Optimal Matching Methods in Sociology,” Sociological Methods and Research 29 (2000): 3-33 (also see Lawrence Wu, “Comments on “Sequence Analysis and Optimal Matching Methods in Sociology: Review and Prospect,” in the same issue, pp.41-64). “Introduction.” Theory and Society ran a special issue on “New Directions in Formalization and Historical Analysis,” edited by Roberto Franzosi and John Mohr (Volume 26 1997), Nos. 2-3. See Franzosi’s and Mohr’s “Introduction,” pp. 133-160.

⁸²Charles Ragin. The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987) and Fuzzy-Set Social Science (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000).

⁸³Julia Adams and Tasleem Padamsee, “Signs and Regimes: Rereading Feminist Work on Welfare States,” Social Politics 8(2001):1-23; Tasleem Padamsee and Julia Adams, “Signs and Regimes Revisited,” Social Politics (2002): 187-202; John Mohr, “Measuring Meaning Structures,” Annual Review of Sociology 24(1998):345-370.

⁸⁴Barbara Laslett. “Biography as Historical Sociology: The Case of William Fielding Ogburn,” Theory and Society 20 #4 (August 1991): 511-538; Mary Jo Maynes, Barbara Laslett and Jennifer Pierce, “Agency, Personal Narratives, and Social Science History,” Presidential Session, Social Science History Association, November 2001 [available upon request from the authors]. Carolyn Steedman’s Landscape for a Good Woman: A Story of Two Lives (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1986) has been a particularly influential model for the use of autobiography as method of analysis.

⁸⁵See, for example Margaret R. Somers, “‘We’re No Angels’: Realism, Rational Choice, and Relationality in Social Science,” American Journal of Sociology 104(1998):722-784 and the response from Edgar Kiser and Michael Hechter, “The Debate on Historical Sociology: Rational Choice Theory and Its Critics,” American Journal of Sociology 104(1998):785-816; also see Andrew Abbott, “Transcending General Linear Reality,” Sociological Theory 6 (1998): 169-86; and Charles Ragin’s works, cited above.

sophistication of science studies illuminates the unsteady foundations for unreflective claims to the scientific. Some science studies work in historical sociology questions quite basic assumptions of positivist social science, such as concept-independence or the assumption of temporal invariability that underlies scientific laws.⁸⁶ Defenders of positivism are under assault themselves, in other words, and the critical arrows have penetrated multiple chinks in their defenses. New attempts to please positivistically-minded social scientists – whether by invoking sociology as physics-in-the-making or by policing the practices of historical sociologists with invocations against “unscientific interpretation” – are just as likely to fail as earlier efforts and will keep us from bringing to bear our combined forces on important aspects of social life.

While mainstream social scientists attacked historical sociologists from the premise that we should be more general, abstract and “scientific,” historians often criticized historical sociology for its lack of engagement with the particularities of each case; its failure to plumb relevant primary documents; its condescending treatment of historians’ theoretical debates; its reduction of historiographical debate to fact, and its tendency to lose itself in ungrounded, compounded abstractions – to create what Lawrence Stone memorably called “sociological unicorns.”⁸⁷ Ironically, these stinging and, one must admit, sometimes just accusations stem from the very legacy of interdisciplinarity that historical sociologists have fostered and prized. As historical sociologists are increasingly evaluated from within the disciplinary canons of History as well as their home discipline, they are expected to do the kind of high-quality original archival primary source research expected of historians without sacrificing the impulse toward sociological generalization. Meeting this expectation has made the work inherently more difficult and, some argue, less doable – at least by the lonely artisanal scholar who is still the norm in this corner of our discipline. And if the call to “go to the archives, young woman” was not sufficiently challenging, historical sociologists are now pulled by the cultural turn in History and the humanities, which underlines a whole series of symbolic mediations: that archival documents are problematic texts, themselves in need of discursive deciphering; that explanatory accounts of History-writ-large must be understood as narratives with their own rhetorical devices and plots; that every observation and utterance makes sense only in the context of a symbolic order.⁸⁸

⁸⁶Historical-sociological works in this vein include Thomas Gieryn, Cultural Boundaries of Science: Credibility on the Line (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995); Steven Shapin, A Social History of Truth: Civility and Science in Seventeenth-Century England (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994); Daniel Breslau, In Search of the Unequivocal: The Political Economy of Measurement in U.S. Labor Market Policy (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1998); Libby Schweber, “Manipulation and Articulation: Population Statistics in 19th Century France and England,” Social Research 68 #2, 2001; “Styles of Statistical Reasoning” in Systemes Statistiques et Traditions Nationales, Jean-Pierre Beaud and Jean-Guy Prevost, eds., Presses de l’Universite du Quebec, 2000. See also Bruno Latour, Pandora’s Hope: Essays on the Reality of Science Studies (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999).

⁸⁷ Cf. Lawrence Stone’s review of Jack Goldstone’s Revolution and Rebellion in the Early Modern World (1991) – an ASA “best book” prizewinner and influential book of second wave historical sociology – in the New York Review of Books (“The Revolution over the Revolution,” June 11, 1992). Stone seems remarkably blind to the beauty and allure of these sociological animals.

⁸⁸Some exemplary texts include Jacques Derrida, Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression (translated by Eric Prenowitz) (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996); Carolyn Steedman, Dust: The Archives and Cultural History (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2002); White, Metahistory.

The methodological pulls of history and “proper” social science are powerful forces in creating cleavages among historical sociologists. In conjunction with the whip-hand of tenure, academic review, and gate-keeping more generally, these have pulled what was once a more unitary body of historical sociologists in wildly different methodological directions.⁸⁹ Within departments, universities and subfields, the local balance of forces between neo-positivist and various post-positivist approaches help explain why particular individuals have taken certain scholarly paths. Thus, some are attuned to problems raised from the interpretive disciplines about texts, sources, and systems of meaning, and many have become more suspicious of claims that studies of the social can be scientific in the conventional sense. Others, however, are still attempting to speak to the critiques from the mainstream of social science – we think of James Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschemeyer’s recent edited volume, which in many ways continues the second wave’s project of seeking scholarly legitimacy through emphasizing the ways in which comparative-historical sociology fulfills the requisites of social *science*.⁹⁰ Those who attend to history, especially if they make use of narrative forms or appeal to textuality, rhetoric and semiotics, are too often set up as straw men, spinners of Just-So stories. We editors see historically-minded sociologists using a variety of ways to discipline their inquiries. All these strategies are both legitimate and at least potentially productive.

These methodological debates are obviously fascinating, thoroughly contested terrain. The contributors to this volume do touch on them, but our main brief is theory: the theoretical issues associated with understanding social and cultural change in the light of the intellectual challenges that beset and entice the present generation of historical sociologists. In that context, and before we delve into these challenges, we wish to signal some general, and paradigmatically related, theoretical problems of the analyses of the second wave. As more than one commentator has noted, most are relentlessly structural – and the structures are those of the political economy – and the work remains curiously dissociated from human experience and aspirations.⁹¹ Since these features actually lent their work legitimacy in the academy, and helped make the organizational case for historical sociology, they have proven notoriously hard to shake. However, it is perhaps the attempt to shake them that best characterizes the theoretical impulses that motivate extremely diverse approaches within historical sociology today.

The problem is not with “structure” as a sociological category. It’s certainly useful – nay, indispensable – if it is conceptualized as relatively enduring relations among bounded units of some kind. But the second wavers interpreted “structure” in a particular way, one that authorized certain sorts of

⁸⁹ Certain aspects of the infrastructure of the discipline affect us in distinctive ways: research funding is still geared to more positivist approaches to social analysis (see Steinmetz, this volume), while the press system – more important to us than some of our colleagues because we are still, preeminently, “book people” – faces increasing difficulty in publishing monographs not geared to popular audiences (see Elisabeth S. Clemens, Walter W. Powell, Kris McIlwaine, and Dina Okamoto, “Careers in Print: Books, Journals, and Scholarly Reputations,” *American Journal of Sociology*, 101 (1997): 433-94).

⁹⁰ James Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschemeyer, editors, *Comparative-Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences* (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

⁹¹ Ira Katznelson, “Periodization and Preferences: Contributions of Comparative-Historical Social Science,” pp. 270-301 in James Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschemeyer, editors, *Comparative-Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences* (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

intellectual advances, yet ultimately proved too limiting. They wanted to rescue sociology from what they saw as overly individualistic or voluntaristic accounts of human action and complex social outcomes; “structures” were held up as the mediating feature that constrained human action but also crystallized its emergent properties. The analytic recourse to “structures” as a binarized sign in opposition to “culture” should be situated in the political and intellectual landscape of the time. Culture was often invoked to “blame the victim” (e.g., in so-called “culture of poverty” arguments), or to rationalize the persistence of repressive political regimes by pointing to values that legitimized the status quo.⁹² Unfortunately, “structures” as a particular power term also authorized a naive structure/culture opposition – and that in spite of the fact that social life is unthinkable without cultural structures, like language and other systems of representation in which the bounded units in relationship are signs. In their responses to simplistic notions of culture and individual action, moreover, the second-wave analysts also shied away from analyzing properties of modernity that were not formal-organizational, and as a result their writings often seem strangely one-sided.

It was not just the internal weaknesses of their particular understanding of structure that undermined the approach that characterized the classics of the second wave. The paradigm that guided second wave work proved unable to deal with a whole series of epochal transformations, summed up in the events or rather signs of “1968” and “1989.” 1968 is shorthand for a welter of things, but among them it stands for the genesis of “new” movements⁹³ – feminism, gay liberation, ongoing rebellions among post-colonials and racial and ethnic minorities within the metropole, “post-materialism” – that challenged Marxist-based organizations politically, and opened the way for feminist theory, postcolonial theory, queer theory, and critical race studies to pull apart Marxism in the decades after.⁹⁴ Of course, these challenges to modernist principles also applied to modernist and universalizing liberalism. “1989” signals the subsequent revival of liberalism, the vagaries of globalization, fundamental challenges to the order of nation-states, and the collapse of Marxism as a mode of imagining a future beyond capitalist modernity.⁹⁵ These signs, and the processes and events they reference, triggered the rethinking of the

⁹²It seems obvious -- now -- that we can't understand people's making revolutions without looking at what they thought they were doing. Yet recall that at that time, “culture” did not mean the sophisticated analytics of a Clifford Geertz or a William Sewell, Jr., but was often deployed in rather simplistic ways, understood as homogenous and nationally-unified (e.g. arguments that the U.S. lacked a proper welfare state because of its individualist national culture).

⁹³ We will not be the first to point out that most of these movements are not in fact “new” to the post-WWII world, yet they were and are understood as such by many analysts. And note that is also true that “1968” is often cited as a sign for a series of explosive events fueling Marxist understandings.

⁹⁴ Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe, Hegemony and Socialist Strategy (London: Verso, 1985).

⁹⁵ Few social analysts predicted the events of 1989, and those who did so probably did so accidentally. So one can hardly fault the second wave for unique theoretical lacunae. It was clear to many that structural Marxism was not equipped to deal with the forms of difference and power that were not reducible to class, yet second-wave scholarship, like modernist social science more generally, also obscured the workings of gender, race, and other forms of difference.

landscape of modernity that is currently in process.⁹⁶ The place of the state as a privileged unit of analysis is being eroded by globalization and transnationalism and the proliferation of parastatal and other ambiguous bodies.⁹⁷ Moreover, historical work in the vein of postcoloniality and other approaches has stressed the ways in which metropolises have been formed by events and processes in the periphery (see Magubane, this volume). Current events or rather signifiers of events – “9/11/2001” above all for American scholars – have underlined global interdependency, sometimes cruelly. At this historical moment, the conjuncture of events both in the world and in the academy calls for rethinking certain premises of historical sociology.

Where Historical Sociology Stands Today

It is fair to say that the second wave scholars’ calls for reinfusing sociology with history have had a hearing, and have indeed inspired new generations of scholars pursuing historical research – the contributors to the present volume included.⁹⁸ Historical sociologists now enjoy a hard-won though partial acceptance within the discipline of sociology. The ASA section on Comparative and Historical Sociology is well-established. Historical articles appear in the pages of American Sociological Review and American Journal of Sociology. Sociologists identify themselves as specialists in “comparative historical sociology” in the ASA Guide to Graduate Departments, and graduate departments are ranked by U.S. News and World Report in the specialty of “historical sociology,” along with economic sociology, stratification, cultural sociology and social psychology. However, we’re very far from having convinced mainstream sociologists that social inquiry demands a fundamentally historical approach which attends to the cultural and historical specificity of concepts and categories -- if indeed that is a desirable goal. Indeed, some argue that our acceptance has come at the price of our compartmentalization. We tend to be located at major research institutions, in part because these

⁹⁶ See, for example, Rita Felski, Doing Time: Feminist Theory and Postmodern Culture (New York: New York University Press, 2000); David Harvey 1989. The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change Cambridge, MA: Blackwell. ; Frederic Jameson, Postmodernism, or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1992); Perry Anderson, The Origins of Postmodernity (New York: Verso, 1998); Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, Empire (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000); Allan Pred and Michael John Watts, Reworking Modernity: Capitalisms and Symbolic Discontent (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1992).

⁹⁷ Arjun Appadurai, Modernity at Large. Cultural Dimensions of Globalization (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1996); Giovanni Arrighi, “Globalization and Historical Macrosociology,” in Sociology for the Twenty-first Century, edited by Janet Abu-Lughod (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999), 117-33; Mathieu Deflem, Policing World Society: Historical Foundations of International Police Cooperation (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002); Timothy Mitchell, “The Limits of the State: Beyond Statist Approaches and Their Critics,” American Political Science Review 85(1991):77-96; Bob Jessop, “The Crisis of the National Spatio-Temporal Fix and the Tendential Ecological Dominance of Globalizing Capitalism,” International Journal of Urban and Regional Research 24(2000):231-233; Philip McMichael, “Incorporating Comparison within a World-Historical Perspective,” American Sociological Review 55 (1990): 385-397; Saskia Sassen, The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991); Scott Lash and John Urry, The End of Organized Capitalism. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1987.

⁹⁸ Hall, John R. 1999. Cultures of Inquiry: From Epistemology to Discourse in Sociohistorical Research (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press).

institutions have had the resources to hire from among a sub-discipline that is still regarded – in spite of its classical legacy – as at odds with the mainstream of sociological concerns. By the standards of mainstream sociology, and despite diverse substantive foci, historical sociologists are all part of a sub-discipline that is regarded as something of a luxury good – the sociological equivalent of a Panerai watch or a Prada bag. On the one hand, our pursuits are considered arcane; on the other, pursuing them requires markers of cultural capital (e.g., theory, multiple languages, art appreciation), which may be useful in the quest for departmental “distinction” in the university setting. But any potentially serious disruption to the mainstream has been neutralized by our categorization and segregation as *historical* sociologists – rather than as sociologists who take seriously the claims of historicity implicit in elaborating explanations rooted in, and limited by, time and place. This segregation authorizes conventional work on contemporary – and by any seriously historicized standards, parochial -- U.S. concerns without the need to specify historical and geographical context or limits.

Historical sociologists are often seen by outsiders as united in our focus on “history,” that is, on what is not the (U.S.) present. “History” in no unitary subject, however, and even if we historical sociologists were to surrender to the urge to define ourselves solely in terms of method, larger intellectual debates over positivism, interpretation, textuality divide us. Theoretically, we find ourselves without the unifying analytic framework that undergirded second-wave efforts. This should not occasion regret or nostalgia. We know that some of the advances of the second wave scholars came burdened with troubling repressions and exclusions attendant on that regime of knowledge. This is rather an opportunity for historical sociologists, as they use new tools to re-ask the core questions that preoccupied the second wave -- but also ask new questions and identify and probe silences – particularly to do with culture, agency, the character of modernity, gender, race and the world beyond the West – in the earlier work.

Some contemporary historical sociology – notably the various institutionalisms – represents a series of friendly amendments to the second wave, while other work poses more fundamental challenges. The political-economic structuralism of the second wave is still present in institutionalist approaches, but has developed away from comparative statics towards more processual accounts, often with improved methods (e.g., network analysis) that directly engage the assumed durability of different forms of structure. Moreover, there is a greater appreciation of the range of variation in the historical and political constitution of political actors, with some loosening of strictly political-economic understandings of identities and preferences, interests or goals. Yet even so, institutionalism often operates with a utilitarian understanding of actors’ goals, as well as a strictly goal-driven rather than practice-oriented understanding of action.⁹⁹ And among many institutionalists, many of the problematic exclusions and repressions of second wave work continue, although the emergence of culturalist and gendered institutionalisms is a hopeful development.

We see important work going on in many directions. Our metaphorical model is not the superhighway from a past imperfect to an ever-improving future. We think rather of crooked and tangled side-streets feeding into and radiating out of the broad avenues laid out by the second wave of the 1970s and 1980s. And “we’ll always have Paris” – its high modernist Haussmann boulevards and its medieval and post-modern byways. So we refrain from organizing our discussion of the current state of historical sociology as a story of progress, with successive waves of scholarship getting closer and closer to the

⁹⁹See Biernacki, this volume.

ideal theoretical and methodological approach. In what follows, we investigate strands of third-wave analysis that have developed in reaction to – and on the basis of – second-wave work. We identify five communities or foci of historical sociologists: (1) institutionalism; (2) rational-choice; (3) the cultural turn; (4) feminist challenges and (5) the scholarship on colonialism and the racial formations of empire, in which sociologists turn their eyes to the world beyond the second wave’s favorite stomping grounds, Europe and the United States. Scholars pursuing these different challenges work within a range of intellectual frames, and we see no sign of the emergence of a dominant paradigm of the sort that commanded the second wave’s allegiance. But we believe that the effort by historical sociologists to grasp their intellectual common roots as well as their points of divergence is a prerequisite to having more interesting and fruitful conversations, doing better theory and making more effective alliances with potentially sympathetic groups in and outside of sociology. *Reculer pour mieux sauter*. A more active remembering of our own histories can spark thinking across the analytic divides around agency, signification, power, repression and exclusion that have opened up in the last decade or two.

Institutionalism: Networks, Processes and the Institutional Opportunity

Much of the power of the second wave flowed from the invocation of structural determination. Yet this assertion of structure has been destabilized by a dialogue between Marx and Weber that echoes through much of the work described above. While questions of revolution and the transformation of economic regimes framed many of these projects, the explanations increasingly invoked Weberian themes of complex conjunctures, of the formation of social actors and creation of rationalized structures of domination as specifically historical accomplishments. With this shift in emphasis, historical sociology was reoriented to intersect with important methodological and theoretical developments elsewhere in the discipline: network analysis and the various “new institutionalisms.”¹⁰⁰ To a greater degree than other challenges, institutional analysis both extends key projects of the second wave while opening familiar research questions to explorations of process, transformation, and agency.

The problematics of the second wave continued to inform important projects of historical research, particularly the questions of revolutions that “should or shouldn’t” have occurred, or social classes that “should or shouldn’t” have been mobilized as political challengers. And armed with new technologies of network and organization analysis, researchers could address these anomalies in new and systematic detail. Working on nineteenth-century Paris, Roger Gould explored the complex ground of class formation: why was the uprising of 1848 organized around class lines and through rhetorics of class, whereas neighborhood solidarity served as the organizing framework for the insurrection of 1871?¹⁰¹ Peter Bearman’s study of the English Civil War mobilized fine-grained data on social ties to explain the emergence of new connections between court and country, as well as competing blocs within

¹⁰⁰For example, see Rebecca Jean Emigh, “The Spread of Sharecropping in Tuscany: The Political Economy of Transaction Costs,” *American Sociological Review* 62 (1997):423-442. More generally, see Peter A. Hall and Rosemary C. R. Taylor, “Political Science and the Three New Institutionalisms,” *Political Studies* (1996), XLIV, 936-957.

¹⁰¹Roger V. Gould, *Insurgent Identities: Class, Community, and Protest in Paris from 1848 to the Commune* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995).

the bourgeoisie.¹⁰² Richard Lachmann's two books have examined the signal contribution of organizationally-anchored elites – as distinct from classes – to the transition to capitalism and state-formation in early modern Europe.¹⁰³ Addressing Sombart's classic query of "Why No Socialism in America?," Kim Voss turns to an organizational analysis of locals of the Knights of Labor—a sweeping "producerist" organization of workers in the late nineteenth century—to identify the conditions under which local unions were formed, persisted, and engaged in active challenges to the economic order.¹⁰⁴ These works all share a project defined both theoretically and empirically: to move beyond explanations that rest on the presence or absence of a particular class actor, to develop theoretical explanations and methodologically-sophisticated demonstrations of the processes through which class actors are mobilized.

While second-wave scholarship had focused on breakdowns of and failed challenges to existing political orders¹⁰⁵, more recent scholarship has moved to consider challenges that resulted in new political institutions. Some of this work engages now-classic debates on state-building in Europe, but the bulk deals with twentieth-century America.¹⁰⁶ Social science history has long given a central place to American politics.¹⁰⁷ But a key intellectual switching point may have been Skocpol's 1980 article on the

¹⁰²Peter S. Bearman 1993. Relations into Rhetorics: Local Elite Structure in Norfolk, England, 1540-1640 (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1993).

¹⁰³Richard Lachmann, From Manor to Market: Structural Change in England, 1536-1640 (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1987); Richard Lachmann, Capitalists in Spite of Themselves? Elite Conflict and Economic Transitions in Early Modern Europe (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2000).

¹⁰⁴Kim Voss, The Making of American Exceptionalism: The Knights of Labor and Class Formation in the Nineteenth Century (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1993); on the politics of economic elites, Jason Kaufman, "Three Views of Associationalism in 19th-century America: An Empirical Examination," American Journal of Sociology 104(1999):1296-1345.

¹⁰⁵Jack Goldstone, "Revolutions: Toward a Fourth Generation of Revolutionary Theory," in James Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschemeyer, editors, Comparative-Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

¹⁰⁶See for example Thomas Ertman's Birth of the Leviathan: Building States and Regimes in Medieval and Early Modern Europe (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 1997) and Brian Downing's The Military Revolution and Political Change: Origins of Democracy and Autocracy in Early Modern Europe (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1992). These excellent books, by political scientists, directly engage second-wave historical sociological debates, testifying to the interdisciplinarity of this particular space.

¹⁰⁷An important line of work deals with the historical sociology of educational institutions in America, for example Randall Collins, The Credential Society: An Historical Sociology of Education and Stratification (New York, NY: Academic Press, 1979); Richard Rubinson, "Class Formation, Politics, and Institutions: Schooling in the United States," American Journal of Sociology 92 #3 (November 1986): 519-548; Pamela Barnhouse Walters and Philip J. O'Connell, "The Family Economy, Work, and Educational Participation in the United States, 1890-1940," American Journal of Sociology 93 #5 (March 1988): 1116-1152; Pamela Barnhouse Walters, David R. James and Holly J. McCammon, "Citizenship and Public Schools: Accounting for Racial Inequality in Education in the Pre- and Post-Disfranchisement South," American Sociological Review 62 #1 (February 1997): 34-52; Mustafa Emirbayer, "Beyond

New Deal and theories of the state¹⁰⁸, which brought in its wake renewed interest in the U.S. as a case, in at least implicitly comparative perspective.¹⁰⁹ Others have transposed analyses of competing class fractions and state autonomy to the development of welfare states.¹¹⁰ As contemporary revolutionary openings seemed to close, and revolutionary outcomes to be viewed more sourly, a still-modernist sensibility moved many scholars to consider a non-revolutionary version of progress toward a more egalitarian future, the Progressive Era and New Deal origins of the U.S. welfare state.

With this renewed interest in the U.S. social policy, historical institutionalists have been drawn into vibrant comparative debates over the origins and development of welfare states. Within this multi-faceted intellectual community, scholars explore the conjunctural and multiple causation of a range of policy and political outcomes, even as interest has shifted from the origins and growth of welfare states, to their contemporary character and their uncertain future.¹¹¹ Of late, innovation has been especially

Structuralism and Voluntarism: The Politics and Discourse of Progressive School Reform, 1890-1930,” Theory and Society 21 #5 (October 1992): 621-664.

¹⁰⁸Theda Skocpol, “Political Response to Capitalist Crisis: Neo-Marxist Theories of the State and the Case of the New Deal,” Politics and Society 10(1980): 155-201; for commentary, see Jess Gilbert and Carolyn Howe, “Beyond ‘State vs. Society’: Theories of the State and New Deal Agricultural Policies,” American Sociological Review 56 (1991):204-220; Jeff Manza, “Political Sociological Models of the U.S. New Deal,” Annual Review of Sociology 26(2000): 297-322.

¹⁰⁹In sociology, see for example, Edwin Amenta, Bold Relief: Institutional Politics and the Origins of Modern American Social Policy (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1998); Margaret Weir, Ann Shola Orloff and Theda Skocpol, eds., The Politics of Social Policy in the United States (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988); Elisabeth Clemens, “Organizational Repertoires and Institutional Change: Women’s Groups and the Transformation of U.S. Politics, 1890-1920,” American Journal of Sociology 98(1993):755-798; Margaret Weir, Politics and Jobs: The Boundaries of Employment Policy in the United States (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992); Edwin Amenta, Chris Bonastia, and Neal Caren, “US Social Policy in Comparative and Historical Perspective: Concepts, Images, Arguments, and Research Strategies,” Annual Review of Sociology 27(2001): 213-234; Daniel Lee Kleinmann, Politics on the Endless Frontier: Postwar Research Policy in the United States (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1995). In political science, this renewed interest grew under the banner of “American political development,” including works by Stephen Skowronek, Karen Orren, Victoria Hattam, Martin Shefter, Christopher Howard, Sven Steinmo, and Paul Pierson.

¹¹⁰Jill Quadagno, The Transformation of Old Age Security: Class and Politics in the American Welfare State (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988); Craig J. Jenkins and Barbara G. Brents, “Social Protest, Hegemonic Competition, and Social Reform: A Political Struggle Interpretation of the Origins of the American Welfare State,” American Sociological Review 54:(1989) 891-909; Gregory Hooks, “From an Autonomous to a Captured State Agency: The Decline of the New Deal in Agriculture,” American Sociological Review 55(1990):29-43. Robin Stryker’s “Science, Class and the Welfare State: A Class-centered Functional Account,” American Journal of Sociology 96 #3 (November 1990): 684-726 examines economists’ role in New Deal labor relations and American welfare policies.

¹¹¹Ann Orloff and Theda Skocpol, “Why Not Equal Protection? Explaining the Politics of Public Social Spending in Britain, 1900-1911, and the United States, 1880s-1920,” American Sociological Review 49(1984):726-750; Gosta Esping-Andersen, Politics Against Markets (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1985); Theda Skocpol, Protecting Soldiers and Mothers: The Political Origins of Social Policy in the United States (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1992); George Steinmetz, Regulating the Social: The Welfare State and Local Politics in

notable in conceptualizing the qualitative dimensions of variation across cases and in formulating typologies of ideal types, or “welfare regimes” (at times incorporating gender), which have been linked to distinctive political coalitions and institutional configurations.¹¹² While some of this work, by focusing on presences and absences, may tend toward a “comparative statics,” much of it has opened toward processual analyses. Indeed, regime types have been understood as a way of thinking about distinctive political-institutional “opportunity structures,” giving rise to varying sets of interests or preferences, identities and categories, coalitions, and administrative capacities that influence social politics in “path-dependent” ways.¹¹³ The tempo of history shifts from the sharp alternation of system and contradiction-driven crisis to a more even cadence of contestation and consolidation.

The encounter of classic questions with new methodologies also generated new developments on the more Weberian pole of historical sociology. Just as studies of (non) revolutions generated more processual accounts of class formation, analyses of state-formation also incorporated insights from new advances in the study of networks and identities. Influenced by the Simmelian heritage of positional network analysis,¹¹⁴ John Padgett and Christopher Ansell take fifteenth-century Florence as a major case of the “political centralization [which] lies at the heart of state building.” Their analysis of “the structure and the sequential emergence of the marriage, economic, and patronage networks that constituted the Medicean political party, used by Cosimo in 1434 to take over the budding Florentine Renaissance

Imperial Germany (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993); Thomas Janoski and Alexander Hicks, eds., The Comparative Political Economy of the Welfare State (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994); Alexander Hicks, Social Democracy and Welfare Capitalism (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1999); Evelyne Huber and John Stephens, Development and Crises of the Welfare State: Parties and Policies in Global Markets (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001). Some of these scholars draw on T.H. Marshall, Citizenship, Class, and Other Essays (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1950); Karl Polanyi, The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time (Boston: Beacon Press, 1944) and of course, the social-democratic version of Marxism in which socialism – or welfare states, the “next best thing” – can be achieved by peaceful, democratic means (see e.g., Stephens, The Transition from Capitalism to Socialism; Korpi, Working Class in Welfare Capitalism; Dietrich Rueschemeyer, Evelyne Huber Stephens and John D. Stephens, Capitalist Development and Democracy (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1992).

¹¹²Gosta Esping-Andersen, The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1990) and Social Foundations of Postindustrial Economies (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999); Ann Shola Orloff, “Gender and the Social Rights of Citizenship: The Comparative Analysis of Gender Relations and Welfare States,” American Sociological Review 58(1993b):303-328; Julia S. O’Connor, Ann Shola Orloff, and Sheila Shaver, States, Markets, Families: Gender, Liberalism and Social Policy in Australia, Canada, Great Britain and the United States (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999); Walter Korpi, “Faces of Inequality: Gender, Class and Patterns of Inequalities in Different Types of Welfare States,” Social Politics 7(2000)127-91.

¹¹³Paul Pierson, “Increasing Returns, Path Dependence, and the Study of Politics,” American Political Science Review 94(2000):251-68. However, Ira Katznelson cautions us about institutionalism’s potential neglect of the large-scale dynamics foregrounded by “macrohistorical analysis,” especially as this is expressed in the notion of “path dependency” (“Periodization and Preferences,” pp. 270-301 in Mahoney and Rueschemeyer, especially pp. 290-294).

¹¹⁴Harrison C. White, Identity and Control: A Structural Theory of Social Action (Princeton, NJ: University of Princeton Press, 1992) and An Anatomy of Kinship: Mathematical Models for Structures of Cumulated Roles (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1963).

state.”¹¹⁵ This research explores how relatively strong states emerge out of webs of social relations. In *City of Capital*¹¹⁶, Bruce Carruthers extends this theoretical project, and links it with the longstanding neo-Weberian concern with the “sinews of state power”¹¹⁷ – war and money. Whether concerned with Renaissance Florence or early modern England, these studies harness the analysis of social ties and interactions to a processual account of state formation.

Although driven by network analysis and new interests in collective identities, these developments converged with broader trends in the social sciences that are grouped under the theoretical umbrella of “institutionalism.” At the most general level, institutional theory draws attention to higher-order effects or emergent processes, rejecting the reductionism and methodological individualism that informed much of post-WWII social science.¹¹⁸ In its initial formulations, institutionalism in historical analysis tended to invoke institutions as given, as opportunity structures within which strategic actors operate. The opportunities confronting mobilized groups with a particular interest, for example, will differ across centralized and decentralized political institutions. At some level, this style of analysis only loosens the combination of structural determinism and utilitarian actors characteristic of the second wave. To the extent that these assumptions inform institutional analysis, less attention is paid to both the emergent character and cultural dimensions of institutions.

More recent work, however, takes the institutional framework of states as both the outcome of historical processes and a factor that explains subsequent historical trajectories. Rather than selecting cases of revolution and insurrection, these studies focus on moments of institutional transformation or consolidation. For example, Ann Orloff’s study of the initiation of modern pension programs in Britain, the U.S., and Canada traces the political processes – as conditioned by institutional legacies – which produced the building of the new institutions of the modern welfare state.¹¹⁹ Within American history,

¹¹⁵John F. Padgett and Christopher K. Ansell, “Robust Action and the Rise of the Medici, 1400-1434,” *American Journal of Sociology* 98(1993), pp. 1259, 1260. See also Paul D. McLean’s syncretic culturalist-institutionalist “A Frame Analysis of Favor Seeking in the Renaissance: Agency, Networks, and Political Culture,” *American Journal of Sociology* 104 #1 (July 1998): 51-91.

¹¹⁶Bruce Carruthers, *City of Capital: Politics and Markets in the English Financial Revolution* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996). Thomas Ertman’s *Birth of the Leviathan: Building States and Regimes in Medieval and Early-Modern Europe* (New York, NY: Cambridge 1997) argues that differences in constitutional institutions led to divergent trajectories of state formation.

¹¹⁷ John Brewer, *The Sinews of Power: War, Money, and the English State, 1688-1783* (New York: Knopf, 1988).

¹¹⁸The phrase “historical institutionalism” appears to have sprung from the collective conversations in a 1989 Boulder, Colorado workshop organized by Sven Steinmo and issuing in Kathleen Thelen and Sven Steinmo, “Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Politics” in Sven Steinmo, Kathleen Thelen, and Frank Longstreth, eds. *Structuring Politics: Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Perspective* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992) [personal communication, Sven Steinmo]. See also Elisabeth Clemens and James Cook, “Politics and Institutionalism: Explaining Durability and Change,” *Annual Review of Sociology* (1999)25: 441-66;; Kathleen Thelen, “Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Politics,” *Annual Review of Political Science* 2(1999):369-404.

¹¹⁹ Ann Shola Orloff, *The Politics of Pensions: A Comparative Analysis of Britain, Canada, and the United States, 1880-1940* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1993).

the Progressive Era has provided the “classic case.” Foundational works of institutional history used narrative history embedded in case comparisons to identify the common mechanisms and critical dimensions of variation in processes of state formation.¹²⁰ As these studies foreground complex historical narratives – often through comparisons that highlight similarities and differences of process – they move away from the empty experimental time of second wave historical sociology to a much deeper engagement with historicity and sequence.

In subsequent studies, these key insights into the dynamics of state transformation and consolidation have been coupled to the theoretical as well as methodological sensibilities that characterize the analyses of state-building presented by Padgett and Carruthers. Theories of structuration– as opposed to simply structure – highlight the processual relationships of networks, resources and cultural constructs.¹²¹ Institutional consolidation is understood as a project of embedding the agencies in a complex supporting coalition as well as in key experiments in service that enhanced the agencies’ reputations.¹²² The shift from a political system dominated by parties and centered on elections to one organized around interest groups and legislators was produced as political challengers transposed “organizational models” from non-political activities to political mobilization.¹²³ As with new work on early modern state-formation, these accounts of institutional consolidation and transformation employ processual theories and methods to account for fundamentally Weberian questions of bureaucratization and rationalization.

With respect to the second wave, the emergence of institutionalism within historical sociology is essentially, as we said above, a friendly amendment. The substantive focus remains in the sphere of political economy, although the broadly Marxist terrain of the earlier theory group has been extended and crosscut by Weberian themes of state-building and transformation. In the place of actors whose interests could be read directly from economic position by invoking utilitarian assumptions, institutionalists have substituted actors who are boundedly-rational, operating with repertoires – of collective action, of organization, of identity – that are culturally constituted in ways specific to time and place. But as historical sociology has encountered other intellectual trends, the challenges to basic assumptions have been much more fundamental.

Rational Choice Theory and the Cultural Turn

¹²⁰For example, Stephen Skowronek, Building a New American State: The Expansion of National Administrative Capacities, 1877-1920 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1982); Theda Skocpol, Protecting Soldiers and Mothers: The Political Origins of Social Policy in the United States (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1992).

¹²¹William H. Sewell, Jr., “A Theory of Structure: Duality, Agency and Transformation.” American Journal of Sociology 98 (1982): 1-29; Anthony Giddens, The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984).

¹²²Daniel P. Carpenter, “State Building through Reputation Building: Coalitions of Esteem and Program Innovation in the National Postal System, 1883-1913,” Studies in American Political Development 14(2000): 121-55.

¹²³Elisabeth S. Clemens, The People’s Lobby: Organizational Innovation and the Rise of Interest Group Politics in the United States, 1890-1925 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997).

In very different ways, both the ongoing “cultural turn” and rational choice theory have given people languages first to criticize and then – if they follow out these impulses – to depart from structuralist Marxist-influenced historical work. Rational-choice theory proceeds from rigorously worked-out utilitarian assumptions about the properties of individual and group action. As a body of thought, it too descends from classical sociological founding fathers, Thomas Hobbes and Adam Smith. But just as twentieth-century versions of Marxian theory elaborated and relaxed some of Marx’s core assumptions, so too has rational-choice theory been reshaped, so much so that some practitioners believe that they have solved or transcended the famous Hobbesian problem of “explaining social order” on the basis of individualistic strategic-rational assumptions.¹²⁴ Be that as it may, rational-choice arguments have figured in some recent and historically-relevant incarnations in sociology, such as Edgar Kiser and his collaborators’ work on the fiscal aspects of state formation, which has examined the *longue duree* development of different forms of fiscal extraction and administration in sites including China, Turkey, and western Europe; William Brustein’s analysis of the rise of Nazism; Rosemary Hopcroft’s book on peasant communities and property relations in English history; Julia Adams’ analysis of network mechanisms in the decay of Dutch colonialism; Arthur Stinchcombe’s work on agency problems and slave societies in the 18th century Caribbean; Paul Froese and Steven Pfaff’s exploration of the “missing” religious revival in two of ten post-communist societies of East Central Europe, and Ivan Ermakoff’s work joining game theoretic and interpretivist approaches to examine medieval European political marriages or crisis decision-making in the Weimar Republic or Vichy France.¹²⁵

Except as whipping boy, rational-choice theory is not a widespread presence in today’s historical sociology – not yet. Our sense is that this theoretical tendency will become more influential for two reasons. First, like the cultural turn (with which it has some surprising if subterranean affiliations), rational choice theory is part of a powerful cross- and interdisciplinary intellectual movement, embracing

¹²⁴Talcott Parsons, *The Structure of Social Action*, 2 vols. (New York: The Free Press, 1937); James S. Coleman, *Foundations of Social Theory* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1990).

¹²⁵Julia Adams, “Principals and Agents, Colonialists and Company Men: The Decay of Colonial Control in the Dutch East Indies,” *American Sociological Review* 61,(1996):12-28; William Brustein, *The Logic of Evil: The Social Origins of the Nazi Party, 1925-1933* (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1996); Ivan Ermakoff, “Prelates and Princes: Aristocratic Marriages, Canon Law Prohibitions, and Shifts in the Norms and Patterns of Domination in the Central Middle Ages,” *American Sociological Review* 62 (1997):405-422; Ivan Ermakoff, “Strukturelle Zwänge und Zufällige Geschehnisse,” March 2001, *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, Sonderheft 19: Struktur und Ereignis, pp. 224-256 (also available from the author in English, as “Structural Constraints and Incidental Happenings”); Paul Froese and Steven Pfaff, “Replete and Desolate Markets: Poland, East Germany and the New Religious Paradigm,” *Social Forces* (December 2001) 80 (2): 481-507; Rosemary Hopcroft, *Regions, Institutions and Agrarian Change in European History* (Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1999); Edgar Kiser, “A Principal-Agent Analysis of the Initiation of War in Absolutist States,” in R. Schaeffer, ed., *War and the World System* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1989), pp.65-82; Edgar Kiser and Joachim Schneider “Bureaucracy and Efficiency: An Analysis of Taxation in Early Modern Prussia,” *American Sociological Review* 59 (1994):187-204; Edgar Kiser and Xiaoxi Tong, “Determinants of the Amount and Type of Corruption in State Fiscal Bureaucracies: An Analysis of Late Imperial China,” *Comparative Political Studies* 25(1992); Edgar Kiser and April Linton, “The Hinges of History: State-Making and Revolt in Early Modern France,” *American Sociological Review* 2002, Vol. 67 (December: 889-910); Arthur L. Stinchcombe, *Sugar Island Slavery in the Age of Enlightenment: The Political Economy of the Caribbean World* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1995).

historical work in political science, economics, psychology and evolutionary biology as well as sociology.¹²⁶ The use of rational-choice arguments in new institutionalism and historical path-dependent reasoning will almost certainly increase as a fuller engagement emerges from within historical institutionalism in political science, and as a legacy of the explicit coupling of utilitarian and neo-evolutionary reasoning that is making dramatic headway all over the social sciences. Second, historical sociologists are groping for theoretical languages in which they can discuss strategic action, and rational choice theory is currently the most consistently developed paradigm.¹²⁷ We can expect to see more historical sociological analysis emerging under several rational-choice rubrics, including game theory, which has been applied *inter alia* to the emergence of political actors and coalitions¹²⁸ and the creation and reproduction of political institutions, which have figured as the equilibrium outcomes of repeated games, linked together over time. We can also expect strong resistance to these forms of analysis! Rational choice as an abstract theory has inspired hot-and-heavy reactions from other historical sociologists and will continue to do so.¹²⁹ But rational-choicers' on-the-ground historical analyses, typically less orthodox than their self-conscious methodological pronouncements suggest, often wed utilitarian arguments to Weberian-style comparative institutional analysis or even (gasp) culture.

Historical sociologists with a rational choice bent have not had much to say about modernity *per se*. This is not just because such large and unruly concepts sit awkwardly with methodological individualism. Silence in this case also betrays the taken-for-granted quality of a very close relationship: the detached, individualistic modern self is the utilitarian's chief assumption and analytical building block (but see Kiser, this volume). Yet the genesis of the so-called modern rational actor is itself an outcome of historical developments, including some decidedly non-rational processes of psychic repression and restructuring described in the works of Norbert Elias, Sigmund Freud and Franz Fanon

¹²⁶See for example Hendrik Spruyt, Avner Greif, Hilton Root, Margaret Levi and other contributors to the recent Analytic Narratives collection; Robert H. Bates, Analytic Narratives (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1998). Rational-choice theory has made very little headway in the discipline of History, although forms of utilitarian thinking are certainly to be found there (and therein lies another tale). Hilton L. Root is one of the few partisans. See his The Fountain of Privilege: Political Foundations of Markets in Old Regime France and England. Berkeley/Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press, 1994; Peasants and King in Burgundy: Agrarian Foundations of French Absolutism, Berkeley/Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press, 1987.

¹²⁷Pierre Bourdieu's work – particularly as codified in his Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1984) – is often cited as an alternative. Taken as a whole, however, Bourdieu's arguments involving individual and group strategic action – developed as a relationship between “habitus” and “field” – have a conceptually incoherent relationship to utilitarian thinking.

¹²⁸For example, see Robert Axelrod, “The Emergence of Cooperation Among Egoists,” American Political Science Review (June 1981): 306-18. Historical sociologists interested in the analytic possibilities that game theory offers can consult Avinash K. Dixit and Susan Skeath, Games of Strategy (New York, NY: W. W. Norton and Company, 1999).

¹²⁹See for example the responses to Edgar Kiser and Michael Hechter, “The Role of General Theory in Comparative-historical Sociology,” American Journal of Sociology 97(1991):1-30, including Margaret R. Somers, “‘We’re No Angels,’” now collected in Roger V. Gould, ed., The Rational Choice Controversy in Historical Sociology (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004).

(especially the latter's Black Skin, White Masks) as foundational to the "civilizing process."¹³⁰ Elias in particular argued that the capacity to think calculatively, linking ever-longer chains of means and ends, was necessarily bound up with increased self-discipline: the internalization of controls over socially inadmissible forms of anger, desire and other emotions. Rational-choice historical sociologists may well elect to ignore this, since culture is at best understood in an extremely limited and limiting way, as preferences, in utilitarian work (see Katznelson 2003) and emotions are ruled out of the theory in its rigorous version. Tacitly, however, this growing body of work can help us arrive at a broader and more situated view, although it must be stressed that this view systematically departs from utilitarian frameworks. We believe that capturing the precise contours of conditional and idealized rational action can help illuminate its ascendancy as the dominant mode of action and characteristic trope in today's capitalist world.¹³¹ Less can be said, as yet, about the post-modern causal conditions under which forms of strategic action and utilitarian self-understanding might be extended, undermined or otherwise transformed. Certainly there is a great need for better description and analysis of the dispersion of the mode of detached utilitarian action into all sorts of surprising social spaces.¹³²

If rational choice theory has a natural enemy within historical sociology, that appears to be the "cultural turn," at least at first blush.¹³³ People's routes to and on "the turn" vary tremendously; we would be better off abandoning the highway metaphor and speaking of turns plural. The bottom-line assumption, however, is that signification is a constitutive part of social life, with its own logic, which cannot be reduced to or "read off of" social position. In fact, those positions are themselves formed by processes of meaning-making. The cultural turn as a moniker covers an enormous intellectual field, part of the general shift toward linguistic modes of analysis in the twentieth century,¹³⁴ with ramifying roots in structural linguistics, philosophy, anthropology, history, literary theory, cultural studies, pragmatism,

¹³⁰Norbert Elias, The Civilizing Process (Oxford, UK: Blackwell, 1939); Joseph Breuer and Sigmund Freud, Studies in Hysteria (authorized translation with an introduction A.A. Brill.) (New York: Nervous and Mental Disease Monographs, 1937); Franz Fanon, Black Skin, White Masks (New York: Grove Weidenfeld, 1991).

¹³¹See Gerald F. Davis and Michael Useem 2001. "Top Management, Company Directors and Corporate Control," in Andrew Pettigrew, Howard Thomas and Richard Whittington, eds., Handbook of Strategy and Management (London: Sage, 2002), 233-259 for one example of the organizing power of this language in economic institutions.

¹³²This point is adumbrated in Ulrich Beck, The Risk Society (London: Sage Publications, 1992). Orloff, this volume, discusses this issue with respect to risk management in welfare states. The idea of measuring an agent's willingness to assume risk, found in Plato and Epicurus and reintroduced by Kant, became the core of von Neumann's and Morgenstern's expected utility theory. On this point see William C. Charron, "Greeks and Games: Forerunners of Modern Game Theory," Forum for Social Economics 29 #2 (Spring 2000): 1-32.

¹³³Things are not as simple as they seem. One of us (Julia Adams) has argued that rational choice theories of state formation from Hobbes to the present day are built on tacit, or rather repressed, culturalist arguments (see Julia Adams, "Culture in Rational-Choice Theories of State-Formation," in George Steinmetz, ed. State/Culture: State-Formation after the Cultural Turn [Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1999], 98-122.)

¹³⁴Charles Taylor describes this epochal shift with great clarity in his "Language and Human Nature" and "Theories of Meaning," Chapters 9 and 10 in Human Agency and Language. Philosophical Papers I (New York, Cambridge University Press, 1985), 215-247 and 248-292.

feminist and post-colonial theory – and of course sociology itself. Here we want to signal the most important theoretical themes for historical sociology.¹³⁵

The argument that all conceptual categories are fundamentally social, systemically organized, and historically mutable, hails from Ferdinand de Saussure's Course in General Linguistics and Durkheim and Mauss's Primitive Classification.¹³⁶ One could say that Saussure introduced the concepts of sign and system of signification, and Durkheim in particular underlined its sociality and emergent properties. No wonder Emile Durkheim was the Founding Father ritually abominated by the scholars of the canonical second wave: Durkheim's Elementary Forms of the Religious Life (1955) could serve as a totem – whether worshipped overtly or not – for ways in which scholars foregrounding the historical transformation of classification systems and practices actively disrupted the second wave's social imaginary. Andrew Abbott's The System of Professions (1988), to take one influential example, showed that jurisdictional claims – which revolve around “differences between archetypes” (p. 61) – and struggles among actors over whether and how those archetypal arrangements would be recognized, and perhaps institutionalized, anchor an interdependent system of professions. The major dynamics of system-level change reside in a number of external and internal factors, including technologies and organizations, but the professional formations of valued knowledge, the attendant arguments for recognition, including rhetorics and the migration of metaphors, have their own cultural properties and tendencies of development (Abbott 1988: 57-113).¹³⁷ Pierre Bourdieu's analyses of systems of taste and political language play out the relationship among objects of consumption or ways of speaking that function as signs of class difference in organized fields in which each element takes on its meaning in relationship to others. These elements are then available for actors' manipulation, accumulation, and so forth, but their relationships also constrain the possibilities for strategic action and thus of systemic transformation.¹³⁸

¹³⁵For manifold other aspects, see the excellent review by Eley (1996). Ronald Grigor Suny considers the state of the cultural turn/rational choice face-off in political science in his review essay “Back and Beyond: Reversing the Cultural Turn?” (Pp. 1476-1499 of American Historical Review, December 2002).

¹³⁶Emile Durkheim and Marcel Mauss were responding to Immanuel Kant. See their Primitive Classification (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963) as well as the foundational Ferdinand de Saussure, Course in General Linguistics (New York, NY: Philosophical Library, 1959).

¹³⁷While System defines the archetypal units as “organized groups of individuals” (p. 117), in practice the argument is more complicated, recognizing two levels of archetypes - one a formation of signs, the other a concatenation of individuals and aggregates of individuals. Signs and relations among signs are treated as relatively fixed for purposes of the theory, however, thereby stabilizing and streamlining what is already a complex argument.

¹³⁸Pierre Bourdieu. Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1984); Language and Symbolic Power (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991). Stanley Lieberson pokes a few holes in the empirical basis of Distinction in his “Einstein, Renoir, and Greeley: Some Thoughts about Evidence in Sociology: 1991 Presidential Address,” American Sociological Review 57 #1 (February 1992), pp. 1-15.

Classification systems continue to generate wonderful historical sociological work. Their evolving modes of abstraction and application have been examined across a series of social fields, including double-entry bookkeeping and law.¹³⁹ As classification systems receive renewed attention, the construction and policing of boundaries necessarily comes to the fore, whether they be boundaries among institutionalized formations of knowledge; among perceived racial and class groupings; among medieval and early-modern European status groups; among categories of children, and so on.¹⁴⁰ Some historical sociologists engaged by the disciplinary power residing in categorization also take Michel Foucault as one reference point.¹⁴¹ Foucault's own unclassifiable work, which if not that of a standard *sociologue* certainly flirts with historical sociology and is taught in many of our graduate theory courses, captures the historical emergence of normalizing discourses and "technologies of the self," and traces the processes by which they are embedded in and help create a range of disciplinary complexes including the prison, clinic, confessional, and state apparatuses. These discourses contribute to creating the very individuals that they describe and regulate. These arguments have been one impetus for exciting sociological work detecting the fingerprints of power on shifting historical categories.¹⁴²

Ironically, the state-centric heritage of the second wave has actually been helpful to historical sociologists working in the Foucauldian vein, helping them dodge two dangerous temptations. First, rather than displacing the central in favor of the capillary, or washing out their analytical differences (as Foucault himself tended to do), historical sociologists have sought to reconnect them and trace the genealogies of their institutionalization in forms of rule and the formation of subjects. There Foucault meets Weber, one might say. Thus Ivan Evans analyzes the relationship between racialized forms of local

¹³⁹See Bruce G. Carruthers and Wendy Nelson Espeland, "Accounting for Rationality: Double-Entry Bookkeeping and the Rhetoric of Economic Rationality," *American Journal of Sociology* 97 (1), 1991: 31-69. Arthur L. Stinchcombe's *When Formality Works: Authority and Abstraction in Law and Organizations* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2001) modifies Max Weber's account of the relationship between formal and informal systems.

¹⁴⁰Michele Lamont has explored the morality and historical development of perceived class and racial boundaries in the United States and France. Michele Lamont. *Money, Morals and Manners: The Culture of the French and American Upper-Middle Class* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1992); *The Dignity of Working Men: Morality and the Boundaries of Race, Class, and Immigration* (New York: Russell Sage and Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000). Andrew Abbott's *Chaos of Disciplines* (2001) deals *inter alia* with boundaries among institutionalized formations of knowledge. See also John Sutton, *Stubborn Children: Controlling Delinquency in the United States, 1640-1981* (Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1988) and Samuel Clark, *State and Status: The Rise of the State and Aristocratic Power in Europe* (Buffalo, NY: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1995).

¹⁴¹Foucault was not the first to examine the ways that categories come to be "transfer points" of power; his philosophical lineage rests on Nietzsche, Heidegger, Saussure, Derrida and others, as well as the first wave of classical historical sociology. Two texts have been particularly influential in today's historical sociology: *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (New York, NY: Vintage, 1979); *The History of Sexuality*, vol. 1 (New York, NY: Pantheon, 1978).

¹⁴²See for example John Torpey, *The Invention of the Passport: Surveillance, Citizenship and the State* (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 2000) and Mara Loveman, *Nation-state Building, "Race," and the Production of Official Statistics: Brazil in Comparative Perspective* (Ph.D. Dissertation, Sociology, University of California-Los Angeles, 2001).

vigilantism and state power in the twentieth-century U.S. and South Africa, while Philip Gorski traces the way in which capillary forms of Calvinist social discipline forged in the crucible of the Reformation are incorporated into state projects in early modern Europe.¹⁴³ The second temptation involves the reification of categories. We see this form of vulgar Foucauldianism whenever categories are deemed coextensive with identities and subjectivities (and either celebrated or excoriated as such!), or when categories get treated as homogeneous, suffocating, instrumentally deployed weapons by which the powerful unfailingly repress the less powerful. The growing body of work on identities in historical sociology has by and large evaded this trap. A serious engagement with history makes it hard to ignore the complexity of actors or the unintended consequences of action for those on top as well as on the bottom of the social heap.

The categories of politics – particularly with respect to nations and citizenship – attract the most scholarly attention in historical sociology. The power-political emphasis owes something to the second wave. But before that wave ebbed, politics was considered an arena of rational contestation, not aesthetic spectacle, and categories like citizenship and nationhood were erased or “forgotten” (see Somers, this volume; Spillman and Feages, this volume). No longer. There is now an analytical space for politics as the mobilization of desires and categories, not just interests.¹⁴⁴ Citizenship has been analytically reconstructed through the lens of the cultural turn,¹⁴⁵ and a wealth of work engages the formation of nations and national identities in many forms of politics. Benedict Anderson’s influential concept of nations as “*imagined communities*”¹⁴⁶ has been a touchstone and an inspiration. Some of the new

¹⁴³Ivan Evans, “Racial Violence and State Formation in Two Racial Orders: South Africa and the United States,” [working paper, available from the author]; Philip S. Gorski, “The Protestant Ethic Revisited: Disciplinary Revolution and State Formation in Holland and Prussia,” American Journal of Sociology 99 (1993):265-316, and Philip S. Gorski, The Disciplinary Revolution: Calvinism, Confessionalism and the Growth of State Power in Early Modern Europe (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2003). See also Michael Biggs, “Putting the State on the Map: Cartography, Territory, and European State Formation,” Comparative Studies in Society and History 41 #2, 1999, pp. 374-411.

¹⁴⁴Two quite different examples are John Markoff’s The Abolition of Feudalism: Peasants, Lords and Legislators in the French Revolution (Pennsylvania State University Press, 1996), which analyzes shifting and emergent categories of political grievance in the French Revolution, and Simonetta Falasca-Zamponi’s Fascist Spectacle: The Aesthetics of Power in Mussolini’s Italy (Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1997).

¹⁴⁵Categories of citizenship and nation overlap, of course. See Rogers Brubaker, Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992); Margaret Somers, “Citizenship and the Place of the Public Sphere: Law, Community, and Political Culture in the Transition to Democracy,” American Sociological Review 58 (1993):587-620; Yasemin Soysal, Limits of Citizenship: Migrants and Postnational Membership in Europe (Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1994); John Torpey (cited above), and Michael Hanagan’s Introduction to the Theory and Society Special Issue on Recasting Citizenship, Vol. 26 #4 (August 1997): 397-402.

¹⁴⁶Anderson writes in keeping with the darker impulse behind some of the cultural turn – recall that his project began as an attempt to understand the wars between Vietnam, Cambodia and China. “Who can be confident,” he asked with depressing prescience in the 1983 first edition, “that Yugoslavia and Albania will not one day come to blows?” (Imagined Communities (London: Verso, 1991), p. 12.

scholarship foregrounds Europe;¹⁴⁷ other scholarship looks beyond.¹⁴⁸ Many of these works on nations and national identities take conceptually hybrid forms as well, dovetailing with other foci. For example, Eiko Ikegami deploys the lens of collective identities in conjunction with institutionalism to locate the honorific culture of the samurai as the source of the nationally distinctive combination of collaboration and competition that characterizes the government institutions as well as corporations of modern Japan.¹⁴⁹ Frank Dobbin weds cultural analysis to the national specificities of industrial policy in his study of how policy-makers' perceptions influenced the building of the railways in the nineteenth-century United States, Britain and France.¹⁵⁰ And John Meyer and his collaborators have demonstrated that nation-state institutional forms and capacities for action have become a set of standardized, modular and reproducible cultural templates in today's "world society."¹⁵¹

¹⁴⁷A partial and telegraphic list of sociological works would include Mabel Berezin, Making the Fascist Self: The Political Culture of Interwar Italy (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1997); Rogers Brubaker Nationalism Reframed: Nationhood and the National Question in the New Europe (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996); Liah Greenfield, The Spirit of Capitalism: Nationalism and Economic Growth (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press 2001); Christian Joppke, Immigration and the Nation-State: The United States, Germany and Great Britain (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2000); Anne Kane, "Theorizing Meaning Construction in Social Movements: Interpretation and Symbolic Meaning during the Irish Land War, 1879-1882," Sociological Theory, 1997, 3:249-76; "Narratives of Nationalism: Constructing Irish Nationalist Identity during the Land War," National Identities 3(2000):246-64; Michael D. Kennedy, The Constitution of Critical Intellectuals: Polish Physicians, Peace Activists and Democratic Civil Society (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1990); Michael D. Kennedy, Cultural Formations of Postcommunism. Emancipation, Transition, Nation and War (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2002); John Lie, Multiethnic Japan (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001); Jeffrey K. Olick and Daniel Levy, "Collective Memory and Cultural Constraint: Holocaust Myth and Rationality in German Politics," American Sociological Review 62 #6 (December 1997): 921-936; Yasemin Soysal, Limits of Citizenship: Migrants and Postnational Membership in Europe (Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1994); Susan Cotts Watkins, From Provinces into Nations: Demographic Integration in Western Europe, 1870-1960 (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1991).

¹⁴⁸See for example Lynette Spillman's Nation and Commemoration: Creating National Identities in the United States and Australia (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997); Ming-cheng M. Lo, Doctors Within Borders: Profession, Ethnicity, and Modernity in Colonial Taiwan. Berkeley/Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press, 2002); see also Lo, this volume; Mounira M. Charrad, States and Women's Rights: The Making of Postcolonial Tunisia, Algeria, and Morocco (Berkeley/Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press, 2001); Gershon Shafir, Immigrants and Nationalists: Ethnic Conflict and Accommodation in Catalonia, the Basque Country, Latvia, and Estonia (Albany, NY: State University of New York, 1995). The contributors to Jeffrey K. Olick's edited collection, States of Memory: Continuities, Conflicts, and Transformations in National Retrospection (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2003), discuss collective memory, nation and nationalism with respect to a wealth of European and non-European cases.

¹⁴⁹Eiko Ikegami, The Taming of the Samurai: Honorific Individualism and the Making of Modern Japan (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1995).

¹⁵⁰Frank Dobbin, Forging Industrial Policy: The United States, Britain and France in the Railway Age (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 1994).

¹⁵¹See for example John W. Meyer, "The Changing Cultural Content of the Nation-State: A World Society Perspective," in George Steinmetz, ed., State/Culture: State-Formation After the Cultural Turn (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1999): pp. 123-143.

The making of modernity is central to the cultural turn in historical sociology in at least two ways. First, sociologists engage the substantive problems and questions associated with the formation of historically evolving cultural categories and practices. Often (but not always) these have an explicitly power-political focus.¹⁵² How, Meyer Kestnbaum wonders in this volume, do we describe and explain the ways in which “the people” have become involved in war – as citizens or in the name of other identities – and the corresponding critical relationship between popular uprisings and military mobilization? Or to take another example, one which returns us to the root class-based concerns of the second wave but with a novel culturalist twist, how are class-based identities historically constructed and reconstructed, and what might that mean for politics, work, family life, community action and so on? Howard Kimeldorf has examined such questions with special reference to the Wobblies in U.S. labor history.¹⁵³ Marc Steinberg’s Fighting Words examines the discursive construction of working-class boundaries in early nineteenth-century English politics; Richard Biernacki has analyzed the ways that distinctive conceptions of labor as a commodity shaped the practices of work in the textile industries of Germany and Britain.¹⁵⁴ There are many other possible examples. In fact, this general genealogical project is almost definitive of the way that the cultural turn has played out in historical sociology.

Second, more generally, the very concept of identity, thought to inhere primarily in an authorized individual subject, is the result of a long historical process in which that authorizing power, originally socially located in God or Nature, descends to and is inherited by “the self.”¹⁵⁵ Weber’s *Protestant Ethic* marked out one significant moment of that embattled process.¹⁵⁶ We are now located at an interesting intellectual and political moment at which this notion of the sovereign self and its associated practices are simultaneously being intellectually reinvigorated (for example, in rational-choice theory) and quite thoroughly undermined. Powerful voices outside the academy are reasserting fantasized fundamentalist

¹⁵²For two delightful counter-examples see Wendy Griswold, Renaissance Revivals: City Comedy and Revenge Tragedy in the London Theatre, 1576-1980 (Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1986) and Allan Silver, “Friendship and Trust as Moral Ideals: An Historical Approach,” Archives Europeenes de Sociologie (1989) 30: 274-97. We can expect the choice of analytic objects to broaden further as the second wave recedes.

¹⁵³See Howard Kimeldorf, Battling for American Labor: Wobblies, Craft Workers, and the Making of the Union Movement (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1999). Again, Michele Lamont’s The Dignity of Working Men is an important work in this particular category. See also Ronald Aminzade’s Ballots and Barricades: Class Formation and Republican Politics in France, 1830-1871 (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993); John R. Hall, ed. Reworking Class (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1997) and Joseph Gerteis (2003).

¹⁵⁴Richard Biernacki, Fabrication of Labor: Germany and Britain, 1640-1914 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995); Marc W. Steinberg, Fighting Words: Working-Class Formation, Collective Action, and Discourse in Early Nineteenth-Century England (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1999).

¹⁵⁵See John Meyer and Ronald Jeppersen, “The ‘Actors’ of Modern Society: The Cultural Construction of Social Agency,” Sociological Theory 18 (2000):100-120.

¹⁵⁶Max Weber, The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism (Harper Collins, 1930).

versions of tradition and personhood.¹⁵⁷ But perhaps the strongest credible *intellectual* challenge to date emanates from the inroads of post-structuralism and postmodernism – currents that reached American sociology later than some of the other human sciences. The relevant critiques of the subject, Enlightenment universalism and the grand narratives of modern historical development are by now familiar.¹⁵⁸ Perhaps this shift has become so overriding, bringing with it a sense of meaning as simultaneously crucial and fragile, because social processes associated with modernity and modernization are disenchanting the world.¹⁵⁹ No doubt the horrific political events of the twentieth and now twenty-first century are also an influence – including the total wars that ushered in Eric Hobsbawm’s “age of catastrophe” and seem to “confirm what many have always suspected, that history – among many other and more important things – is the record of the crimes and follies of mankind.”¹⁶⁰ Whereas the utilitarian vision aims for the crystalline clarity of a mathematical model, some of those who have taken “the turn” see through a glass darkly. But it must also be said that others find fundamental uncertainties exhilarating, and take them as an invitation to playful resignification and cultural creativity.

Because modernist theoretical imageries are deeply constitutive of our discipline, however, post-modernist and post-structuralist modes of thought raise substantial problems for sociologists in general and historical sociologists in particular. Opinion is therefore divided within the sociological community with respect to the more avowedly “postie” versions of the cultural turn. Some historical sociologists are grappling with this repertoire, trying to destabilize organizing imageries of progress and modernity in constructive (rather than simply deconstructive) ways.¹⁶¹ Others have responded by seeking to define these currents out of existence – or at least out of comparative historical sociology – in an attempt to make common cause with the more *soi-disant* scientific and soft-utilitarian sub-discipline of historical institutionalist political science. For James Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschemeyer, “comparative historical analysis” should by definition exclude most interpretivists, whom they also call “cultural theorists.” “The

¹⁵⁷“Cleric, rabbi, sadhi, and mullah mount the rostrum, occupy the public place, seeking to ordinate society according to a text originating outside of it.” The quote is from p. 236 of Roger Friedland, “Religious Nationalism and the Problem of Collective Representation,” *Annual Review of Sociology* 27, 2001: 125-152.

¹⁵⁸Jean-Francois Lyotard, *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1984 [1979]); Seyla Benhabib, “Hannah Arendt and the Redemptive Power of Narrative,” *Social Research* 57 (1990):167-196.

¹⁵⁹The sense of progress, of progressive change, is one casualty. In her comparison of the late nineteenth and late twentieth century commemorations, Lynette Spillman found that faith in progress had diminished in the twentieth century, even though there was more progress – by nineteenth century criteria – in the twentieth. Lynette Spillman, *Nation and Commemoration: Creating National Identities in the United States and Australia* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

¹⁶⁰Eric Hobsbawm, *Age of Extremes: A History of the World, 1914-1991* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1994), p. 584.

¹⁶¹Mayer N. Zald. 1996. “More Fragmentation? Unfinished Business in Linking the Social Sciences and the Humanities,” *Administrative Science Quarterly* 41 (2): 251-61. Things are complicated by the fact that “cultural sociology” has in part been constituted in reaction to cultural studies and “postie” thought – at the same time that it has been influenced by them, and is itself a product of the same intellectual and historical moment. All the more reason to render the “turn” in cultural turn in the plural!

danger of not taking sides on this issue,” they warn, “is that promising young researchers may be steered toward the theoretical nihilism embraced in the more extreme forms of postmodern theory.”¹⁶²

This latter strategy – *je refuse!* – seems as misconceived as it is to be expected. Work in the historical sociology of science – itself a wonderfully alive area in the cultural turn, as we noted above – would suggest that these efforts at boundary maintenance are characteristic of not only normal science but also of legitimacy moves emerging from within sociology. Think, for example, of the repressions that Charles Camic (1992) has shown were part and parcel of the Parsonian project of grand theorizing and institution-building. Why should historical sociology be immune from this hegemonizing impulse? Nevertheless, we should resist it – and ironically there are good scientific grounds for doing so. Innovations in fundamental knowledge often emerge from the encounter with other fundamental knowledges, as Arthur Stinchcombe notes, and fundamental knowledge is not stratified along a single dimension.¹⁶³ There is plenty to criticize about “the turn” – including some of its methods of analysis, which are as yet in their infancy – and criticism should be vigorously pursued. But given the rapid transformation of these knowledges, and the world that they are seeking to map, who is to prophesy from whence will come the “cultural toolkit”¹⁶⁴ for the historical sociologists of the third, fourth or future waves?

Feminist Challenges

Like their *companeras* in other parts of the human sciences, feminists within historical sociology have contested the exclusions and repressions that have characterized social analysis, and have revealed both the promises and limits of universalist modern categories and of modern social structures themselves.¹⁶⁵ They are but one small wing of a set of multifaceted intellectual and political movements, emerging in the 1960s and continuing today, that has transformed social life and social theory across the globe. These movements, some of the most successful grass-roots ventures in United States and, indeed, world history, have been dedicated to expressing what has been understood to be women’s interests and identities, and to reversing exclusions of women from modernity’s privileged intellectual spaces and fields of practice, including social theory and the university. Even with women’s movements past their peak of popular mobilization, scholars in gender studies – including historical sociologists – often

¹⁶²James Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschemeyer, Comparative-Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2003), p. 24. Since every prohibition is also an incitement, to paraphrase Foucault, we would have thought that such finger-wagging would only add to the temptations luring today’s academic youth to their culturalist doom.

¹⁶³Arthur Stinchcombe, When Formality Works: Authority and Abstraction in Law and Organizations (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001), see especially pp. 158-178.

¹⁶⁴Here we borrow Ann Swidler’s staunchly utilitarian metaphor. See Ann Swidler, “Culture in Action: Symbols and Strategies,” American Sociological Review 51(1986):273-86.

¹⁶⁵The current renaissance of feminist intellectual work got underway in the late 1960s, concurrent with our second-wave historical sociologists; feminist academics in historical sociology and other disciplines have been allied with a social movement – the “second wave” women’s movement that peaked in the 1970s, but continues in more institutionalized forms even today.

continue to be linked to feminist political activities outside academia. This differentiates them from some of the other challenges to second-wave work discussed above, and gives the feminist challenges to historical sociology – usually, but not always, mounted by women – a stronger political charge than we find in most other areas.

Working against disciplinary resistance within both heterodox fields like historical sociology and more orthodox areas like stratification research, feminists have had real though uneven successes in bringing the insights of gender scholarship to bear on theory and research.¹⁶⁶ In so doing, they have upset many of the foundational concepts of modernist social theory; they continue to trouble sociological analysis. Social theorizing founders on the gendered divisions between rational and non-rational action, and the evident unsuitability of practices like mothering for theorizing agency in the rationalist mode of second-wave, rational-choice and institutionalist historical sociologists. Women and the work they do – care-giving, housekeeping, sexual labor, their varying modes of political activity, and gendered signification, have been troublesome categories for sociological analyses of politics, capitalism and modernity. Meanwhile, the gendered (masculine) character of the central sociological subjects of modernity – citizens, workers, soldiers -- and what have been seen as core constituents of modernity – markets, public spheres, states – has also been revealed by feminist analysis, challenging the universalist modern on another front.¹⁶⁷ Feminist scholarly challenges raised difficulties for second-wave historical sociology, for they undermined taken-for-granted premises about who were the important political subjects and which were the critical events; upended periodization; and opened new arenas for political analysis – bodies, families, sexualities – while deepening the understanding of how gender structures even formal political spaces where women were excluded.

In the narrative of modernization theory, and in most varieties of Marxism, women have been seen to inhabit a “traditional,” “private,” world of family and home. As they move into the public sphere of the labor market, civil society and the state – as did men before them (in the transition from feudalism to modern capitalism) – they, too, become modern subjects. We can now say that women’s status and activities are important signs of what is understood to be modern or traditional, including by social scientists, even as the content and significance of these terms shifts over time and place. “Women” represent a key category of modernity’s Others, and liberal and autonomous individuals, citizens, workers, soldiers – the categories of modern subjects – are defined in opposition to what is “woman,” even when actual women were making decisions, working or fighting. Their absence helped to constitute the modern bourgeois public sphere and citizenship. Later, their inclusion signifies that modernity has arrived, even if the structures themselves retain a masculine character. Once (in the nineteenth-century heyday of the “family wage”) women’s paid labor was taken as evidence of the barbaric (if not satanic)

¹⁶⁶ On the general issue of disciplines and feminism, see Judith Stacey and Barrie Thorne, “The Missing Feminist Revolution in Sociology,” *Social Problems* 32(1985):301-15 and “Is Sociology Still Missing its Feminist Revolution?” in “The Missing Feminist Revolution: Ten Years Later,” *Perspectives: The ASA Theory Section Newsletter* 18(1996):1-3; Michael Burawoy, “The Power of Feminism,” in this same issue of *Perspectives*, 3-8.

¹⁶⁷ Barbara Marshall argues that those aspects of feminism that challenge modernist premises have gone against the grain of sociology precisely because our discipline is a modernist project (see her *Engendering Modernity* and *Configuring Gender*). See also Helene Silverberg, editor, *Gender and American Social Science: The Formative Years* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998).

character of capitalism, which had to be civilized by protecting women from paid work.¹⁶⁸ Contemporary analysts often assume that modernizing developments will inevitably bring women out of what they see as traditional housewifery and into the paid labor force and that the exclusion of women from paid work demonstrates societal backwardness.¹⁶⁹ Feminists have shifted this narrative decisively, showing that women's expulsion from public social life and the erection of a public-private divide between domesticity, home and family on the one hand, and paid labor, democratic politics and states on the other is very much a modern creation, not the residue of women's incomplete modernization.

Thanks to their cross-disciplinary ties through gender studies, feminist historical sociologists have been a conduit into the subdiscipline for a variety of intellectual trends, including women's history, feminist political theory, cultural studies, post-structuralism, and (post)colonial studies. Women's politics and women's experiences, historical and contemporary – later to be subjected to deconstructive readings and political interventions – provided the initial impetus for feminist work in the human sciences over thirty years ago. Within still second-wave historical sociology, feminists brought novel arguments and analyses about gender relations, previously understood only as “sexual difference,” or marginalized as insignificant to the main action of modernization. Power and inequalities – core concerns of political and historical sociology – had a gendered face, where they had been previously understood as principally about class and (sometimes) race. In this period, feminists in historical sociology – like their colleagues in the rest of the subfield, and indeed throughout the human sciences – understood women and men to be natural groups, emerging from biological or social universals. They saw “women's interests” in the classical Marxian-Lukacsian fashion found throughout second-wave historical sociology: identifiable by social analysts (or feminist vanguards), who could read them off social-structural locations, even as their interpretations diverged on what provided the material basis for those interests – labor, citizenship, mothering or sexuality. Sometimes these approaches construed women's interests and political demands in the same vaguely utilitarian mode as much mainstream institutionalist analysis. Yet at times feminist historical sociologists mounted an explicit challenge to utilitarianism and the concept of the atomized, rational individual pursuing his own interests. How, for example, could such premises accommodate the activities of mothers – and indeed fathers – caring for, and sacrificing for, children? (The question remains a pertinent point of analytical vulnerability.)¹⁷⁰ An even more severe break with the fantasy of clear materialist determination was to come with the various culturalist and post-structuralist moves of the late 1980s and early 1990s.

¹⁶⁸ Both men and women championed mothers' domesticity, although with different aims in mind; only a minority of women pursued the goals of gaining entry to paid labor, which today would be recognized as a “feminist” position. In many places (not simply the United States and Europe), women often struggled for resources and political recognition on the basis of gender “difference,” in the instance of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, on the basis of what were understood to be distinctively feminine virtues associated with mothering; see, e.g., Mothers of a New World: Maternalist Politics and the Origins of Welfare States, edited by Seth Koven and Sonya Michel (New York: Routledge, 1993).

¹⁶⁹ International organizations use measures of women's status to construct a “Gender-related development index,” which can be compared to the general “Human development index”; see, e.g., United Nations Development Programme, Human Development Report 2000 (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000). See also Nitza Berkovitch, From Motherhood to Citizenship: Women's Rights and International Organizations (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999).

¹⁷⁰ Some rational-choice thinkers are seeking to plug this analytical hole with a spot of evolutionary biology, but this has analytic strategy has yet to make an appearance in historical sociology. No doubt it will, and soon.

Second-wave historical sociology experienced a series of challenges to its premises about power, the construction of agents and signification with the cultural turns of the late 1980s and beyond (as we have outlined above). These challenges affected feminist historical sociologists from two directions – from within the subdiscipline and within gender studies, where parallel contestations erupted, with scholars mounting devastating attacks on the concepts of a culturally- or linguistically-unmediated experience and of a natural, pre-social and unified category of “women,” heretofore the lodestars of women’s movement politics and women’s studies scholarship.¹⁷¹ Joan Scott showed “women’s experience” to be culturally-mediated and variable yet she argued, with wide influence in historical sociology, that a (changeable) gender is “a useful category of historical analysis,” with two interrelated aspects: gender as “a constitutive element of social relationships based on perceived differences between the sexes” and as “a primary way of signifying relationships of power.”¹⁷² Not all who embraced the turn to signification and culture took Scott’s deconstructive path, but her formulation helped to establish cultural approaches for feminists doing historical work, including historical sociologists.

Another part of the culturalist challenge can be categorized as anti-essentialism, in which the category of “women” was exploded by consideration of multiple differences or post-structuralist decomposition. Analysts such as Evelyn Nakano Glenn mined the vein of difference beyond gender to unearth confounding dissimilarities and inequalities based on race and ethnicity, nationality, sexuality and the like.¹⁷³ Much of the work around “multiple differences” or “intersecting inequalities” incorporates discursive and cultural issues, yet some of it has maintained the familiar materialist premises about groups and interests even as the possible bases of oppression multiply.¹⁷⁴ Denise Riley – an influential gender scholar hailing from the humanities – demonstrated that “women” were a fiction, “historically, discursively constructed... a volatile collectivity in which female persons can be very differently positioned... synchronically and diachronically erratic as a collectivity... inconstant [for the

¹⁷¹ Judith Butler, who became the iconic post-structuralist feminist theorist, conceived gender as performance. Yet her innovative work was less significant for historical sociologists than the others here cited, for her analyses are for the most part historically decontextualized. Moreover, to the dismay of sociologists, the now-canonical (in gender studies) Gender Trouble (New York: Routledge, 1990) did not explore the work of such obvious predecessors as Erving Goffman. Butler’s work also lost something by this refusal to engage both Goffman and Clio.

¹⁷² Joan W. Scott, “Experience,” pp.22-40 in Feminists Theorize the Political, edited by Judith Butler and Joan W. Scott (New York: Routledge, 1992) and “Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis,” American Historical Review 91(1986):1053-75.

¹⁷³ Evelyn Nakano Glenn, “From Servitude to Service Work: Historical Continuities in the Racial Division of reproductive Labor,” Signs 18(1992):1-43. The critique of the idea of a unified category of woman was extremely widespread, and the literature on what has come to be called “multiple differences” or “intersectionality” is enormous. Feminism and Race, edited by Kum-Kum Bhavnani (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001) is an excellent collection on the debates around race, gender, colonialism, sexuality. For an influential piece in history, see Tessie Liu, “Teaching the Differences among Women from a Historical Perspective: Rethinking Race and Gender as Social Categories,” Women's Studies International Forum 14(1991): 265-76.

¹⁷⁴ For “interlocking oppressions” see, for example, Patricia Hill Collins, Black Feminist Thought (Boston: Unwin, Hyman, 1990), and the critique of the limits on her “deconstructive zeal” by Paul Gilroy in Black Atlantic, p.232n26.

individual] and [unable to]... provide an ontological foundation.”¹⁷⁵ The deconstruction of “women” also combined with concerns about multiple inequalities, raising difficult questions about what might be involved in relations *among* women. For example, Chandra Mohanty revealed the colonialist discursive moves embedded in the monolithic portrayal of “third world women” as Other to “Western feminism.”¹⁷⁶ These sorts of challenges raised particular difficulties for large-scale comparative or *longue-duree* historical work; while historical case studies (or ethnography) may be well-suited to unpacking the complex, cultural construction of identities at the intersection of multiple forms of difference, power and inequality for small groups of women (or men), undertaking studies of what Leslie McCall calls “complex inequality” on the vast terrain of the labor market, state, revolutions and other collective political action is challenging indeed.¹⁷⁷

The intellectual shifts to representation and the multiplicity of identities and inequalities have been very powerful, and open new understandings of modernity. Yet it is important to note that within historical sociology, as across the academy, feminism retains very diverse theoretical orientations, and different attitudes about modernist analysis and its various post- alternatives. And of course feminist theory and analysis continues to develop.¹⁷⁸ Feminism’s increasing internal diversity is reflected among feminist historical sociologists, who run the gamut from deconstructionism – one end of culturalist work – to standpoint theory, which assumes a still-robust social determinism. Historical sociologists, raised on earlier, largely materialist understandings of gender relations, were initially ambivalent about the deconstructionist and culturalist critiques. And, indeed, the materialist tendencies have not been extinguished, as much work continues in a still-modernist vein, within an implicitly utilitarian institutionalist or power resources framework. Of late, however, with the spread of culturalist approaches throughout the discipline, historical sociologists have become friendlier to analyses featuring signification. Many feminist historical sociologists have been influenced by the cultural turn, but most have not taken what Geoff Eley calls “the escalator” all the way to post-structuralism¹⁷⁹, and only a few have ventured into post-structuralist archaeologies of categories and concepts (especially the categories of “woman” and “man” themselves). Thus gender has entered (historical) sociology mainly as a dimension of analysis, to be incorporated into various theoretical frameworks, rather than through the adoption of feminist theories. Feminist historical sociologists are trying to strike compromise positions.

¹⁷⁵Denise Riley, “Am I That Name?” *Feminism and the Category of Women in History* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1989).

¹⁷⁶Chandra Talpade Mohanty, “Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses,” pp.51-80 in *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism*, edited by Chandra Mohanty, Ann Russo, and Lourdes Torres (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991).

¹⁷⁷ Leslie McCall, *Complex Inequality: Gender, Race and Class in the New Economy* (New York: Routledge, 2001).

¹⁷⁸ The project of “gendering” sociology means different things for scholars in different subdisciplines, and with different analytic and theoretical leanings. Sociologists of gender who identify with the historical wing of the discipline differ sharply from their rather presentist and too-often positivist colleagues by their concern with the *explicitly* political institutions of modernity. See O’Connor, Orloff and Shaver, *States, Markets, Families*, pp.10-11.

¹⁷⁹Geoff Eley, “Is All the World a Text? From Social History to the History of Society Two Decades Later,” in T. McDonald, ed., *The Historical Turn in the Human Sciences* (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1996), 193-243.

With respect to the analysis of collective political action and states, this is where we are today, on this extremely unsettled ground.

Feminist historical sociology has had some impressive intellectual successes, yet we take note of a gendered patterning in the areas of scholarship where feminist analyses have, or have not, made headway, and where they have found resistance. Gender analysis has faced resistance throughout the academy, echoing the opposition feminist politics have faced in the “real world.” This resistance takes on a distinctive character in historical sociology, with its center of gravity in the macro-political.¹⁸⁰ R.W. Connell has argued that opposition to feminism grows stronger the closer one gets to what he calls the core institutions of male power: the state apparatus, especially its military wing.¹⁸¹ (He thinks feminists are capable of achieving “local reversals” in “peripheral” sites such as the family.) We do not sign onto Connell’s overall analysis of patriarchy and state power – which is extremely bleak – but we do see a parallel relationship between resistance to feminism and feminist theory and proximity of an academic discipline or subdiscipline to the commanding heights of state power. Thus, it has been easier for gendered work to take hold in English than in economics, or in the sociology of the family than in political sociology, including its historical wing. When we examine historical sociological research on the state, we find greater penetration by gender analysis in scholarship on welfare policy than in research on state formation and state building, including the symbolically masculine activities of war and coercion. The gender segregation of scholarship, ubiquitous in academia and intellectual life, disables historical sociologists from making convincing historicized accounts of modernity, capitalism, states and politics. The recurring theoretical move of shunting “concerns of gender” to women scholars or to fields of scholarship marked as feminine prevents analyses of “core” political institutions and practices from understanding their gendered character – and thus, results in fatally misunderstanding them. And gender scholarship is reciprocally impoverished by the lack of work on institutions and practices that are also central to the constitution of gender relations.

Feminists in the last two to three decades have built up a significant body of research on gendered processes of reproduction, understood broadly as encompassing biological, social, and cultural elements; of gendered processes of identity-formation within classes, nations, racial/ethnic formations; of gendered collective action and citizenship practices; of gendered systems of social provision (welfare states). This research took off from the distinguished line of work among Marxist feminists on class reproduction, families and gender, but has evolved its own post-Marxist character.¹⁸² Nicola Beisel’s Imperiled Innocents, for example, argues for the central role of the family, gender and sexual politics in

¹⁸⁰ Julia Adams, “Feminist Theory as Fifth Columnist or Discursive Vanguard? Some Contested Uses of Gender Analysis in Historical Sociology,” Social Politics 5(1998):1-16; Ava Baron, “Romancing the Field: The Marriage of Feminism and Historical Sociology,” Social Politics 5(1998):17-37; Ewa Morawska, “A Historical Turn in Feminism and Historical Sociology,” Social Politics 5(1998):38-47.

¹⁸¹R.W. Connell, Gender and Power: Society, the Person, and Sexual Politics. (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1987). A fascinating counter-argument is Robert Max Jackson’s Destined for Equality: The Inevitable Rise of Women’s Status (Boston, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998).

¹⁸²See Barbara Laslett and Johanna Brenner, “Gender and Social Reproduction: Historical Perspectives,” Annual Review of Sociology 15 (1989): 381-404.

class formation and reproduction – including cultural aspects of these processes, and links these to the formation of Anthony Comstock’s anti-vice movement in Victorian America.¹⁸³

Nevertheless it must be said that the masculine preserves of states remain analytically off limits. There have been few if any historical analyses of the gendered mechanics of warmaking itself – this in spite of the implicit invitation in Norbert Elias’ The Civilizing Process, a text about, above all, the social disciplining and internalization of forms of *masculinized* coercion involved in the formation of “modern” states and male subjects.¹⁸⁴ And studies of state formation, one of the most significant and influential areas of scholarly activity by comparative-historical sociologists, have remained relatively untouched by gender analysis. For too many scholars in these areas, masculinity remains unmarked, and gender continues to signify women.¹⁸⁵ Yet recent work by historians and political theorists has revealed not only elements of women’s role in state-making, but also the ways in which masculine identities and men’s gendered aims were implicated in the political activities that established modern states and democratic orders.¹⁸⁶ Other analyses highlight the ways in which “woman” or particular women functioned as signs in sexualized political discourses and political culture.¹⁸⁷ Among historical sociologists, Pavla Miller has traced the making and unmaking of different forms of patriarchal governance across a number of Western sites, relating gender and family dynamics, technologies of the self and larger processes of state-making and capitalist industrialization.¹⁸⁸ Gary Hamilton compares the intersection of families and states in China and Western Europe, reevaluating Weber’s arguments about patriarchy and patrimonialism.¹⁸⁹ Julia Adams’ work on the Netherlands, England and France uncovers the way in which representatives of family lineages mobilized signifiers of fatherhood and rule in the formation of patrimonial political structures, and shows how the articulation of signs of paternity, elite family forms and political structures

¹⁸³Nicola Beisel, Imperiled Innocents: Anthony Comstock and Family Reproduction in Victorian America (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997).

¹⁸⁴ Norbert Elias, The Civilizing Process (Oxford, UK: Blackwell, 1939). On the other hand, historical and political theoretical studies of representations of war abound. See, for example, the sections on masculinity and representations of war in Jean Bethke Elshtain’s Women and War (New York: Basic Books, 1987).

¹⁸⁵ Terrell Carver, Gender Is Not a Synonym for Women (Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Reiner, 1996).

¹⁸⁶Joan Landes, Women and the Public Sphere in the Age of the French Revolution (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1988); Carole Pateman, Disorder of Women: Democracy, Feminism, and Political Theory (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1989) and The Sexual Contract (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1988).

¹⁸⁷Linda Gregerson, “Native Tongues: Effeminization, Miscegenation and the Construct of Tudor Nationalism,” Mitteilungen des Zentrums zur Erforschung der Fruhen Neuzeit, No. 3 (June 1995), Frankfurt, Renaissance Institute, Johan Wolfgang Goethe Universitat: 18-38; Lynn Hunt, Politics, Culture and Class in the French Revolution (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984) and The Family Romance of the French Revolution (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992); Sara Maza, Private Lives and Public Affairs: The Causes Célèbres of Prerevolutionary France (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993); Zerilli, Signifying Woman.

¹⁸⁸ Pavla Miller, Transformations of Patriarchy in the West, 1500-1900 (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1998).

¹⁸⁹Gary G. Hamilton, “Patriarchy, Patrimonialism, and Filial Piety: A Comparison of China and Western Europe,” The British Journal of Sociology 41 #1 (March 1990): 77-104.

contributed to the different fates of these three states.¹⁹⁰ This general body of work has mostly concentrated on Europe – a limitation, to be sure, but also a rhetorical advantage, since Europe was often rendered as the premiere site of rationalized state-making – the site in which gender, associated with notions of traditionalism, was supposed to have been progressively extirpated.¹⁹¹

While work on “the sinews of power” – war, bureaucratization, fiscal extraction – has not yet become a favored site for feminist historical sociology, it is not the case that they have neglected states altogether. Far from it. Gender analysts in historical sociology have thoroughly worked the ground of states and their critical role in social reproduction, particularly in systems of social provision and regulation – today’s welfare states and their precursors (see Orloff, this volume). Feminist historical sociologists have changed the way welfare states or regimes are conceptualized. By beginning from feminist premises about “women’s (and men’s) interests,” focusing on different capacities to exercise citizenship rights, the distribution of paid and unpaid labor, employment opportunities, poverty levels, and support for caregiving, they have upended much of the common wisdom about the modern welfare state and citizenship, including the periodization of citizenship rights, the categorization of regimes, the import of key concepts like “decommodification,” and the prerequisites for state welfare. To take only one of these accomplishments: Mainstream scholars of the early years of modern state welfare saw workingmen utilizing political rights to demand social rights, which in turn strengthened their collective political capacities. Feminists brought out the gendered content of these struggles, showing that trade unionists, employers and others had gender and familial as well as occupational or class interests. In the struggles over protective legislation for women and for family provision, for example, many workingmen wanted women to be constructed as wives, male employers wanted them to be (subordinate, cheap) workers, and women themselves often wanted recognition as mothers or as (equally-paid and equal) workers.¹⁹² Which group won out differed across countries and time periods. Furthermore, historical sociologists showed that for women, social rights preceded political rights – reversing the periodization handed down by T.H. Marshall to historical sociologists of welfare – and that women utilized distinctive political strategies and forms to win passage of legislation in the absence of the franchise.¹⁹³

Gender analysts of welfare systems for the most part have followed the basic intellectual contours of institutionalism, including many of its utilitarian assumptions. But by starting with women, many institutionalist premises are unravelled. And considerations of gender often bleed into topics outside the normally dry parameters of institutionalist analysis, such as body rights or, even more

¹⁹⁰ Julia Adams, “The Familial State: Elite Family Practices and State-Making in the Early Modern Netherlands,” *Theory and Society* 23(1994):505-539; Julia Adams, “The Rule of the Father: Patriarchy and Patrimonialism in Early Modern Europe,” Working Paper, Russell Sage Foundation.

¹⁹¹ George Steinmetz, ed. *State/Culture* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1999).

¹⁹² Susan Pedersen, *Family, Dependence, and the Origins of the Welfare State: Britain and France, 1914-1945* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993); Jane Jenson, “Gender and Reproduction: Or, Babies and the State,” *Studies in Political Economy* 20(1986):9-45.

¹⁹³ Skocpol, *Protecting Soldiers and Mothers*; Clemens, *People’s Lobby*.

commonly, unpaid care work.¹⁹⁴ These subjects are difficult to assimilate to certain aspects of the utilitarian model of the actor, which depends on notions of an autonomous liberal individual, whose gender is unmarked but masculine and is unburdened by care or other attachments. Moreover, opening up questions about care, women's exclusion, and bodies has troubled assumptions about the easy interpretability of "interests" apart from politics, culture and signification. For example, many scholars have looked at different political struggles around the proper relationship of motherhood and paid labor, citizenship and welfare benefits, finding that different groups of men and women take varying positions over time and across countries. Debates around the meanings of all these statuses are shifting and politically and culturally charged.¹⁹⁵ Within this research area, many are paying increased attention to the ways in which states create categories and subjects, which is leading some to consider the ways in which making claims on the state incorporates cultural or discursive dimensions, as in a host of studies on the ways in which discursive categories have been institutionalized in state agencies and professional-administrative practices at the local level, and either embraced or resisted by those to whom they have been applied.¹⁹⁶

Scholars working on the broad topic of collective action – which has always been a contentious area with respect to gender – uncovered the contribution of women to class politics and social movements, then moved to consider the ways in which gendered identities and gender relations are politically and culturally created, sustained or challenged by social movements and in the routines of institutionalized politics. Facile assumptions about working-class solidarity across gender lines or the content of political demands were undermined by the research of historical sociologists such as Ava Baron, Johanna Brenner, Elizabeth Faue, Ruth Milkman, Sonya Rose and Carole Turbin, writing in the 1980s and early 1990s on the history of working-class or middle-class women, gender in the workplace,

¹⁹⁴ O'Connor, Orloff, and Shaver, States, Markets, Families; Orloff, "Gender and the Social Rights of Citizenship."

¹⁹⁵ Julia Adams and Tasleem Padamsee, in "Signs and Regimes: Rereading Feminist Work on Welfare States," Social Politics 8 (2001): 1-23 and Tasleem Padamsee and Julia Adams ("Signs and Regimes Revisited," pp. 187-202 in Social Politics 9 #2 (Summer 2002)) draw on post-structuralism in their analysis of the deployment of the concept of "maternalism" in feminist histories of the U.S. welfare state; see also Ann Shola Orloff. 2000. "Farewell to Maternalism: Welfare Reform, Liberalism, and the End of Mothers' Right to Choose Between Employment and Full-time Care" (Evanston, Ill. : Institute for Policy Research, Northwestern University).

¹⁹⁶See, for example, Barbara Hobson and Marika Lindholm, "Collective Identities, Power Resources, and the Making of Welfare States," Theory and Society (Fall 1997):1-34; Lynne Haney, Inventing the Needy: Gender and the Politics of Welfare in Hungary (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002); Susan Gal and Gail Kligman, The Politics of Gender After Socialism (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000); Bruce Bellingham and Mary Pugh Mathis, "Race, Citizenship and the Bio-politics of the Maternalist Welfare State: "Traditional" Midwifery in the American South under the Sheppard-Towner Act, 1921-29," Social Politics 1(1994):157-89; see also Steinmetz, Regulating the Social. Nancy Fraser has made several influential interventions to bring discursive approaches to gendered welfare scholarship; see "Women, Welfare and the Politics of Need Interpretation," and "Struggle over Needs: Outline of a Socialist-Feminist Critical Theory of Late Capitalist Political Culture," pp.144-60 and pp.161-90 in her book, Unruly Practices: Power, Discourse and Gender in Contemporary Social Theory (Minneapolis" University of Minnesota Press, 1989) and the essays in Justice Interruptus: Critical Reflections on the "PostSocialist" Condition (New York: Routledge, 1997); Nancy Fraser and Linda Gordon, "A Genealogy of 'Dependency': Tracing a Keyword of the US Welfare State," Signs 19(1994):309-36.

the gender politics of the labor movement, and the role of the state in creating sex segregation.¹⁹⁷ Others chronicled the rise of the different waves of women's movements.¹⁹⁸ But their close ties to history also meant they felt the pull of the cultural turn, and the associated shift from the "history of women"¹⁹⁹ to the post-structuralist historical construction of sexual difference.²⁰⁰ The construction of distinctive masculinities and femininities in diverse contexts, and the sources of gendered political action, have been examined by many analysts, including, for example, Mary Ann Clawson in an analysis of nineteenth century U.S. fraternal organizations or Raka Ray in a study of women's movements in two Indian cities, while Kathleen Blee incorporated the racialized dimensions of women's identities in a study of women's participation in the Ku Klux Klan.²⁰¹ This focus on gendered mobilization extends to the formation of nations and states as well – for example, Gay Seidman's examination of post-apartheid South Africa and Daina Stukuls' study of processes of gendered normalization in post-Soviet Latvia.²⁰² Theda Skocpol's analysis of the emergence and successes of "maternalist" movements in the first decades of the twentieth century challenged understandings of U.S. political and policy history and of the sources of collective action that had formed the basis for much political sociology.²⁰³ In all of these studies, we see not only better historical documentation of the varying forms and levels of gendered collective action (including armed struggle), but also interesting attempts to integrate culturalist preoccupations with political

¹⁹⁷ See Ava Baron, ed., Work Engendered: Toward a New History of American Labor (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1991); Johanna Brenner and Maria Ramos, "Rethinking Women's Oppression," New Left Review 144(1984):33-71; Elizabeth Faue, Community of Suffering and Struggle: Women, Men, and the Labor Movement in Minneapolis, 1915-1945 (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1991); Ruth Milkman, Gender and Work: The Dynamic of Job Segregation by Sex During World War II (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1987); Sonya Rose, Limited Livelihoods: Gender and Class in Nineteenth-Century England (Berkeley, Ca: University of California Press, 1992); Samuel Cohn, The Process of Occupational Sex-typing: The Feminization of Clerical Labor in Great Britain (Philadelphia: PA: Temple University Press, 1985); Carole Turbin, Working Women of Collar City: Gender, Class and Community in Troy, New York, 1864-1886 (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1992); Desley Deacon, Managing Gender: The State, the New Middle Class and Women Workers, 1830-1930 (Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 1989).

¹⁹⁸ For example, Myra Marx Ferree and Beth B. Hess, Controversy and Coalition: The New Feminist Movement (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1985); Jo Freeman, The Politics of Women's Liberation: A Case Study of an Emerging Social Movement and Its Relation to the Policy Process (New York, McKay, 1975).

¹⁹⁹ Louise A. Tilly and Joan W. Scott, Women, Work, and Family (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1978).

²⁰⁰ For example, Joan Scott, Gender and the Politics of History (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988); see also Eley, "Is All the World a Text?," pp. 202-03.

²⁰¹ Kathleen Blee, Women of the Klan: Racism and Gender in the 1920s (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1991); Mary Ann Clawson, Constructing Brotherhood: Class, Gender, and Fraternalism (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1989); Raka Ray, Fields of Protest: Women's Movements in India (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999).

²⁰² Gay Seidman, "'No Freedom Without the Women': Mobilization and Gender in South Africa, 1970-1992," Signs 18 (1993): 291-320; and Daina Stukuls, "Body of the Nation: Mothering, Prostitution, and Women's Place in Post-Communist Latvia," Slavic Review 58 (1999):537-558.

²⁰³ Skocpol, Protecting Soldiers and Mothers.

struggles and structures. Much of this work deals with the ways in which gender relations are interwoven with political struggles and gendered signs and symbols are constitutive of political discourse.

Feminists in historical sociology have conducted a spirited campaign to bring gender into the political and still-masculinized core of modernity. The masculine redoubts of the working class (like welfare states) have been revealed in exemplary historical sociological research as sites of gendered contestation and sources of gendering broader social orders, but we have been less successful in entering the corporate headquarters of modernity. We think this means less satisfying explanatory accounts of social transformation for all of us. Sociologists who want to incorporate gender analysis into their work will continue to find the road hard going, but we hope they will keep up their efforts. We editors also hope that they will resist certain intellectual tendencies within gender studies, particularly those that automatically reject any further congress between the liberal subject and womanhood. This rejection would be a grievous mistake at a moment when gendered meanings of “tradition” and “modernity,” swirling around women’s bodies and practices yet again, threaten to engulf whatever progress – situated and relative though it may be – women have achieved through a qualified embrace of modernity.

With respect to the wider community of historical sociologists, and the discipline of sociology itself, “la lucha continua” (as we used to say). Linda Zerilli points out in her study of classical political theory and the signifier “woman” that political theory as an intellectual enterprise also participates in the construction of gender – the same point may be made of historical sociology.²⁰⁴ Witness the ways in which areas of sociology in which gender analyses have scored some successes may be subject to redefinition by those who would prefer, consciously or not, to dispense with it.²⁰⁵ The gendering encounters on intellectual territory are never finally fixed.

World-Systems, Postcoloniality and Remapping the World after the Second Wave

Historical sociology is built on theories of transitions to capitalist modernity, and those theories have been historically centered around versions of the European Experience. Both first and second wave sociologists overemphasized the originary importance of European historical lineages, as we have seen, and many simply assumed that the concepts and theories deriving from those lineages applied around the world. Certain key features of those lineages (such as their linkage to colonialism or Islam) were also off the table. As people in and outside the academy reexamine these assumptions, the process of academic soul-searching in historical sociology is underway on three main fronts.

First, some scholars are critically reevaluating and extending second wave work and debates. The filiation is often explicitly marked. Thus the reciprocal relationship between organized violence – including war-making – and state centralization highlighted by Charles Tilly among others has been qualified and reformulated by Karen Barkey, based on the case of the Ottoman Empire, and Miguel

²⁰⁴ Adams, “Feminist Theory as Fifth Columnist or Discursive Vanguard”; Baron, “Romancing the Field”; Zerilli, Signifying Woman.

²⁰⁵ Some might wonder if the machine terminology attached to the intellectual move to “social mechanisms” is not at least partially an attempt to reclaim masculine intellectual space, for example!

Centeno and Fernando Lopez-Alves, with respect to patterns of state-formation in Latin America.²⁰⁶ What role ideology might play in the genesis of revolutions, the topic of a well-known debate between Theda Skocpol and William Sewell, Jr., spurred Mansoor Moaddel's study of the 1979 Iranian Revolution.²⁰⁷ Revolutionary processes and outcomes established in the state-centered tradition of second-wave research have been reexamined in non-European states by Jeff Goodwin, Timothy Wickham-Crowley and others.²⁰⁸ Do certain class coalitions make particular paths of political development more likely? James Mahoney and Jeffery Paige revisit Barrington Moore Jr.'s classic arguments in their respective studies of liberalism and the rise of democracy in Central America.²⁰⁹ Does a state's relative autonomy not simply from the bourgeoisie, but from a colonial power, help secure the conditions of modernization? Muge Gocek reexamines the familiar second wave Marxian question in her study of the Ottoman Empire.²¹⁰ This is only a sampling of recent scholarship in this genre. "While history may perhaps suffer less from this confusion than the social sciences," write Miguel Centeno and Fernando Lopez-Alves, "we are all used to assumptions that peasant means French, state means Germany, revolution means Russia, and democracy means Westminster."²¹¹ These and other excellent

²⁰⁶Karen Barkey. Bandits and Bureaucrats: The Ottoman Road to State Centralization. (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1994); Miguel Angel Centeno. Blood and Debt: War and the Nation- State in Latin America. (University Park, Pa.: Penn State University Press, 2002); Fernando Lopez-Alves, "'The Transatlantic Bridge: Mirrors, Charles Tilly, and State Formation in the River Plate,'" pp. 153-176 in Miguel Angel Centeno and Fernando Lopez-Alves, eds. The Other Mirror: Grand Theory Through the Lens of Latin America (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2002). See also Misagh Parsa, States, Ideologies, and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of Iran, Nicaragua and the Philippines (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000).

²⁰⁷Mansoor Moaddel. Class, Politics and Ideology in the Iranian Revolution (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1992). For a quite different historical-sociological interpretation, see Said Arjomand's The Turban for the Crown: The Islamic Revolution in Iran (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988) and his "Perso-Indian Statecraft, Greek Political Science and the Muslim Idea of Government," International Sociology 16 #3, 2001, pp. 455-473. The Sewell/Skocpol debate is William Sewell, Jr., "Ideologies and Social Revolutions: Reflections on the French Case," Journal of Modern History 57 (1985): 57-85; Theda Skocpol, "Cultural Idioms and Political Ideologies in Revolutionary Reconstruction of State Power: A Rejoinder to Sewell," Journal of Modern History 57 (1985): 86-96.

²⁰⁸See Jeff Goodwin, No Other Way Out: States and Revolutionary Movements, 1945-1991 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001); Timothy P. Wickham-Crowley, Guerrillas and Revolution in Latin America. A Comparative Study of Insurgents and Regimes Since 1956 (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1992).

²⁰⁹Jeffery Paige. Coffee and Power: Revolution and the Rise of Democracy in Central America (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997); James Mahoney. Legacies of Liberalism. Path Dependence and Political Regimes in Central America. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins Press, 2001.

²¹⁰Fatma Muge Gocek, Rise of the Bourgeoisie, Demise of Empire: Ottoman Westernization and Social Change (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1996). In the Marxian tradition, see also Vivek Chibber's "Breaching the Nadu: Lordship and Economic Development in Pre-colonial South India," The Journal of Peasant Studies 26 (1), 1998 1-42 and his "Building a Developmental State: The Korean Case Reconsidered," Politics and Society 27(3):309-346, 1999.

²¹¹See Miguel Angel Centeno's and Fernando Lopez-Alves' "Introduction," pp. 3-24 of their edited volume The Other Mirror: Grand Theory Through the Lens of Latin America (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2002).

works disorganize these assumptions, tell us about Other Cases, and rewrite the empirical generalizations and sociological theories of state-formation derived from internalist and nationally-specific European histories.²¹²

Another version of this approach, which we might call critical extensions of second wave scholarship, follows in the path of Fernando Cardoso, Andre Gunder Frank, Immanuel Wallerstein and other pioneers of dependency theory and world systems analysis.²¹³ This vision has been taken up in a variety of fruitful ways by Janet Abu-Lughod; Giovanni Arrighi; Terry Boswell; Georgi Derluguian; Peter Evans; John Foran; Harriet Friedman, and David Strang among others.²¹⁴ In the broadest sense, it has diffused beyond the boundaries of world-systems analysis: the general world-systems intuition is now quite widespread, with plenty of historical sociologists who do not sign onto the theory making free with some vague version of the concept. True, few historical sociologists have adopted Wallerstein's full argument that there is something one might call a "world system": a *single* network of core, peripheral and semi-peripheral nodes sustained by the extraction of surplus based on economic specialization and rationalization rather than imperial force. Nevertheless the impulse behind world systems analysis was a

²¹²Note that individual scholars with second wave affiliations have followed the threads into other areas as well, such as historical institutionalism. Karen Barkey, for example, has since written on network organization in the Ottoman Empire in the manner of the "institutionalist challenge" described above. See Barkey's and Ronan Van Rossem's "Networks of Contention: Villages and Regional Structure in the Seventeenth-Century Ottoman Empire," American Journal of Sociology 102 #5 (March 1997): 1345-1382. In general, this whole category of work overlaps substantially with similar moves in historical institutionalist political science.

²¹³Fernando Henrique Cardoso and Enzo Faletto, Dependency and Development in Latin America, tr. Marjory M. Urquidí. (Berkeley/Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press, 1979, originally published 1971); Andrew Gunder Frank, The Development of Underdevelopment (Boston, MA: New England Free Press, 1966); Wallerstein, Immanuel. 1974. The Modern World System I: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World Economy in the Sixteenth Century. New York: Academic Press. An insightful contemporaneous discussion of this literature is Ian Roxborough, Theories of Underdevelopment (London: Macmillan, 1979). John Foran's "An Historical-Sociological Framework for the Study of Long-Term Transformations in the Third World" (pp. 330-349 in Humanity and Society vol. 16 #3 (August 1992)) examines the relationship between underdevelopment theory, dependency and world-systems theories.

²¹⁴Some of the highlights of this intellectual tradition include Janet Abu-Lughod, Before European Hegemony: The World-System A.D. 1250-1350 (New York, Oxford University Press, 1989); Giovanni Arrighi and Beverly J. Silver, Chaos and Governance in the Modern World System (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1999); Albert Bergesen and Ronald Schoenberg, "Long Waves of Colonial Expansion and Contraction, 1415-1969," in Studies of the Modern World System (New York: Academic Press); Terry Boswell, "Colonial Empires and the Capitalist World-System: A Time-Series Analysis of Colonization, 1640-1960," American Sociological Review 54, 1989: 180-196); Georgi M. Derluguian, "The Politics of Identity in a Russian Borderland Province: The Kuban Neo-Cossack Movement, 1989-1996," Europe-Asia-Studies, ed. Serge Cipko (1997, 49 (8): 1485-1500); Peter Evans, Dependent Development: The Alliance of Multinational, State, and Local Capital in Brazil (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1979); John Foran, Fragile Resistance: Social Transformation in Iran from 1500 to the Revolution (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1993); David Strang, "From Dependency to Sovereignty: An Event History Analysis of Decolonization 1870-1987," American Sociological Review 55 #6 (December 1990, pp. 846-890).

remarkable one, and it is still one that all of us might profitably take up, particularly when it comes to jettisoning the automatic identification of important social processes with the boundaries of contemporary sovereign states and nation-state borders.²¹⁵

In all this work, we continue to see the signs of the rending and tearing of the second wave paradigm along several fault lines. Those who hold by its core dimensions, who try to explain what they're about in terms of expanding the reach and generalizability of second-wave models, are prey to increasingly sharp analytic tensions. Sometimes those tensions are explicitly thematized. Jeff Goodwin, for example, discusses the limitations of his "state-centered perspective" (pp. 55-58), including its failure to tackle associational networks and culture. These limits are reasonable trade-offs, he argues, when one is looking for a parsimonious rather than exhaustive explanation (p. 58). But the basic question – which Goodwin himself raises elsewhere in his work -- is whether the omitted dimensions structure the state of affairs that sociologists are examining.²¹⁶ World systems analysts for their part want to incorporate dynamics of race, ethnicity, even religion into their analyses, but find themselves corseted by the economic propositions about what organizes the relationships among relevant network nodes.²¹⁷ The further insistence that there must exist a social totality, an integrated and in this case global regime, has blocked off valuable avenues of discussion with people of other theoretical inclinations.²¹⁸

²¹⁵See Open the Social Sciences: Report of the Gulbenkian Commission on the Restructuring of the Social Sciences (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1996). The report of the commission, which was chaired by Wallerstein, includes an excellent section on the analytic problems associated with "state-centric thinking" (pp. 80-85). This does not mean that we should all analyze the world – a dubious project in any case, subject to all the objections that were raised about the vaulting ambition of Braudelian "total history." (See especially J. H. Hexter's critical (and often hilarious) comments on Braudel in his On Historians: Reappraisals of Some of the Makers of Modern History (Boston, MA: Harvard University Press, 1979).) Note that Wallerstein also continues to make impassioned and inspiring arguments for not simply interdisciplinary but de-disciplinary historical analysis. See his The End of the World as We Know It. Social Science for the Twenty-First Century (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1999).

²¹⁶In Goodwin's "The Libidinal Constitution of a High-Risk Social Movement: Affectual Ties and Solidarity in the Huk Rebellion, 1946 to 1954," American Sociological Review 62 #1, 1997, pp. 53-69, he examines the absence of "sexual relationships and affectual ties" from social science analyses of collective action. Here's the memorable first sentence: "If the modern era is characterized by "a veritable discursive explosion" (Foucault 1978: 17) about sexuality, then social-movement theory remains deeply embedded in the *ancien regime*." (P. 53)

²¹⁷A symptom of this problem is the widening distance between the theoretical propositions and the historical analyses or predictions that are adduced from them. See for example the five concluding propositions in Arrighi and Silver, pp. 271-289 of Chaos and Governance in the Modern World System. The book is admirably historical; for example, it treats this era's hegemonic arrangements in relationship to previous hegemonic systems. But it is very difficult to see how propositions at this level of abstraction can be qualified by empirical evidence, much less gainsaid. The problem then is that historical materials take on a purely illustrative character. We would feel more confident of the overall argument if the authors also presented some materials that they felt were puzzling or less automatically incorporated into their theoretical system.

²¹⁸The versions of history featured in regulation-theoretic sociology share this totalizing feature as well. See for example David Harvey's The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell (1989). Michael Burawoy criticizes this tendency on pp. 337-41 of his "Grounding Globalization" in Global Ethnography: Forces, Connections, and Imaginations in a Postmodern World (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press: 2000), pp. 337-350. George Steinmetz (this volume) offers a friendlier evaluation of regulation theory and its uses

In general, the category of “race” is one symptomatic flashpoint at which these sorts of paradigmatic strains ignite. Race is easily digested within second wave paradigms as long as it is taken to index fixed, underlying and even biologically-given attributes rather than shifting sets of signifiers that are not tethered to referents in any essential way. (The parallel developed in the above section on feminist challenges to historical sociology is the reduction of gender to the category of biological sex.) Actors are assumed to have certain attributes and to fall into natural groups on this basis, groups that have one or another economic or political function within a social formation. Note that some superb second wave work on the historical sociology of race, class and states was conducted within this rubric.²¹⁹ But the analytical line in the sand drawn by the second wave precluded many of us historical sociologists from recognizing the plasticity and autonomy of systems of racial classification and their relationship to the structuring of societies and subjectivities. This has been problematic for the analysis of the entwined European, African and American historical trajectories themselves – because of the deep importance of chattel slavery and its unfolding impact on systems of racial classification and nationhood.

These trajectories and systems are precisely what is at issue in a second category of scholarship that problematizes the lines of connection between colonizer and colonized. This might mean explaining historical transitions between colonial formations that were basically bipolar at the outset of empire-building but then sprouted more rival heads than a Hydra. Rulers might disagree among themselves, or the subject population split into factions, or middlemen set up on their own accounts, having escaped mechanisms of colonial and post-colonial control delivered through principal-agent networks (on agency relations and empire, see Kiser and Tong 1992; Stinchcombe 1995; Adams 1996). This relational research tradition dovetails with ongoing efforts in political science and historical economics to induct more well-known cases into more general utilitarian understandings of colonialism and post-colonialism.²²⁰

Much of this family of work on connections between colonizer and colonized, however, focuses on the circulation of discourses, categorization and identification in colonial and post-colonial settings. A

for historical sociology.

²¹⁹See for example David R. James, “The Transformation of the Southern Racial State: Class and Race Determinants of Local-State Structures,” American Sociological Review 53 #2 (1988): 191-208, which argues that institutional features of the local “racial state” were created and defended by white planters and farmers in order to forward their interests in maintaining certain features of labor-intensive cotton agriculture. A recent book on apartheid South Africa by Ivan Evans tackles just this issue – the racialization of bureaucracy – from a more culturalist angle. See Ivan Evans, Bureaucracy and Race. Native Administration in South Africa (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1997). Two other pertinent works, excellent examples of third-wave historical sociology, are Anthony W. Marx’s Making Race and Nation: A Comparison of South Africa, the United States, and Brazil (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998) and Gay Seidman, Manufacturing Militance: Workers’ Movements in Brazil and South Africa, 1970-1985 (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1994).

²²⁰See for example Jeffrey A. Frieden, “International Investment and Colonial Control: A New Interpretation,” International Organization 48 #4: 1994, pp. 559-93; David Laitin, Identity in Formation: The Russian-Speaking Populations in the Near Abroad (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1998).

number of the authors whose writings fall into these category are represented in this volume.²²¹ Nader Sohrabi, for example, analyzes the role of constitutionalist discourses in key political conjunctures in pre-revolutionary Iran. Zine Magubane charts the historical development of discourses about race, some of which were legally institutionalized, that circulate between Britain and South Africa. George Steinmetz, who deploys post-colonial theory to pinpoint and analyze shifts among colonialists' – and their indigenous inheritors' – “native policy models” – racial discourses which categorize “natives” as civilizable – or not. These discourses, he argues, are differentially implicated in genocidal state policies.²²² This style of historical sociology has some affinities with the broader field of post-colonial scholarship which, Catherine Hall (1996: 70) notes, argues that “the political and institutional histories of ‘the centre’ and its outer circles [are] more mutually constituted than we used to think.”²²³ What is being constituted here is not typically economics, but the nexus of politics and culture. “Provincializing Europe” – to borrow Dipesh Chakrabarty's catchy phrase – is the overall intellectual project.²²⁴ This is a crucial but tricky business: it involves tacking back and forth between deconstructing and deploying European universalistic notions embedded in social theorizing and political practice. These notions were

²²¹See in particular the bibliographical references to Lo; Magubane; Sohrabi; Spillman and Steinmetz, and the relevant essays in this volume. These and other historical sociological works do not take Geoff Eley's (1996) post-structuralist escalator all the way to complete concept-dependence. On the other hand, who does? (This was always a utopian – or dystopian, if you hail from other theoretical persuasions – formulation.) There are referents as well as signifiers and signifieds in their stories, and the problem of the relationship between signification and other mechanisms is also perennially on the table. For some of these authors, Marshall Sahlins' Historical Metaphors and Mythical Realities: Structure in the Early History of the Sandwich Islands Kingdom (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1981) is a theoretical touchstone.

²²²Nader Sohrabi, “Global Waves, Local Actors: What the Young Turks Knew about Other Revolutions and Why it Mattered,” Comparative Studies in Society and History 44 (1), 2002:45-79; “Historicizing Revolutions: Constitutional Revolutions in the Ottoman Empire, Iran and Russia, 1905-1908,” American Journal of Sociology 100 (6), 1995: 1383-1447); Zine Magubane, Forthcoming, Bringing the Empire Home: Imagining Race, Class and Gender in Britain and Colonial South Africa (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.); George Steinmetz, “Precoloniality and Colonial Subjectivity: Ethnographic Discourse and Native Policy in German Overseas Imperialism, 1780s-1914,” Political Power and Social Theory 15, 2001; George Steinmetz, “‘The Devil's Handwriting’: Precolonial Discourse, Ethnographic Acuity, and Cross-Identification in German Colonialism,” pp. 41-95 in Comparative Studies in Society and History 2003. See also Julian Go, “Chains of Empire, Projects of State: Political Education and U.S. Colonial Rule in Puerto Rico and the Philippines,” Comparative Studies in Society and History 42 (2), 2000: 333-362; Enid Lynette Logan, “Conspirators, Pawns, Patriots and Brothers: Race and Politics in Western Cuba 1906-1909,” Political Power and Social Theory 14, pp. 3-51; Moon-kie Jung, “No Whites, No Asians: Race, Marxism, and Hawaii's Preemergent Working Class,” Social Science History 23 #3 (1999): 357-393.

²²³Catherine Hall is quoted in Magubane, this volume. See Catherine Hall, “Histories, Empires, and the Post-Colonial Moment,” in The Post-Colonial Question: Common Skies, Divided Horizons, edited by Iain Chambers and Lidia Curti (New York, NY: Routledge, 1996). See also Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin, eds. The Post-Colonial Studies Reader (New York, NY: Routledge, 1995); Thomas Blom Hansen and Finn Stepputat (2001); Ann Laura Stoler, “Developing Historical Negatives: Race and the (Modernist) Visions of a Colonial State,” pp. 156-185 in Brian Keith Axel, ed. From the Margins: Historical Anthropology and its Futures (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2002); Robert J. C. Young, Postcolonialism: An Historical Introduction (Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 2001).

²²⁴Dipesh Chakrabarty. Provincializing Europe (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000).

not developed in the isolated modernizing capitalist spaces of Europe – as second wave historical sociology would have had it – but during centuries of colonial encounters that actors based in Europe organized and experienced.²²⁵ That this formative process was mutual is clear, but its contours remain hazy and much detective work remains to be done, in historical sociology as well as elsewhere. On the purely theoretical level, as Zine Magubane discusses (this volume), historical sociologists are just beginning to ask how the particular colonialist optic of the classical theorists constitute the terms of their concepts and theories, and when that affects claims to universal applicability and reach.²²⁶ This part of the provincialization project should also include scrutinizing the particular versions of world history embedded in classical theories that many sociologists still take as emblematic of – and sometimes a substitute for – history itself.

Having ignored the “colonial Other” for so long, sad to say, historical sociologists are at least relatively free of romantic visions of the “agency” of that “Other” or of its self-appointed academic representatives.²²⁷ Perhaps we can escape the trap of romanticizing the supposed collective *communitas* of the East as an antidote to the liberal individual, thus avoiding re-Orientalizing non-Western societies and selves.²²⁸ Let us hope so, for we will otherwise find ourselves flummoxed when professions of modernity and liberal individualism among political actors make an indigenous appearance in contexts far beyond the second wave’s imagined European and North American spaces. As they do and will!

Finally, meta-narrative and synoptic grand theory are making a comeback as a third variety of the historical sociology that reaches beyond the second wave’s internalist version of Europe and the United States. One major example is the work of S. N. Eisenstadt and others on the world’s axial civilizations.²²⁹

²²⁵C. L. R. James’ pioneering *The Black Jacobins* (New York: Vintage, 1963 [1938]) has been a foundational text for those making this argument.

²²⁶For one recent debate, see R. W. Connell, “Why is Classical Theory Classical?” (*American Journal of Sociology* 102 (6), 1997: 1511-1557) and Randall Collins, “A Sociological Guilt Trip: Comment on Connell,” *American Journal of Sociology* 102 (6), 1997: 1558-64. The flip side of these discussions appears in Paul Gilroy’s *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993), which argues, *inter alia*, that to “diaspora blacks,” the “ambiguous intellectual traditions of the European Enlightenment” have served as both “a lifeline and a fetter” (p. 30).

²²⁷One controversial complaint is Arif Dirlik’s, delivered from a Marxist perspective, excoriating post-colonial studies and its intellectual avatars. See his “The Postcolonial Aura: Third World Criticism in the Age of Global Capitalism,” *Critical Inquiry* 20 (1997: pp. 328-56). Some might argue that American sociologists have been busy romanticizing the agency of internal “Others” instead – particularly Black Americans. See the Review Symposium in the *American Journal of Sociology* 107 #6 (May 2002): 1468-1599, in which Loic Wacquant finds fault with the ethnographic work of Mitchell Dunier, Elijah Anderson and Katherine Newman on just these grounds, and is roundly criticized in return.

²²⁸Edward Said. *Orientalism*. (New York, NY: Vintage, 1994).

²²⁹See especially S. N. Eisenstadt “The Civilizational Dimension in Sociological Analysis,” pp. 1-21 in *Thesis Eleven* 62 (August 2000); S. N. Eisenstadt, “The Civilizations of the Americas: The Crystallization of Distinct Modernities,” pp. 43-62 in *Comparative Sociology* 1 #1 (2002). See also Gary G. Hamilton’s wide-ranging “Civilizations and the Organization of Economies,” pp. 183-205 in Neil J. Smelser and Richard Swedberg, eds. *The Handbook of Economic*

This move toward grand civilizational narratives is part of a more general intellectual impulse, we believe, and it is thoroughly understandable in this age of academic dispersion and global religious resurgence.²³⁰ We editors sympathize with the urge, but find it simultaneously nostalgic and premature. There are far too many open questions of theory and method in historical sociology – many of them detailed in this document – that cannot be readily folded into a new totalizing narrative. Rather, historical sociologists need to ask, as concretely as possible, whether there are alternative practices conducted under the sign of modernity that have emerged from colonial and post-colonial encounters and if so, what they look like.²³¹ How are categories and practices that are tagged by the actors themselves as “modern” or “Western” picked up, modified, rejected, recombined, transported, elaborated and so on? Are dimensions of social and cultural life that historical sociologists in the U.S. and elsewhere take for granted as part of a modernist ensemble connected differently – or not at all – in different historical settings? There are many ways to approach these questions without falling back into simplistic polarities between the categories of “the West and the Rest.”²³² One strategy would analyze how notions of and practices associated with, say, property, or “civil society” and “public sphere,” are appropriated and transformed in non-Western contexts – including Eastern Europe, which often gets lost in the binarizing shuffle.²³³ A second strategy might involve analyzing non-western colonialisms – such as Japan’s colonization of Taiwan.²³⁴ Yet another, engaging in historicized ethnographies of global connections

Sociology (New York: Russell Sage Foundation/Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994); Johan Goudsblom, Fire and Civilization (New York, NY: Penguin 1992); Johan Goudsblom, The Course and Human History. Economic Growth, Social Process and Civilization (Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe, 1996).

²³⁰For samples of such engagements in other fields see, for example, Samuel Huntington (1996); Andrew Sherratt, “Reviving the Grand Narrative: Archaeology and Long-Term Change,” Journal of European Archaeology 3 (1995); Bruce Mazlish and Ralph Buultjens, ed. Conceptualizing Global History (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1993).

²³¹Are they “the same but not quite” or are they radically different, and if so, how? At the core of colonial discourse, Homi K. Bhabha (1994) argues, there is a fundamental ambivalence and “classificatory confusion”: “colonial mimicry is the desire for a reformed, recognizable Other, *as a subject of difference that is almost the same, but not quite.*” (p. 86) [italics in original] On alternative modernities, see for starters Charles Taylor (1999): 153-174 and Nilufer Gole. “Global Expectations, Local Experiences: Non-Western Modernities,” in Wil Arts, ed. Through a Glass, Darkly: The Blurred Images of Cultural Tradition and Modernity over Distance and Time (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill).

²³²Stuart Hall, “The West and the Rest: Discourse and Power,” in Stuart Hall and Adam Gieben, eds. Formations of Modernity. Cambridge, England: Open University Press, 1992.

²³³See for example David Stark, “Recombinant Property in East European Capitalism,” American Journal of Sociology 101 #4 (January 1996): 993-1027; Akos Rona-Tas, “The First Shall Be Last? Entrepreneurship and Communist Cadres in the Transition from Socialism,” American Journal of Sociology 100 #1 (July 1994): 40-69; Craig Calhoun, ed. (1993) Habermas and the Public Sphere (Boston, MA: MIT Press).

²³⁴See for example Ming-cheng M. Lo’s Doctors within Borders: Profession, Ethnicity, and Modernity in Colonial Taiwan (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2002).

emerging in today's "postmodern world."²³⁵ There are of course other avenues of exploration, all promising.

This is a thoroughly interdisciplinary arena of discussion, where sociologists have both plenty to learn and some distinctive theoretical and methodological tools for identifying social and cultural conditions for cosmopolitanism and other vaunted goals. No matter what the authors' preferred theory, values or political position – no matter what their relationship to "modernity" – it is clear that such analyses are not antiquarian exercises. We live in an historical moment during which many academics and intellectuals assert that the Enlightenment notions of personhood, rights, reason embedded in the "sociological modern" should be expunged as vestiges of imperialism. Others (including Adams, Clemens and Orloff) think that these notions – reclaimed, revised, retranslated – are essential to critical intellectual and political projects everywhere.²³⁶

Conclusion: Remaking Modernity, Historicizing Sociology

If these challenges represent a theoretical and substantive enrichment of historical sociology, they have also come with costs. As the careful reader will have noticed, the present moment lacks both the topical and theoretical coherence of the second wave. The *marxisant* framework identified important problems, such as revolution; provided a dominant narrative of change fueled by class conflict; and tied contemporary concerns to past processes. The events of 1968 and imagined future rebellions were understood – both theoretically and viscerally – as belonging to a historical series that began with the English and French Revolutions, and that had roots in the transitions to, and ongoing developments of, capitalism. For the core substantive topics of the second wave – revolution, transitions to democracy, the welfare state – past and present are linked in ongoing processes of social change.

It seems clear to us that historical sociology will die if left solely to modify the second wave's answers to Marxist questions generated in the heat of the 1960s and 1970s. Although a powerful heuristic, this intellectual framework is too confining and incompatible with the openness of the current moment, our interest in differences along many dimensions. Surely new questions emerge from the current encounters of modernity and Islam, post-colonialism, postsocialism, aboriginality; from the ongoing transformations of capitalist modernity in its core, and from many other moments in world historical time. There is not the same political cohesiveness that we saw during the height of the second wave, but more than enough intellectual reasons to insist that answering these new questions of modernity will require a *historicized sociology*.

²³⁵See the contributions in Michael Burawoy, ed., *Global Ethnography: Forces, Connections, and Imaginations in a Postmodern World* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2000). See also Daniel Lee Kleinman, *Impure Cultures: University Biology and the Commercial World* (Madison, WI: forthcoming, University of Wisconsin Press).

²³⁶There are clear parallels to the ongoing arguments about multiculturalism and history in the U.S. academy. Will Kymlicka advocates accommodations to "minority nationalism" in "American Multiculturalism in the International Arena," *Dissent* (Fall 1998): 73-79. Claims to cultural "authenticity" are fictive (if nonetheless deeply felt and historically institutionalized) argues David A. Hollinger in *Postethnic America: Beyond Multiculturalism* (New York, Basic Books, 1995).

Note that we emphasize “historicized” than simply “historical” sociology. We reject the segregation of historical inquiry to a designated set of problems located securely in the past, and reinforce the conviction that inspired the revival of historical sociology in the 1970s: that the past is connected to, and informs our understanding of, the present and future. The close identification of historical sociology with methods of archival research or systematic comparison based largely in secondary sources – perhaps a necessary strategy for initially professionalizing a project with roots in political commitments – now unnecessarily limits the enterprise’s scope, which we would take to be the whole canvas of modern social transformations, including those ongoing in the present.²³⁷ The very label “historical sociology” may have occluded this possibility of linking of past to present, of redescribing the past to inform our understanding of contemporary and future processes. Much of the “transitions” literature – the burgeoning body of research on post-socialist societies – illustrates the failure of historical sociology to make a connection to questions of dramatic societal transformation (see Emigh, this volume). In these debates, the theoretical underpinnings of historical sociology are often rejected, both for their association with the collapsed political regimes and because the phenomena themselves – the creation of markets and civil societies – appear to fall outside the empirical ambit of studies of revolution and class formation, especially when they were informed by a loosely marxist teleology. In the place of this theoretical framework, an implicit imagery of modernization and convergence with the West prevails: how are the institutions of credit or property rights constructed? How are network ties rooted in party membership transformed into resources for entrepreneurial endeavors? And so on. What we need, as Martin Shaw (1998) put it, is an “historical sociology of the present and future.”

How then to proceed? From our discussion of third-wave challenges – institutionalist, rational choice, culturalist, feminist and colonial/post-colonial studies – we can identify four main axes of theoretical descent and dissent from the second wave paradigm. First, there are assertions of agency, or attempts to theorize agency, against the second wave’s structuralist approach, in which subjects’ interests and ideologies were more or less automatically given by their social-structural location (see for example the chapters by Biernacki; Kiser and Baer).²³⁸ Second, we have challenges to the exclusions of second wavers and their modernist forebears from scholars speaking on behalf of diverse subaltern groups and invoking the heretofore repressed dimensions of social life connected to relations between the unmarked, dominant subjects of modernity and these “others” (gender, sexuality, “race,” nation, etc.). Fueled in part by attention to the constitution of domination outside the formal polity, a third tendency has expanded the analysis of power to include capillary processes working through classification systems, therapeutic discourses, and other technologies of order. Finally, there are scholars investigating those

²³⁷Take the phenomenon of formerly “historical sociologists” claiming that they “no longer do historical sociology” as they have taken up work on contemporary topics. The contemporary subject matter is usually linked theoretically with their earlier work, and reflects an extension of the analysis of social change to the present moment -- but simply does not demand use of conventionally historical sources (archival or secondary).

²³⁸ In sociological theory, work on “structuration” has been a critical inspiration. See, for example, Pierre Bourdieu, Outline of a Theory of Practice (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1977); William H. Sewell, Jr., “A Theory of Structure: Duality, Agency and Transformation.” American Journal of Sociology 98 (1992): 1-29; Anthony Giddens, The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration. Berkeley : University of California Press, 1984. For the flip side, see Mustafa Emirbayer and Ann Mische, “What is Agency?” (American Journal of Sociology 103 (4), 1998: 962-1023).

elements of the social that were repressed by the second wave's focus on the structures of the political economy (see for example the chapters by Gorski and Kestnbaum). Here we find a whole variety of approaches grouped under the rubric of the cultural turn or turns, efforts to "bring back in" religion, emotion, violence, habit, and all the non-rational elements of social life.

These tendencies have resulted in a burst of topical differentiation and theoretical reformulation. The domain of the political has been stretched to include the interplay of politics and religion (e.g. Gorski, this volume) and the cultural constitution of nation and citizenship (e.g. Somers; Spillman and Faeges, this volume). Even within the domain of the economic, recent historical sociology extends the second wave's central interest in relations of production to include explorations in the creation of markets and relations of consumption (see the chapters by Carruthers and Emigh). In these lines of inquiry, as well as many others, both actors and the relationships among them are understood as profoundly constituted, by culture and historical conjuncture, rather than as reflections of some underlying system of economic relations (see for example the chapters by Biernacki, Brubaker, Magubane, and Lo). Thus power relationships are reconceptualized in terms of classification systems, and formal political institutions are embedded within broader systems of capillary power that harness categories to projects of domination and contestation (Orloff, Sohrabi). With a recognition of the multiplicity of structures, new sites of agency are located where actors transgress and transpose the constraints of local but established interaction orders (see Gould, this volume).

Thus the kaleidoscopic quality of historical sociology – ranging from the Dutch patrimonial state and its Indonesian colonies to the origins of welfare states and interest groups (to cite only our own concerns) – may easily obscure a more coherent set of theoretical engagements with the defining problematics of the second wave. In place of the combination of structural determinism, a singular focus on political economy, and a model of the rational actor, much recent work documents the multiplicity of structures, the underdetermination of outcomes, and the complex constitution of human agency (Clemens, this volume). While this new combination might appear doomed to fragmentation, this is not inevitable. In making a case for "global ethnography," Michael Burawoy and his collaborators "emphasized the way the external 'system' colonized the subject lifeworld and how that lifeworld, in turn, negotiated the terms of domination, created alternatives, or took to collective protest." Their ambition was to accommodate "empirical findings to wider contexts of determination" (2000: 25). Recent historical sociology complements this move, demonstrating how structures, subjects or institutions are inflected by particular settings and, in the process, potentially transformed. Neither grand general theory nor particular case studies are adequate to the task of understanding social change, its continuities and unprecedented transformations.

For historical sociologists, like global ethnographers, new directions of inquiry may require (but not be defined by) new research strategies. As a practical matter, today's historical sociologists proceed from both extremes in order to understand the interpenetration of general processes and local settings as played out in world historical time. Some produce rich case studies that explore that explore conjunctures and their consequences. In her study of Taiwanese doctors under Japanese colonialism, for example, Ming-Cheng Lo illuminates "the importance of the 'agents' of modernity by attending to how different social groups negotiate between the powerful narrative of the universality of science and the concrete political and social relationships through which science is delivered and developed" (2002: 10). Others harness the analytic power of comparison by tracking the inflection of a large-scale project – German colonialism for Steinmetz (2003), the Marshall Plan for Djelic (1998) – across a series of settings to

exploit the analysis of variation deeply embedded in world historical time. For fundamental theoretical reasons, these comparative strategies reject the criterion of the independence of cases. The repertoire of comparative methods that complemented the political economy of the second wave (world systems theory notably excluded) tended to explore the unfolding of capitalism and modernity in an implicitly empty world or one in which “tradition” would collapse and be erased by the progress of a modernizing social order. In contrast to the imagery of clearly-bounded cases existing in the empty “experimental time” of comparative methods, these studies define their objects as fully embedded in world historical time and explore conjunctures in which institutional legacies other than Western capitalism or democracy resist or transform the allegedly homogenizing tendencies of globalization. Beyond this, historical sociology needs to attend to encounters generated by other dynamic institutional orders such as other world religious traditions as well as to the blowback within capitalism itself, the transformative effects of free trade on the labor markets and economic organization of the core.

Prediction is a dangerous game, particularly for historical sociologists. We are, after all, daughters and sons of Clio as well as of sociology (which, being a creation of modernity, has no muse). But this vision of a more fully historicized sociology builds on the conviction that the study of the past illuminates both present and future. The current conversation among historical sociologists is symptomatic of a moment when world events, the reordering of signs and trajectories of social change have confounded many people’s expectations. Yet as new manifestations of political, cultural, and religious past infuse the current moment, it is impossible to take this defeat of expectations as a signal of some sharp caesura between present and past. Perhaps different parts of the past demand our attention as we strive to understand processes of social change that have operated behind and beside those foregrounded by historical sociology’s second wave. “But the danger of continuity types of argument is that they bring us back to where theoretically we started: normalizing a phenomenon *in advance of rethinking it*” (p. 826, author’s italics).²³⁹ Perhaps this is also a genuinely unprecedented historical moment. We should consider these possibilities, carefully but urgently. Figure and ground have been disturbed; new figures are there to be found.

Many Americans in particular see their way of life as newly unsettled. For although the majority of the world’s peoples have lived with this condition much longer than we have, this *is* a moment in which both world and theory have been shaken in the core. Historical sociologists, like other academics and intellectuals, have unconsciously depended on this sense of settlement, of achieved modernity, and are disoriented by its loss. So it is natural when they react with nostalgia for old totalities, a past of imagined theoretical stability, or with a sense of perceived threat – by policing the boundaries of intellectual inquiry to try to forcibly settle things anew, or by simply refusing to debate or consider new ways of thinking. But unsettled times demand open minds. In a speech in Munich, in 1918, at just such another troubling moment, Max Weber said that although “the ultimately possible attitudes toward life are irreconcilable, and hence their struggle can never be brought to a final conclusion,” science – which he meant in the broadest sense, as *Wissenschaft* – offers us tools and training for thought; technologies for action, and the possibility of gaining some clarity about where we stand (1919: 150-151, 152). His

²³⁹Peter Baehr’s excellent “Identifying the Unprecedented: Hannah Arendt, Totalitarianism, and the Critique of Sociology,” *American Sociological Review* 67 (December 2002: pp. 804-831) deals with the inability of 1930s sociologists to grasp the novelty and importance of National Socialism and the Nazi concentration camps; it also includes a discussion of the unprecedented character of al-Qaeda and 9/11/2001.

vision of historical sociology still seems right to us – refusing ultimate guarantees or fundamental foundations; generous, not cramped; focused on “the demands of the day,” and wide open to the future.²⁴⁰

Overview of the Volume

These challenges and responses crosscut the various contributions to this volume. The first section contains a trio of chapters that engage the development of sociology as a discipline. **George Steinmetz** explores the historical constitution of the mid-century discipline of sociology against which a resurgent historical sociology defined itself. **Zine Magubane** turns her eyes back toward the classical sociologists, and to the ongoing debate over the shaping presence of particular visions of colonialism and empire in their (and our) work. **Richard Biernacki** then looks towards future theoretical possibilities in which assumptions of the goal-oriented actor, encoded in Parsonian sociology, are displaced by a developed theory of practice, attuned to the historical and cultural constitution of rationalities and other modes of action.

The Weberian imprint on historical sociology is most evident in the attention paid to state formation. Drawing on rational choice arguments, **Edgar Kiser and Justin Baer** reconsider processes of bureaucratization. Close attention to the strategic choices confronting elites replaces a functional account of efficiency with analyses of the risks and benefits of domination via different means. But if the bureaucratic state developed as a mechanism for extracting resources, it now also delivers benefits, although with some hefty conditions. **Ann Shola Orloff** surveys the development of systems of social provision and regulation (including welfare states), a central topic for students of the second wave but now very much under reconstruction. Finally, **Philip Gorski** argues that historical analyses of both state-formation and religious change have been hampered by the failure to address the deep mutual implication of these two processes.

The next trio of chapters shifts perspective, examining politics from the vantage point of political contention, including the mobilization of violence. **Meyer Kestnbaum** turns to a topic which, with the hindsight of the twentieth century, is strangely absent from classical sociological theory: war. Long acknowledged as an exogenous shock which might catalyze economic or political contradictions, war-making has only recently received sustained analysis in the context of state-making and the changing relations between states and peoples. **Nader Sohrabi** addresses the flourishing research on revolutions, emphasizing how theorizing has been reshaped by attention to cases beyond Europe and to the intersecting politics of nations embedded in transnational relations and cultural conversations. And in an essay on contentious politics, the late **Roger Gould** (to whom this volume is dedicated) offers a bracing corrective to historicist tendencies, arguing that robust patterns have been identified across episodes and contexts of political conflict.

Just as historical sociologists have reconsidered the centrality of the tropes of the utilitarian and goal-oriented actor, so too has historical research transformed our understanding of the home turf of that

²⁴⁰Here is the full quote, the last sentences in Weber’s “Science As a Vocation”: “We shall set to work and meet the ‘demands of the day,’ in human relations as well as in our vocation. This, however, is plain and simple, if each finds and obeys the demon who holds the fibers of his very life.” (Weber 1946: 156)

actor: the economy. **Rebecca Jean Emigh** surveys responses to what was a central preoccupation of the first wave: the transition to capitalism. Historical research across a growing set of cases, both positive and negative, has redefined the puzzle as one of transitions to capitalisms, plural, just as the transformations signaled by “1989” have raised questions of the generalizability of historical explanation. **Bruce Carruthers** then traces the path of another great question for classical theory – the development of markets – which after decades of exile in economic history now reemerges as a critical topic for historical sociology. The connections among race, ethnicity, class, and gender, along with colonial domination, anchor **Ming-Cheng Lo’s** reconsideration of work on the history of the professions. As both a relic of guild society and a vehicle of rationalizing experts, these collectivities provide a powerful lens on the internal ambiguities of modernity.

The historical sociologies of both state-building and political conflict have burst the boundaries of institutional politics to address the formation of collective identities. Wars transform the relations between states and peoples, states are differentially embedded in religious communities and practices. **Lynette Spillman and Russell Faeges** directly explore these relationships in an essay on another of the surprising absences in classical theory: the nation. **Margaret Somers’** essay addresses the curiously chequered history of citizenship in historical sociology, in hopes that new approaches can help us think not just about citizens and subjects, but also about the stateless. **Rogers Brubaker** joins this general conversation, interrogating a concept both central and utterly taken-for-granted – the group – in the context of the politics of race and ethnicity.

Across a range of topics, the contributors to this volume explore how recent work in historical sociology has confronted the challenges and opportunities discussed throughout this introduction. Although these essays reveal few signs of an emergent theory group, patterns do emerge: key theoretical appropriations, persistent lines of division. In a concluding chapter, **Elisabeth Clemens** surveys these local maps of current historical sociology, arguing that recent research is at least partially organized around a set of theoretical puzzles – the articulation of practices, the embedding of institutional domains – rather than substantive questions such as which classes were or were not revolutionary.

Whereas many discussions of historical sociology have focused on questions of method, these chapters privilege the substantive and theoretical challenges presented by the making of modernity, by social change writ large. Many of the weightiest processes and events, both past and present, resist standard sociological methods but our discipline is fundamentally poorer if we ignore them for this reason. We hope that *Remaking Modernity* illuminates the possibilities of historical sociology and the large-scale transformations that made and continue to make our worlds.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many people have read previous drafts of this paper and generously offered responses. We weren't able to address all comments, but the essay is stronger because of the arguments they sparked. Our biggest thanks go to our fellow volume contributors. We are also grateful to Andy Abbott, Gabi Abend, Raphael Allen, Ron Aminzade, Nicola Beisel, Michael Burawoy, Craig Calhoun, Chas Camic, Georgi Derluguian, Geoff Eley, Ivan Evans, Ray Grew, Ira Katznelson, John Lie, Art Stinchcombe, and two anonymous reviewers for Duke University Press. Earlier versions were presented at the Sociology Department at Columbia University; Comparativist Day at UCLA; the European University Institute, and the Comparative and Historical Workshop at Northwestern University, and the essay benefitted from those occasions as well. We are enormously appreciative of Kari Hodges' and Kendra Schiffman's help in getting the unruly text and bibliography into shape. Our work was supported by the American Sociological Association/National Science Foundation Fund for the Advancement of the Discipline, which along with the Judd and Marjorie Weinberg College of Arts and Sciences and the Department of Sociology at Northwestern University made possible the 2001 conference at which volume participants presented their first drafts. Julia Adams wishes to thank the American Council of Learned Societies and especially the Russell Sage Foundation, which provided a wonderful setting for work on the final draft. Ann Orloff is grateful to the Judd and Marjorie Weinberg College of Arts and Sciences and the Department of Sociology at Northwestern University for supporting her research.

Works Cited

- Abbott, Andrew. 2001. Time Matters: On Theory and Method. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- . 2001. Chaos of Disciplines. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- . 1998. "Transcending General Linear Reality." Sociological Theory 6: 169-86.
- . 1994. "History and Sociology: the Lost Synthesis." In Engaging the Past: The Uses of History across the Social Sciences, Eric H. Monkkonen, ed. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, pp.77-112.
- . 1988. The System of Professions: An Essay on the Division of Expert Labor. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- . 1983. "Sequences of Social Events," Historical Methods 16: 129-47.
- Abbott, Andrew and A. Tsay. 2000. "Sequence Analysis and Optimal Matching Methods in Sociology: Review and Prospect." Sociological Methods and Research 29:3-33.
- Abraham, David. 1981. The Collapse of the Weimar Republic: Political Economy and Crisis. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Abrams, Phillip. 1982. Historical Sociology. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Abu-Lughod, Janet, ed. 1999. Sociology for the Twenty-first Century: Continuities and Cutting Edges. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . 1989. Before European Hegemony: The World-System A.D. 1250-1350. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Adams, Julia. 2003. "The Rule of the Father: Patriarchy and Patrimonialism in Early Modern Europe," Working Paper, Russell Sage Foundation.
- .1999. "Culture in Rational-Choice Theories of State-Formation." State/Culture: State Formation after the Cultural Turn, ed. George Steinmetz. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, pp. 98-122.
- . 1998. "Feminist Theory as Fifth Columnist or Discursive Vanguard: Some Contested Uses of Gender Analysis in Historical Sociology." Social Politics 5(1): 1-16.
- . 1996. "Principals and Agents, Colonialists and Company Men: The Decay of Colonial Control in the Dutch East Indies." American Sociological Review 61(1): 12-28.
- . 1994. "The Familial State: Elite Family Practices and State-Making in the Early Modern Netherlands." Theory and Society 23:505-539.
- Adams, Julia and Tasleem Padamsee. 2001. "Signs and Regimes: Rereading Feminist Work on Welfare States." Social Politics 8 (1): 1-23.
- Althusser, Louis. 1972. "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses," Lenin and philosophy, and other essays. New York, New York: Monthly Review Press.

----. 1969. "Contradiction and Overdetermination: Appendix." In For Marx, New York, New York: Pantheon Books, pp. 117-128.

Amenta, Edwin. 1998. Bold Relief: Institutional Politics and the Origins of Modern American Social Policy. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

---- and Chris Bonastia, and Neal Caren. 2001. "U.S. Social Policy in Comparative and Historical Perspective: Concepts, Images, Arguments and Research Strategies." Annual Review of Sociology, 27: 213-234.

Aminzade, Ronald. 1993. Ballots and Barricades: Class Formation and Republican Politics in France, 1830-1871. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

----. 1992. "Historical Sociology and Time." Sociological Methods and Research 20(4);456-480.

----1981. Class, Politics, and Early Industrial Capitalism: A Study of Mid-Nineteenth-Century Toulouse, France. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Anderson, Benedict. 1991. Imagined Communities. London: Verso.

Anderson, Michael. 1971. Family Structure in Nineteenth Century Lancashire. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Anderson, Perry. 1998. The Origins of Postmodernity. New York: Verso.

----. 1974. Lineages of the Absolutist State. London: Verso.

Appadurai, Arjun. 1996. Modernity at Large. Cultural Dimensions of Globalization. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Arjomand, Said. 1988. The Turban for the Crown: The Islamic Revolution in Iran. New York: Oxford University Press.

----. 2001. "Perso-Indian Statecraft, Greek Political Science and the Muslim Idea of Government," International Sociology 16(3): 455-473.

Arrighi, Giovanni. 1999. "Globalization and Historical Macrosociology." In Sociology for the Twenty-first Century. Janet Abu-Lighod, ed. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, pp. 117-133.

---- and Beverly J. Silver. 1999. Chaos and Governance in the Modern World System Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Ashcroft, Bill Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin, eds. 1995. The Post-Colonial Studies Reader New York, NY: Routledge.

Aston, T.H. and C. H. E. Philpin, eds. 1988. The Brenner Debate: Agrarian Class Structure and Economic Development in Pre-Industrial Europe. New York, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Axel, Brian Keith, ed. 2002. From the Margins: Historical Anthropology and its Futures. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press.

- Axelrod, Robert. 1981. "The Emergence of Cooperation Among Egoists." American Political Science Review (June): 306-18.
- Baehr, Peter. 2002 "Identifying the Unprecedented: Hannah Arendt, Totalitarianism, and the Critique of Sociology" American Sociological Review 67: 804-831.
- Baker, Paula. 1984. "The Domestication of Politics: Women and American Political Society, 1780-1920." American Historical Review 89: 620-647.
- Baron, Ava. 1998. "Romancing the Field: The Marriage of Feminism and Historical Sociology." Social Politics 5: 17-37.
- , ed. 1991. Work Engendered: Toward a New History of American Labor. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Barkey, Karen. 1994. Bandits and Bureaucrats: The Ottoman Road to State Centralization. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Barkey, Karen and Ronan Van Rossem. 1997. "Networks of Contention: Villages and Regional Structure in the Seventeenth-Century Ottoman Empire." American Journal of Sociology 102 (5): 1345-1382.
- Bates, Robert H., ed. 1998. Analytic Narratives. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Bearman, Peter S. 1993. Relations into Rhetorics: Local Elite Structure in Norfolk, England, 1540-1640. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press.
- Beck, Ulrich. 1992. The Risk Society. London: Sage Publications.
- Beisel, Nicola. 1997. Imperiled Innocents: Anthony Comstock and Family Reproduction in Victorian America. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Bellah, Robert Neelly. 1967. Tokugawa Religion: Cultural Roots of Modern Japan. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press.
- Bellingham, Bruce and Mary Pugh Mathis. 1994. "Race, Citizenship and the Bio-politics of the Maternalist Welfare State: "Traditional" Midwifery in the American South under the Sheppard-Towner Act, 1921-29." Social Politics 1:157-89
- Bendix, Reinhard. 1967. "Tradition and Modernity Reconsidered." Comparative Studies in Society and History: 9 292-346.
- , 1964. Nation-building and Citizenship. New York: Wiley.
- Benhabib, Seyla. 1990. "Hannah Arendt and the Redemptive Power of Narrative." Social Research 57:167-196.
- Berezin, Mabel. 1997. Making the Fascist Self: The Political Culture of Interwar Italy. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Bergesen, Albert and Ronald Schoenberg. 1980. "Long Waves of Colonial Expansion and Contraction, 1415-1969." In Studies of the Modern World System. Albert Bergesen, ed. New York: Academic Press

- Berkovitch, Nitz. 1999. From Motherhood to Citizenship: Women's rights and International Organizations. Baltimore, Maryland: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Berman, Marshall. 1976. All That Is Solid Melts Into Air: The Experience of Modernity. New York: Viking Penguin.
- Bhabha, Homi K 1994. "Of Mimicry and Man: The Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse." In The Location of Culture. New York, NY: Routledge, pp. 85-92.
- Bhavnani, Kum-Kum, ed. 2001. Feminism and "Race." New York, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Biernacki, Richard. 1995. Fabrication of Labor: Germany and Britain, 1640-1914. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Biggs, Michael. 1999. "Putting the State on the Map: Cartography, Territory, and European State Formation." Comparative Studies in Society and History 41(2): 374-411.
- Blee, Kathleen. 1991. Women of the Klan: Racism and Gender in the 1920s. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Bloom, Harold. 1997. The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bonnell, Victoria E. 1984. Roots of Rebellion: Workers' Politics and Organizations in St. Petersburg and Moscow, 1900-1914. Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Boswell, Terry. 1989. "Colonial Empires and the Capitalist World-System: A Time-Series Analysis of Colonization, 1640-1960." American Sociological Review 54: 180-196.
- Bourdieu, Pierre Language and Symbolic Power (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991)
- . 1984. Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- . 1977. Outline of a Theory of Practice. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Brenner, Johanna and Maria Ramos. 1984. "Rethinking Women's Oppression." New Left Review. 144: 33-71.
- Breslau, Daniel. In Search of the Unequivocal: The Political Economy of Measurement in U.S. Labor Market Policy (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1998).
- Breuer, Joseph and Sigmund Freud. 1937. Studies in Hysteria (authorized translation with an introduction A.A. Brill.) New York: Nervous and Mental Disease Monographs..
- Brewer, John. 1988. The Sinews of Power: War, Money, and the English State, 1688-1783. New York: Knopf.
- Brubaker, Rogers. 1992. Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- . 1996. Nationalism Reframed: Nationhood and the National Question in the New Europe. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Brustein, William. 1996. Logic of Evil: The Social Origins of the Nazi Party, 1925-1933. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Burawoy, Michael, ed. 2000. Global Ethnography: Forces, Connections, and Imaginations in a Postmodern World. Berkeley, California: University of California Press.
- . 1996. "The Power of Feminism." In "The Missing Feminist Revolution: Ten Years Later." Perspectives: The ASA Theory Section Newsletter 18(3): 3-8.
- . 1991. Ethnography Unbound: Power and Resistance in the Modern Metropolis. Berkeley: University of California Press
- . 1989. "Two Methods in Search of Science: Skocpol versus Trotsky." Theory and Society 18: 759-805.
- . 1972. The Colour of Class on the Copper Mines: From African Advancement to Zambianization. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Burke, Peter. 1980. Sociology and History. Boston: Allen & Unwin.
- Butler, Judith. 1990. Gender Trouble. New York: Routledge.
- Calhoun, Craig J. 1996. "The Rise and Domestication of Historical Sociology," in The Historic Turn in the Human Sciences, Terrence J. McDonald, ed. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- . 1995. Critical Social Theory: Culture, History and the Challenge of Difference Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- , ed. 1993 Habermas and the Public Sphere. Boston, MA: MIT Press.
- . 1982. The Question of Class Struggle: Social Foundations of Popular Radicalism during the Industrial Revolution. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Calhoun, Craig J., Paul Price and Ashley Timmer, eds. 2002. Understanding September 11. New York, New York: New Press.
- Camic, Charles. 1992. "Reputation and Predecessor Selection: Parsons and the Institutionalists." American Sociological Review 57(4) August: 421-445
- . 1983. Experience and Enlightenment: Socialization for Cultural Change in Eighteenth-century Scotland. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Camic, Charles and Neil Gross. 1998. "Contemporary Developments in Sociological Theory: Current Projects and Conditions of Possibility," Annual Review of Sociology 24: 453-476.
- Cardoso, Fernando Henrique and Enzo Faletto. 1979. Dependency and Development in Latin America, tr. Marjory M. Urquidi. Berkeley/Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press, , originally published 1971.
- Carpenter, Daniel P. 2000. "State Building through Reputation Building: Coalitions of Esteem and Program Innovation in the National Postal System, 1883-1913." Studies in American Political Development 14 (2): 121-155.
- Carruthers, Bruce. 1996. City of Capital: Politics and Markets in the English Financial Revolution. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Carruthers, Bruce G. and Wendy Nelson Espeland. 1991. "Accounting for Rationality: Double-Entry Bookkeeping and the Rhetoric of Economic Rationality." American Journal of Sociology 97 (1): 31.
- Carver, Terrell. Gender Is Not a Synonym for Women. 1996. Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Reiner.
- Centeno, Miguel Angel. 2002. Blood and Debt: War and the Nation-State in Latin America. University Park, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Centeno, Miguel Angel and Fernando Lopez-Alves, eds. 2002. The Other Mirror: Grand Theory through the Lens of Latin America. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Chakrabarty, Dipesh. 2000. Provincializing Europe. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Charrad, Mounira M. 2001. States and Women's Rights: The Making of Postcolonial Tunisia, Algeria, and Morocco. Berkeley, California: University of California Press.
- Charron, William C. 2000. "Greeks and Games: The Ancient Forerunners of Mathematical Game Theory," Forum for Social Economics 29 (2): 1-32.
- Chibber Vivek. 1999. "Building a Developmental State: The Korean Case Reconsidered." Politics and Society 27(3): 309-346
- 1998. "Breaching the Nadu: Lordship and Economic Development in Pre-colonial South India." The Journal of Peasant Studies 26(1) 1-42.
- Clawson, Mary Ann. 1989. Constructing Brotherhood: Class, Gender, and Fraternalism. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Clark, Samuel. 1995. State and Status: The Rise of the State and Aristocratic Power in Europe. Buffalo, NY: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Clemens, Elisabeth S. 1997. The People's Lobby: Organizational Innovation and the Rise of Interest Group Politics in the United States, 1890-1925. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . 1993. "Organizational Repertoires and Institutional Change: Women's Groups and the Transformation of U.S. Politics, 1890-1920." American Journal of Sociology 98: 755-798.
- and James Cook. 1999. "Politics and Institutionalism: Explaining Durability and Change," Annual Review of Sociology 25: 441-466.
- and Martin D. Hughes. 2002. "Recovering Past Protest: Archival Research on Social Movements," Suzanne Staggenborg and Bert Klandermans, eds. Methods of Social Movement Research. Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.
- and Walter W. Powell, Kris McIlwaine, and Dina Okamoto. 1997. "Careers in Print: Books, Journals, and Scholarly Reputations." American Journal of Sociology 101: 433-94.
- Cohen, Jean L. 1982. Class and Civil Society: The Limits of Marxian Critical Theory. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.

- Coleman, James S. 1990. Foundations of Social Theory. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Cohn, Samuel. 1985. The Process of Occupational Sex-typing: The Feminization of Clerical Labor in Great Britain Philadelphia: PA: Temple University Press,
- Collins, Patricia Hill. 1990. Black Feminist Thought. Boston: Unwin, Hyman.
- Collins, Randall. 1997. "A Sociological Guilt Trip: Comment on Connell." American Journal of Sociology 102 (6): 1558-64.
- . 1986. Weberian Sociological Theory. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1979. The Credential Society: An Historical Sociology of Education and Stratification. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Connell, R.W. 1997. "Why is Classical Theory Classical?" American Journal of Sociology 102: 1511-1557.
- . 1987. Gender and Power: Society, the Person, and Sexual Politics. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Davis, Gerald F. and Michael Useem. 2001. "Top Management, Company Directors and Corporate Control." In Handbook of Strategy and Management, Andrew Pettigrew, Howard Thomas and Richard Whittington, eds. London: Sage, 233-259.
- Davis, Natalie. 1983. The Return of Martin Guerre. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Deacon, Desley. 1989. Managing Gender: The State, the New Middle Class and Women Workers, 1830-1930 Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- Deflem, Mathieu. 2002. Policing World Society. Historical Foundations of International Police Cooperation. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Derluigian, Georgi M. 1997. "The Politics of Identity in a Russian Borderland Province: The Kuban Neo-Cossack Movement, 1989-1996," Europe-Asia-Studies, ed. Serge Cipko (49 (8): 1485-1500.
- Derrida, Jacques. 1996. Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression (translated by Eric Prenowitz). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- 1987. The Truth in Painting (tr. Geoff Bennington and Ian McLeod). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- 1976. Of Grammatology (translated by Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Dirlik, Arif. 1997 "The Postcolonial Aura: Third World Criticism in the Age of Global Capitalism," Critical Inquiry 20: pp. 328-56.
- Dixit, Avinash K. and Susan Skeath. 1999. Games of Strategy. New York, NY: W.W. Norton and Company.
- Dobbin, Frank. 1994. Forging Industrial Policy: The United States, Britain and France in the Railway Age. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

- Dosse, Francois. 1997 [1991]. History of Structuralism. Vol. I: The Rising Sign, 1945-1966. (tr. Deborah Glassman). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Downing, Brian. 1992. The Military Revolution and Political Change: Origins of Democracy and Autocracy in Early Modern Europe. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- DuBois, W.E.B. 1977 [1938]. Black Reconstruction in America. New York: Atheneum.
- Durkheim, Emile. 1995. The Elementary Forms of Religious Life (tr. Karen E. Fields). New York, NY: Free Press.
- . 1961. Moral Education: A Study in the Theory and Application of the Sociology of Education. Chapters IV-VI. New York: Free Press.
- Durkheim, Emile and Marcel Mauss. 1963. Primitive Classification. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Eisenstadt, S. N. 2002. "The Civilizations of the Americas: The Crystallization of Distinct Modernities." Comparative Sociology 1(1): 43-62.
- . 2000. "The Civilizational Dimension in Sociological Analysis," Thesis Eleven 62 (August): 1-21.
- . 1963. The Political Systems of Empires. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press of Glencoe.
- Eley, Geoff. 1996. "Is All the World a Text? From Social History to the History of Society Two Decades Later," in T. McDonald, ed., The Historical Turn in the Human Sciences, pp. 193-243. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Elias, Norbert. 1939. The Civilizing Process. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Eliot, George. Middlemarch (New York, NY: Penguin, 1994).
- Elshtain, Jean Bethke. 1987. Women and War. New York: Basic Books.
- Emigh, Rebecca Jean. 1997. "The Spread of Sharecropping in Tuscany: The Political Economy of Transaction Costs." American Sociological Review 62:423-442.
- Emirbayer, Mustafa. 1992. "Beyond Structuralism and Voluntarism: The Politics and Discourse of Progressive School Reform, 1890-1930," Theory and Society 21(5): 621-664.
- Emirbayer, Mustafa and Ann Mische. 1998. "What is Agency?" American Journal of Sociology 103 (4) 962-1023.
- Ermakoff, Ivan. 2001. "Strukturelle Zwänge und Zufällige Geschehnisse." Geschichte und Gesellschaft, Sonderheft 19 (March): Struktur und Ereignis, pp. 224-256.
- Ermakoff, Ivan. 1997. "Prelates and Princes: Aristocratic Marriages, Canon Law Prohibitions, and Shifts in the Norms and Patterns of Domination in the Central Middle Ages." American Sociological Review 62:405-422.
- Ertman, Thomas. 1997. Birth of the Leviathan: Building States and Regimes in Medieval and Early Modern Europe. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Espeland, Wendy Nelson and Mitchell Stevens. "Commensuration as a Social Process," Annual Review of Sociology 24, 1998: 313-343.

- Esping-Andersen, Gosta. 1999. Social Foundations of Postindustrial Economies. New York, New York: Oxford University Press.
- 1990. The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- 1985. Politics Against Markets. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Evans, Ivan. 1997. Bureaucracy and Race. Native Administration in South Africa. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- 2003. "Racial Violence and State Formation in Two Racial Orders: South Africa and the United States" [working paper, available from author]
- Evans, Peter. Dependent Development: The Alliance of Multinational, State, and Local Capital in Brazil. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1979.
- Falasca-Zamponi, Simonetta. 1997. Fascist Spectacle: The Aesthetics of Power in Mussolini's Italy. Berkeley/Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- Fanon, Franz. 1991. Black Skin, White Masks. New York: Grove Weidenfeld.
- Faue, Elizabeth. Community of Suffering and Struggle: Women, Men, and the Labor Movement in Minneapolis, 1915-1945 (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1991);
- Felski, Rita. 2000. Doing Time: Feminist Theory and Postmodern Culture. New York: New York University Press.
- Ferree, Myra Marx and Beth B. Hess. 1985. Controversy and Coalition: The New Feminist Movement. Boston: Twayne Publishers.
- Foran, John. 1993. Fragile Resistance: Social Transformation in Iran from 1500 to the Revolution. Westview Press.
- "An Historical-Sociological Framework for the Study of Long-Term Transformations in the Third World" (pp. 330-349 in Humanity and Society vol. 16 #3 (August 1992)
- Foucault, Michael Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison (New York, NY: Vintage, 1979)
- The History of Sexuality, vol. 1 (New York, NY: Pantheon, 1978)
- Frank, Andre Gunder. 1966. The Underdevelopment of Development. Boston, MA: New England Free Press.
- Franzosi, Roberto. 1998. "Narrative Analysis – Why (and How) Sociologists Should Be Interested in Narrative," in John Hagan, ed., Annual Review of Sociology 24:517 –54.
- and John Mohr. "New Directions in Formalization and Historical Analysis." Theory and Society 26, no. 2/3 (1997): 133-160.
- Fraser, Nancy. 1989. Unruly Practices: Power, Discourse, and Gender in Contemporary Social Theory. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- 1997. Justice Interruptus: Critical Reflections on the "PostSocialist" Condition. New York: Routledge.

- and Linda Gordon, "A Genealogy of 'Dependency': Tracing a Keyword of the US Welfare State," Signs 19(1994):309-36
- and Linda Gordon. 1994. "'Dependency' Demystified: Inscriptions of Power in a Keyword of the Welfare State." Social Politics 1(1):4-31.
- Freeman, Jo. 1975. The Politics of Women's Liberation: A Case Study of an Emerging Social Movement and Its Relation to the Policy Process. New York, McKay.
- Frieden, Jeffrey A "International Investment and Colonial Control: A New Interpretation," International Organization 48 #4: 1994, pp. 559-93
- Roger Friedland, "Religious Nationalism and the Problem of Collective Representation," Annual Review of Sociology 27, 2001: 125-152.
- Froese, Paul and Steven Pfaff, "Replete and Desolate Markets: Poland, East Germany and the New Religious Paradigm," Social Forces (December 2001) 80 (2): 481-507.
- Fukuyama, Francis. The End of History and the Last Man. New York: Avon, 1993.
- Gal, Susan and Gail Kligman. 2000. The Politics of Gender After Socialism: A Comparative- Historical Essay. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Goankar, Dilip Parameshwar, ed. 2001. Alternative Modernities. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press.
- Gerteis, Joseph. Forthcoming 2003. "The Possession of Civic Virtue: Movement Narratives of Race and Class in the Knights of Labor," American Journal of Sociology.
- Giddens, Anthony. 1984. The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- . 1985. The Nation-State and Violence. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Giddens, Anthony and Christopher Pierson, Conversations with Anthony Giddens: Making Sense of Modernity (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1998).
- Gieryn, Thomas. 1995. Cultural Boundaries of Science: Credibility on the Line (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).
- Gilbert, Jess and Carolyn Howe. 1991. "Beyond 'State vs. Society': Theories of the State and New Deal Agricultural Policies, American Sociological Review 56(2):204-220.
- Gilroy, Paul. 1993. The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Ginzburg, Carlo.1980. The Cheese and the Worms: The Cosmos of a Sixteenth-century Miller (trs. John and Anne Tedeschi) Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Glenn, Evelyn Nakano. "From Servitude to Service Work: Historical Continuities in the Racial Division of reproductive Labor," Signs 18(1992):1-43.

Go, Julian. "Chains of Empire, Projects of State: Political Education and U.S. Colonial Rule in Puerto Rico and the Philippines," Comparative Studies in Society and History 42 (2), 2000: 333-362

Gocek, Fatma Muge. 1996. Rise of the Bourgeoisie, Demise of Empire: Ottoman Westernization and Social Change. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Goldstone, Jack A. 2003. "Comparative-Historical Analysis and Knowledge Accumulation in the Study of Revolutions." In James Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschemyer, eds. Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press

----. 1991. Revolution and Rebellion in the Early Modern World. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Goldthorpe, John. 1997. "Current Issues in Comparative Macrosociology: A Debate on Methodological Issues." Social Research 16:1-26.

----. "The Uses of History in Sociology: Reflections on Some Recent Tendencies," British Journal of Sociology 42 (1991): 211-30.

Gole, Nilufer. 1997. "Global Expectations, Local Experiences: Non-Western Modernities," in Wil Arts, ed. Through a Glass, Darkly: The Blurred Images of Cultural Tradition and Modernity over Distance and Time (Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill)

Goodwin, Jeff. 2001. No Other Way Out: States and Revolutionary Movements, 1945-1991. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

----. 1997 "The Libidinal Constitution of a High-Risk Social Movement: Affectual Ties and Solidarity in the Huk Rebellion, 1946 to 1954," American Sociological Review 62 #1, , pp. 53-69

Gordon, Linda. 1990. Women, the State, and Welfare. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

----. 1994. Pitied But Not Entitled: Single Mothers and the History of Welfare. New York: Free Press.

Gorski, Philip S. 2003. The Disciplinary Revolution: Calvinism, Confessionalism and the Growth of State Power in Early Modern Europe. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

----. 1993. "The Protestant Ethic Revisited: Disciplinary Revolution and State Formation in Holland and Prussia." American Journal of Sociology 99(2):265-316.

Goudsblom, Johan. 1996. The Course of Human History. Economic Growth, Social Process and Civilization. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.

----. 1992. Fire and Civilization. New York, NY: Penguin.

Gould, Mark. 1987. Revolution in the Development of Capitalism: The Coming of the English Revolution. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Gould, Roger V., ed. Forthcoming 2004. The Rational Choice Controversy in Historical Sociology. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press.

----. 1995. Insurgent Identities: Class, Community, and Protest in Paris from 1848 to the Commune. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Greenfield, Liah. 2001. The Spirit of Capitalism: Nationalism and Economic Growth. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Gregerson, Linda. 1995. "Native Tongues: Effeminization, Miscegenation and the Construct of Tudor Nationalism." Mitteilungen des Zentrums zur Erforschung der Fruhen Neuzeit, No. 3 (June), Frankfurt, Renaissance Institute, Johan Wolfgang Goethe Universitat: 18-38.

Grew, Raymond. "The Case for Comparing Histories," The American Historical Review 85 #4 (October 1980): 763-778.

Griffin, Larry J. "Narrative, Event-Structure Analysis, and Causal Interpretation in Historical Sociology," American Journal of Sociology 98 #5 (March 1993), pp. 1094-1133.

Griswold, Wendy. 1986. Renaissance Revivals: City Comedy and Revenge Tragedy in the London Theatre, 1576-1980. Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Habermas, Jurgen. 1987. The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity. Twelve Lectures (tr. Frederick Lawrence). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Hachen, David and Joey Sprague. 1982. "The American Class Structure," American Sociological Review 47:709-726.

Hall, Catherine. 1996. "Histories, Empires, and the Post-Colonial Momen." In The Post-Colonial Question: Common Skies, Divided Horizons, edited by Iain Chambers and Lidia Curti (New York, NY: Routledge).

Hall, John A. 1989. "They Do Things Differently There, Or, The Contribution of British Historical Sociology" The British Journal of Sociology 40 #4, December: 544-564.

-----, 1986. Powers and Liberties. London, England: Penguin.

Hall, John R. 1999. Cultures of Inquiry: From Epistemology to Discourse in Sociohistorical Research. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

-----, ed. Reworking Class (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1997).

-----, 1992. "Where History and Sociology Meet: Forms of Discourse and Socio-historical Inquiry," Sociological Theory 10.

Hall, Peter A. and Rosemary C. R. Taylor, "Political Science and the Three New Institutionalisms," Political Studies (1996), XLIV, 936-957.164-193

Hall, Stuart. 1996. "When Was the Post-Colonial: Thinking at the Limit," in The Post-Colonial Question: Common Skies, Divided Horizons, edited by Iain Chambers and Lidia Curti. New York, NY: Routledge..

-----, "The West and the Rest: Discourse and Power," in Stuart Hall and Adam Gieben, eds. Formations of Modernity. Cambridge, England: Open University Press, 1992.

-----, "Rethinking the 'Base-Superstructure' Metaphor," in Jon Bloomfield (ed.), Class, Hegemony and Party (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1977), pp. 43-72.

Hamilton, Gary G. "Civilizations and the Organization of Economies," pp. 183-205 in Neil J. Smelser and Richard Swedberg, eds. The Handbook of Economic Sociology (New York: Russell Sage Foundation/Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994).

----. "Patriarchy, Patrimonialism, and Filial Piety: A Comparison of China and Western Europe," The British Journal of Sociology 41 #1 (March 1990): 77-104

Hanagan, Michael. 1997. "Introduction to the Special Issue on Recasting Citizenship," Theory and Society 26 #4: 397-402.

Haney, Lynne A. 2002. Inventing the Needy: Gender and the Politics of Welfare in Hungary. Berkeley, California: University of California Press.

----. 1996. "Homeboys, Babies, and Men in Suits: The State and the Reproduction of Male Dominance." American Sociological Review 61:759-778.

Hansen, Thomas Blom and Finn Stepputat. 2001. "Introduction: States of Imagination," Thomas Blom Hansen and Finn Stepputat, eds., States of Imagination: Ethnographic Explorations of the Postcolonial State. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press.

Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri. 2000. Empire. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Harvey, David. 1989. The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Hechter, Michael. 1975. Internal Colonialism: The Celtic Fringe in British National Development, 1536-1966. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Hedström, Peter and Richard Swedberg, eds. 1998. Social Mechanisms: An Analytical Approach to Social Theory. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Herbst, Jeffrey. 2000. States and Power in Africa: Comparative Lessons in Authority and Control. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Hexter, J. H. 1979. On Historians: Reappraisals of Some of the Makers of Modern History. Boston, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hicks, Alexander. 1999. Social Democracy and Welfare Capitalism: A Century of Income Security Politics. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.

Hobsbawm, Eric. 1994. Age of Extremes: A History of the World, 1914-1991. New York: Pantheon Books.

Hobson, Barbara. 1990. "No Exit, No Voice: Women's Economic Dependency and the Welfare State," Acta Sociologica 33:235-50.

Hobson, Barbara and Marika Lindholm. 1997. "Collective Identities, Power Resources, and the Making of Welfare States." Theory and Society (Fall):1-34.

Hollinger, David A. Postethnic America: Beyond Multiculturalism. New York, Basic Books, 1995.

- Hooks, Gregory. 1990. "From an Autonomous to a Captured State Agency: The Decline of the New Deal in Agriculture," American Sociological Review 55:29-43.
- Hopcroft, Rosemary. 1999. Regions, Institutions, and Agrarian Change in European History. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press.
- Huber, Evelyne and John Stephens. 2001. Development and Crisis of the Welfare State: Parties and Policies in Global Markets. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press.
- Hume, David. 1975 [1748]. An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Hunt, Lynn. 1984. Politics, Culture, and Class in the French Revolution. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- , 1992. The Family Romance of the French Revolution. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Huntington, Samuel P. 1996. The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of the World Order. New York, New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Ikegami, Eiko. 1995. The Taming of the Samurai: Honorific Individualism and the Making of Modern Japan. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Inglehart, Ronald and Wayne E. Baker, "Modernization, Cultural Change, and the Persistence of Traditional Values," American Sociological Review 65 #1 (2000): 19-51.
- Jackson, Robert Max. 1998. Destined for Equality: The Inevitable Rise of Women's Status. Boston, MA: Harvard University Press.
- James, C.L.R. 1963 [1989]. The Black Jacobins. New York, NY: Vintage.
- James, David R. "The Transformation of the Southern Racial State: Class and Race Determinants of Local-State Structures," American Sociological Review 53 #2 (1988): 191-208,
- Jameson, Frederic. 1992. Postmodernism, or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Janoski, Thomas and Alexander Hicks, eds. 1994. The Comparative Political Economy of the Welfare State. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jenson, Jane. "Gender and Reproduction: Or, Babies and the State," Studies in Political Economy 20(1986):9-45.
- Jenkins, Craig J and Barbara G. Brents, "Social Protest, Hegemonic Competition, and Social Reform: A Political Struggle Interpretation of the Origins of the American Welfare State," American Sociological Review 54:(1989) 891-909
- Jessop, Bob. 2000. "The Temporal Fix and the Tendential Ecological Dominance of Globalizing Capitalism," International Journal of Urban and Regional Research 24 (1): 231-233.
- Joppke, Christian. 1999. Immigration and the Nation-State: The United States, Germany, and Great Britain. New York, New York: Oxford University Press.

- Juergensmeyer, Mark. 2000. Terror in the Mind of God: The Global Rise of Religious Violence. Berkeley, California: University of California Press.
- Jung, Moon-kie. 1999. "No Whites, No Asians: Race, Marxism, and Hawaii's Preemergent Working Class" Social Science History 23 (3): 357-393
- Kane, Anne. 2000. "Narratives of Nationalism: Constructing Irish National Identity During the Land War, 1879-82." National Identities 2 (3): 245-264.
- . 1997. "Theorizing Meaning Construction in Social Movements: Interpretation and Symbolic Meaning during the Irish Land War, 1879-1882." Sociological Theory 3:249-76.
- Kasakoff, Alice Bee. 1999. "Is There a Place for Anthropology in Social Science History?" Social Science History 23 #4 : 535-559.
- Katznelson, Ira. 2003. "Periodization and Preferences: Contributions of Comparative-Historical Social Science," James Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschemeyer, eds. Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1981. City Trenches: Urban Politics and the Patterning of Class in the United States. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kaufman, Jason. 1999. "Three Views of Associationalism in 19th Century America: An Empirical Examination," American Journal of Sociology 104 (3): 1296-1345.
- Kennedy, Michael D. 2002. Cultural Formations of Postcommunism: Emancipation, Transition, Nation, and War. Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.
- . 2001. "Postcommunist Capitalism, Culture and History" American Journal of Sociology 106 (4): 1138-1151.
- . 1990. The Constitution of Critical Intellectuals: Polish Physicians, Peace Activists and Democratic Civil Society. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Kerber, Linda. 1980. Women of the Republic: Intellect and Ideology in Revolutionary America. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Kimeldorf, Howard. 1999. Battling for American Labor: Wobblies, Craft Workers, and the Making of the Union Movement. Berkeley, California: University of California Press.
- Kiser, Edgar. 1989. "A Principal-Agent Analysis of the Initiation of War in Absolutist States," pp. 65-82 in War and the World System, ed. Robert Schaeffer. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Kiser, Edgar and Michael Hechter. 1999. "The Debate on Historical Sociology: Rational Choice Theory and its Critics," American Journal of Sociology 104 (3): 785-816.
- Kiser, Edgar and Michael Hechter. 1991. "The Role of General Theory in Comparative-historical Sociology," American Journal of Sociology 97(1991):1-30.
- Kiser, Edgar and April Linton, "The Hinges of History: State-Making and Revolt in Early Modern France," American Sociological Review 2002, Vol. 67 (December: 889-910).

- Kiser, Edgar and Joachim Schneider. 1994. "Bureaucracy and Efficiency: An Analysis of Taxation in Early Modern Prussia," American Sociological Review 59 (April): 187-204.
- Kiser, Edgar and Xiaoxi Tong. 1992. "Determinants of the Amount and Type of Corruption in State Fiscal Bureaucracies: An Analysis of Late Imperial China," Comparative Political Studies 25.
- Kleinman, Daniel Lee. Forthcoming 2003. Impure Cultures: University Biology and the Commercial World. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- . 1995. Politics on the Endless Frontier: Postwar Research Policy in the United States. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Knight, Alan. 2002. "Subalterns, Signifiers, and Statistics: Perspectives on Mexican Historiography," Latin American Research Review 37 (2): 136-158.
- Knijin, Trudie and Monique Kremer. 1997. "Gender and the Caring Dimension of Welfare States." Social Politics 4:328-61.
- Konrad, George and Ivan Szelenyi. 1979. The Intellectuals on the Road to Class Power. (Trs. Andrew Arato and Richard E. Allen). New York, NY: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Korpi, Walter. 2000. "Faces of Inequality: Gender, Class and Patterns of Inequalities in Different Types of Welfare States," Social Politics 7:127-91
- Korpi, Walter The Working Class in Welfare Capitalism: Work, Unions and Politics in Sweden (Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1978).
- Koven, Michel and Sonya Michel. 1990. "Womanly Duties: Maternalist Politics and the Origins of Welfare States in France, Germany, Great Britain, and the United States, 1880-1920." American Historical Review 95(4):1076-1108.
- Kriedte, Peter, Hans Medick and Jurgen Schlumbohm. 1981. Industrialization Before Industrialization. Rural Industry in the Genesis of Capitalism. (Translated by Beate Schempp) New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Kymlicka, Will. 1998. "American Multiculturalism in the International Arena," Dissent (Fall): 73-79
- Lachmann, Richard. 2000. Capitalists in Spite of Themselves: Elite Conflict and Economic Transitions in Early Modern Europe. New York, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lachmann, Richard. 1987. From Manor to Market: Structural Change in England, 1536-1640. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Laclau, Ernesto and Chantal Mouffe. 1985. Hegemony and Socialist Strategy. London: Verso.
- Laitin, David D. 1998. Identity in Formation: The Russian-Speaking Populations in the Near Abroad Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Lamont, Michele. 2000. The Dignity of Working Men: Morality and the Boundaries of Race, Class and Immigration. New York, New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

- . 1992. Money, Morals and Manners: The Culture of the French and American Upper-Middle Class. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Landes, Joan. 1988. Women and the Public Sphere in the Age of the French Revolution. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Langan, Mary and Ilona Ostner. 1991. "Gender and Welfare," pp.127-50 in Towards a European Welfare State?, ed. by G. Room. Bristol U.K.: School for Advanced Urban Studies.
- Lash, Scott "Postmodernity and Desire," Theory and Society 14 #1 (January 1985): 1-33.
- Lash, Scott and John Urry, The End of Organized Capitalism. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1987.
- Laslett, Barbara. 1991. "Biography as Historical Sociology: The Case of William Fielding Ogburn," Theory and Society 20 #4 (August): 511-538.
- Laslett, Barbara and Johanna Brenner, "Gender and Social Reproduction: Historical Perspectives," Annual Review of Sociology 15 (1989): 381-404.
- Laslett, Barbara, Johanna Brenner, and Yesim Arat, eds. 1995. Rethinking the Political: Gender, Resistance and the State. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Latour, Bruno. 1999. Pandora's Hope: Essays on the Reality of Science Studies. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Latour, Bruno and Steve Woolgar. [1979] 1986. Laboratory Life. Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Lewis, Jane. 1992. "Gender and the Development of Welfare Regimes," Journal of European Social Policy 3:159-73.
- Lie, John. 2001. Multiethnic Japan. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Lieberson, Stanley. 1992. "Einstein, Renoir, and Greeley: Some Thoughts about Evidence in Sociology: 1991 Presidential Address," American Sociological Review 57 #1 (February), pp. 1-15.
- . 1991. "Small N's and Big Conclusions: An Examination of the Reasoning in Comparative Studies Based on a Small Number of Cases." Social Forces 70:307-320.
- Lipset, Seymour Martin. 1963. The First New Nation: The United States in Historical and Comparative Perspective. New York: Basic.
- . 1950. Agrarian Socialism: The Coöperative Commonwealth Federation in Saskatchewan. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Liu, Tessie. 1991. "Teaching the Differences among Women from a Historical Perspective: Rethinking Race and Gender as Social Categories," Women's Studies International Forum 14: 265-76.
- Lo, Ming-cheng M. 2002. Doctors within Borders: Profession, Ethnicity, and Modernity in Colonial Taiwan. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

- Logan, Enid. 2000. "Conspirators, Pawns, Patriots and Brothers: Race and Politics in Western Cuba, 1906-1909," Diane Davis, ed. Political Power and Social Theory, 14. Amsterdam, Holland: JAI Press, pp. 3-51.
- Löwy, Michael and Robert Sayre. 2001. Romanticism Against the Tide of Modernity. Translated by Catherine Porter. Durham NC: Duke Univ Press.
- Loveman, Mara. 2001. Nation-state Building, "Race," and the Production of Official Statistics: Brazil in Comparative Perspective. Ph.D. Dissertation, Sociology, University of California-Los Angeles.
- Lyotard, Jean-Francois. 1984 [1979] The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Magubane, Zine. 2003. Bringing the Empire Home: Imagining Race, Class, and Gender in Great Britain and Colonial South Africa. Chicago, Illinois: Chicago University Press.
- Mahoney, James. 2001. Legacies of Liberalism. Path Dependence and Political Regimes in Central America. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins Press.
- 2001. "Beyond Correlational Analysis: Recent Innovations in Theory and Method," Sociological Forum 16 (3): 575-593.
- 1999. "Nominal, Ordinal, and Narrative Appraisal in Macrocausal Analysis." American Journal of Sociology 104 (4): 1154-1196.
- Mahoney, James and Dietrich Rueschemeyer, eds. 2003. Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Mamdani, Mahmood. 1996. Citizen and Subject. Contemporary Africa and the Legacy of Late Colonialism. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ Press.
- Mandelbaum, Maurice. 2000. "Historical Explanation: The Problem of Covering Laws." History and Theory 1 (3): 229-242.
- Mann, Michael. 1986 and 1993. The Sources of Social Power, volumes 1 and 2. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Manza, Jeff. 2000. "Political Sociological Models of the U.S. New Deal." Annual Review of Sociology 26: 297-322.
- Markoff, John. 1996. The Abolition of Feudalism: Peasants, Lords and Legislators in the French Revolution. Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Marshall, Barbara L. 2000. Configuring Gender: Explorations in Theory and Politics. Peterborough, Ontario: Broadview Press
- 1994. Engendering Modernity: Feminism, Social Theory and Social Change. Boston: Northeastern University Press
- Marshall, T. H. 1950. Citizenship, Class, and Other Essays. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Marx, Anthony W. Making Race and Nation: A Comparison of South Africa, the United States, and Brazil (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998)
- Marx, Karl. 1973 [1852]. The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte. New York: International Publishers.
- Marx, Karl and Frederick Engels. 1998 [1848]. The Communist Manifesto. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Maza, Sara. 1993. Private Lives and Public Affairs: The Causes Célèbres of Prerevolutionary France. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Mazlish, Bruce and Ralph Buultjens. 1993. Conceptualizing Global History. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Megill, Allan. Prophets of Extremity: Nietzsche, Heidegger, Foucault, Derrida (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1985)
- McAdam, Doug and Sidney Tarrow and Charles Tilly. 2001. Dynamics of Contention. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- McCall, Leslie. 2001. Complex Inequality: Gender, Class and Race in the New Economy. New York, New York: Routledge.
- McDonald, Terrence J. ed. The Historic Turn in the Human Sciences (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1996).
- McLean, Paul D. "A Frame Analysis of Favor Seeking in the Renaissance: Agency, Networks, and Political Culture," American Journal of Sociology 104 #1 (July 1998): 51-91.
- McMichael, Philip. 1990. "Incorporating Comparison within a World-Historical Perspective," American Sociological Review 55: 385-397.
- Megill, Allan. 1985. Prophets of Extremity: Nietzsche, Heidegger, Foucault, Derrida. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Merton, Robert King. 1970 [1938]. Science, Technology and Society in Seventeenth-Century England (New York: H. Fertig).
- Meyer, John W. 1999. "The Changing Cultural Content of the Nation-State: A World Society Perspective," State/Culture: State-Formation after the Cultural Turn, ed. George Steinmetz. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, pp. 123-143.
- Meyer, John W. and Michael T. Hannan (eds.) National Development and the World System. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970).
- Meyer, John W. and Ronald Jepperson. 2000. "The 'Actors' of Modern Society: The Cultural Construction of Social Agency," Sociological Theory 18 (1): 100-120.
- Milkman, Ruth. 1987. Gender and Work: The Dynamic of Job Segregation by Sex During World War II. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

- Mill, John Stuart. 1875. A System of Logic, Raciocinative and Inductive, Being a Connected View of the Principles of Evidence, and the Methods of Scientific Investigation. 9th edition. London: Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer.
- Miller, Pavla. 1998. Transformations of Patriarchy in the West, 1500-1900. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press.
- Mitchell, Timothy. 1991. "The Limits of the State: Beyond Statist Approaches and Their Critics," American Political Science Review 85:77_96.
- Moaddel, Mansoor. 1992. Class, Politics and Ideology in the Iranian Revolution. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Mohanty, Chandra Talpade. "Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses," pp.51-80 in Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism, edited by Chandra Mohanty, Ann Russo, and Lourdes Torres (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991).
- Mohr, John. 1998. "Measuring Meaning Structures," Annual Review of Sociology 24:345_370.
- Moore, Barrington. 1966. Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy: Lord and Peasant in the Making of the Modern World. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Morawska, Ewa. 1998. "A Historical Turn in Feminism and Historical Sociology," Social Politics 5:38-47.
- Mullins, Nicholas C., with the assistance of Carolyn J. Mullins. 1973. Theories and Theory Groups in Contemporary American Sociology. New York, New York: Harper and Row.
- O'Connor, Julia S., Ann Shola Orloff, and Sheila Shaver. 1999. States, Markets, Families: Gender, Liberalism and Social Policy in Australia, Canada, Great Britain and the United States. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Olick, Jeffrey K., ed., States of Memory: Continuities, Conflicts, and Transformations in National Retrospection (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2003).
- Olick, Jeffrey K. and Daniel Levy, "Collective Memory and Cultural Constraint: Holocaust Myth and Rationality in German Politics," American Sociological Review 62 #6 (December 1997): 921-936.
- Orloff, Ann Shola. 2000. "Farewell to Maternalism: Welfare Reform, Liberalism, and the End of Mothers' Right to Choose Between Employment and Full-time Care." Evanston, Ill. : Institute for Policy Research, Northwestern University
- . 1993a. Politics of Pensions: A Comparative Analysis of Britain, Canada, and the United States, 1880-1940. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- _____. 1993b. "Gender and the Social Rights of Citizenship: The Comparative Analysis of Gender Relations and Welfare States." American Sociological Review 58(3):303-328.
- Orloff, Ann Shola and Theda Skocpol. 1984. "Why Not Equal Protection? Explaining the Politics of Public Social Spending in Britain, 1900-1911, and the United States, 1880s-1920." American Sociological Review 49:726-750.
- Padamsee, Tasi and Julia Adams. 2002. "Signs and Regimes Revisited," Social Politics (2002): 187-202.

Padgett, John F., and Christopher K. Ansell. 1993. "Robust Action and the Rise of the Medici, 1400-1434." American Journal of Sociology 98 (6): 1259-1319.

Paige, Jeffery. 1997. Coffee and Power: Revolution and the Rise of Democracy in Central America. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

-----, 1975. Agrarian Revolution: Social Movements and Export Agriculture in the Underdeveloped World. New York: Free Press.

Parsa, Misagh. 2000. States, Ideologies, and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of Iran, Nicaragua and the Philippines. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Parsons, Talcott. 1971. The system of modern societies. Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall

-----, 1966. Societies: Evolutionary and Comparative Perspectives. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

-----, 1937. The Structure of Social Action, 2 vols. New York: The Free Press.

Pateman, Carole. 1988. The Sexual Contract. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

-----, 1989. Disorder of Women: Democracy, Feminism, and Political Theory. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Patterson, Orlando. 1990. Slavery and Social Death: A Comparative Study. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Pedersen, Susan. 1993. Family, Dependence, and the Origins of the Welfare State: Britain and France, 1914-1945. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Pierson, Paul. 2001. "Post-Industrial Pressures on the Mature Welfare States," in Paul Pierson, ed., The New Politics of the Welfare State. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 80-104.

-----, 2000. "Increasing Returns, Path Dependence, and the Study of Politics." American Political Science Review 94(2): 251-267.

Poggi, Gianfranco. 1978. The Development of the Modern State: A Sociological Introduction. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Polanyi, Karl. 1944. The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time. Boston: Beacon Press.

Poulantzas, Nicos. 1973. Political Power and Social Classes. London: Verso.

Pred, Allan and Michael John Watts, Reworking Modernity: Capitalisms and Symbolic Discontent (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1992).

Quadagno, Jill. 1988. The Transformation of Old Age Security: Class and Politics in the American Welfare State. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Raffin, Anne. 2002a. "The Integration of Difference in French Indochina during World War II: Organizations and Ideology Concerning Youth," Society and Theory 31 #3 (June): 365-390.

- Raffin, Anne. 2002b. "Easternization Meets Westernization: Patriotic Youth Organizations in French Indochina during World War II," French Politics, Culture and Society 20 #2 (Summer): pp. 121-140.
- Ragin, Charles. 2000. Fuzzy-Set Social Science. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- _____. 1987. The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Ray, Raka. 1999. Fields of Protest: Women's Movements in India. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Riley, Denise. 1989. Am I That Name? Feminism and the Category of Women in History. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Rona-Tas, Akos. 1994. "The First Shall Be Last? Entrepreneurship and Communist Cadres in the Transition from Socialism," American Journal of Sociology 100 #1 (July): 40-69.
- Root, Hilton L. 1994. The Fountain of Privilege: Political Foundations of Markets in Old Regime France and England. Berkeley/Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- , Peasants and King in Burgundy: Agrarian Foundations of French Absolutism, Berkeley/Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press, 1987.
- Rose, Sonya. 1992. Limited Livelihoods: Gender and Class in Nineteenth-Century England. Berkeley, Ca: University of California Press.
- , 1988. "Proto-Industry, Women's Work and the Household Economy in the Transition to Industrial Capitalism," Journal of Family History 13 (Spring): 181-193
- , 1986. "Gender at Work: Sex, Class and Industrial Capitalism," History Workshop Journal 21 (Spring).
- Rowbotham, Sheila. 1972. Women, Resistance, and Revolution: A History of Women and Revolution in the Modern World. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Roxborough, Ian. 1988. "Modernization Theory Revisited: A Review Article," Comparative Studies in Society and History, volume 1 #30 (October): 753-761.
- , 1979. Theories of Underdevelopment. London: Macmillan.
- Roy, William G. 1987. "Time, Place, and People in History and Sociology: Boundary Definitions and the Logic of Inquiry," Social Science History 11: 53-62.
- Rubinson, Richard. 1986. "Class Formation, Politics, and Institutions: Schooling in the United States," American Journal of Sociology 92 #3 (November): 519-548.
- Rueschemeyer, Dietrich, Evelyne Huber Stephens and John D. Stephens. 1992. Capitalist Development and Democracy. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Ruggie, Mary. 1984. The State and Working Women: A Comparative Study of Britain and Sweden. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

- Sahlins, Marshall. 1981. Historical Metaphors and Mythical Realities: Structure in the Early History of the Sandwich Islands Kingdom Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Said, Edward. 1994. Orientalism. New York: Vintage Books
- Sassen, Saskia. 1991. The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Saussure, Ferdinand de. Course in General Linguistics (New York, NY: Philosophical Library, 1959).
- Scott, Joan W. 1992. "Experience." In Feminists Theorize the Political,. Judith Butler and Joan W. Scott, eds. New York: Routledge, pp. 22-40.
- . 1988. Gender and the Politics of History. New York: Columbia University Press.
- . 1986. "Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis," American Historical Review 91: 1053-75.
- Seidman, Gay. 1994. Manufacturing Militance: Workers' Movements in Brazil and South Africa, 1970-1985. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- . 1993. "'No Freedom Without the Women': Mobilization and Gender in South Africa, 1970-1992." Signs 18:291-320.
- Sewell, William H., Jr. 1996. "Three Theories of Temporality," The Historic Turn in the Human Sciences, Terrence J. McDonald, ed. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- . 1992. "A Theory of Structure: Duality, Agency and Transformation." American Journal of Sociology 98 (1): 1-29.
- . 1985. "Ideologies and Social Revolutions: Reflections on the French Case," Journal of Modern History 57: 57-85
- . 1980. Work and Revolution in France: The Language of Labor from the Old Regime to 1848. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Shapin, Steven. 1994. A Social History of Truth: Civility and Science in Seventeenth-Century England. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Shafir, Gershon. 1995. Immigrants and Nationalists. Ethnic Conflict and Accommodation in Catalonia, the Basque Country, Latvia, and Estonia. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Sherratt, Andrew. "Reviving the Grand Narrative: Archaeology and Long-Term Change," Journal of European Archaeology 3 (1995).
- Silver, Allan. 1990. "Friendship and Trust as Moral Ideals: An Historical Approach," Archives Europeenes de Sociologie 30: 274-97.
- Silverberg, Helene, ed. Gender and American Social Science: The Formative Years (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998).

Skocpol, Theda. 2003. "Doubly Engaged Social Science: The Promise of Comparative- Historical Analysis." In Mahoney and Rueschemeyer, eds., Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

----. 1992. Protecting Soldiers and Mothers: The Political Origins of Social Policy in the United States. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

----. 1988. "An 'Uppy Generation' and the Revitalization of Macroscopic Sociology." Theory and Society 17:627-643.

----. 1985a. "Bringing the State Back In: Strategies of Analysis in Current Research," pp. 3-43 in Bringing the State Back In, ed. by Peter Evans, Dietrich Rueschemeyer and Theda Skocpol. New York: Cambridge University Press.

----. 1985b. "Cultural Idioms and Political Ideologies in Revolutionary Reconstruction of State Power: A Rejoinder to Sewell," Journal of Modern History 57: 86-96.

----. 1984a. "Sociology's Historical Imagination," in T. Skocpol, ed., Vision and Method in Historical Sociology, pp. 1-21. New York: Cambridge University Press.

----. 1984b. "Emerging Agendas and Recurrent Strategies in Historical Sociology," pp. 356-391 in T. Skocpol, ed., Vision and Method in Historical Sociology, pp. 1-21. New York: Cambridge University Press.

----. 1980. "Political Response to Capitalist Crisis: Neo-Marxist Theories of the State and the Case of the New Deal." Politics and Society 10(2): 155-201.

----. 1979. States and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia, and China. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Skocpol, Theda and Margaret Somers. 1980. "The Uses of Comparative History in Macrosocial Inquiry." Comparative Studies in Society and History 22(2):174-197.

Skowronek, Stephen. 1982. Building a New American State: The Expansion of National Administrative Capacities, 1877-1920. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Smelser, Neil J. 1976. Comparative Methods in the Social Sciences. Engelwood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

----. 1959. Social Change in the Industrial Revolution: An Application of Theory to the British Cotton Industry. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Smith, Dennis. The Rise of Historical Sociology, Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1991.

Social Science History, 1992, Special Issues on Narrative.

Sohrabi, Nader. 2002. "Global Waves, Local Actors: What the Young Turks Knew about Other Revolutions and Why it Mattered," Comparative Studies in Society and History 44 (1) 45-79.

----. 1995. "Historicizing Revolutions: Constitutional Revolutions in the Ottoman Empire, Iran and Russia, 1905-1908," American Journal of Sociology 100 (6): 1383-1447.

Somers, Margaret R. 1993. "Citizenship and the Place of the Public Sphere: Law, Community, and Political Culture in the Transition to Democracy." American Sociological Review 58:587-620.

----. 1998. "'We're No Angels': Realism, Rational Choice, and Relationality in Social Science." American Journal of Sociology 104(3):722-784.

Soysal, Yasemin. 1994. Limits of Citizenship: Migrants and Postnational Membership in Europe. Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Spillman, Lynette. 2002. "Causal Reasoning, Historical Logic, and Sociological Explanation," in Jeff Alexander, Gary Marx, and Christine Williams, eds. Self, Social Structure, and Beliefs: Explorations in the Sociological Thought of Neil J. Smelser (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press).

----. 1997. Nation and Commemoration: Creating National Identities in the United States and Australia. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Stacey, Judith. 1983. Patriarchies and Socialist Revolution in China. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Stacey, Judith and Barrie Thorne. 1996. "Is Sociology Still Missing its Feminist Revolution?" in "The Missing Feminist Revolution: Ten Years Later," Perspectives: The ASA Theory Section Newsletter 18(1996): 1-3.

----. 1985. "The Missing Feminist Revolution in Sociology," Social Problems 32:301-15.

Stark, David. 1996. "Recombinant Property in East European Capitalism," American Journal of Sociology 101 #4 (January): 993-1027.

Steedman, Carolyn. 2002. Dust: The Archives and Cultural History. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

----. 1986. Landscape For a Good Woman: A Story of Two Lives. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Steinberg, Marc W. 1999. Fighting Words: Working-Class Formation, Collective Action, and Discourse in Early Nineteenth-Century England. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Steinmetz, George. 2003. "'The Devil's Handwriting': Precolonial Discourse, Ethnographic Acuity, and Cross-Identification in German Colonialism," Comparative Studies in Society and History, 45 (1): 41-95.

----. 2002. "Precoloniality and Colonial Subjectivity: Ethnographic Discourse and Native Policy in German Overseas Imperialism, 1780s-1914," Political Power and Social Theory 15, Diane E. Davis, ed. Amsterdam, Holland: JAI Press.

----. 1998. "Critical Realism and Historical Sociology," Comparative Studies in Society and History 40 (1): 170-186.

----. 1993. Regulating the Social: The Welfare State and Local Politics in Imperial Germany. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Steinmetz, George, ed. 1999. State/Culture: State Formation after the Cultural Turn. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.

Stephens, John. 1979. The Transition from Capitalism to Socialism. London: Macmillan.

Stinchcombe, Arthur L. 2001. When Formality Works: Authority and Abstraction in Law and Organizations. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press. pp. 158-178.

- , 1995. Sugar Island Slavery in the Age of Enlightenment: The Political Economy of the Caribbean World. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- , 1991. "The Conditions of Fruitfulness of Theorizing about Mechanisms in Social Science," Philosophy of the Social Sciences 21(3): 367-387.
- , 1978. Theoretical Methods in Social History. New York: Academic Press.
- Stoler, Ann Laura. "Developing Historical Negatives: Race and the (Modernist) Visions of a Colonial State," pp. 156-185 in Brian Keith Axel, ed. From the Margins: Historical Anthropology and its Futures (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2002)
- Stone, Lawrence. 1992. "The Revolution over the Revolution," (review of Jack Goldstone's Revolution and Rebellion in the Early Modern World), New York Review of Books, June 11.
- Strang, David. 1996. "From Dependency to Sovereignty: An Event History Analysis of Decolonization, 1870-1987," American Sociological Review 53 (6): 846-860.
- Stryker, Robin "Science, Class and the Welfare State: A Class-centered Functional Account," American Journal of Sociology 96 #3 (November 1990): 684-726 .
- Stukuls, Daina. 1999. "Body of the Nation: Mothering, Prostitution, and Women's Place in Post-Communist Latvia," Slavic Review 58(3): 537-558.
- Suny, Ronald Grigor. 2002. "Back and Beyond: Reversing the Cultural Turn?" American Historical Review (December): 1476-1499.
- Sutton, John. 1988. Stubborn Children: Controlling Delinquency in the United States, 1640-1981. Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Swaan, Abram de. 1988. In Care of the State: Health Care, Education and Welfare in Europe and the USA in the Modern Era. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Swidler, Ann. 1986. "Culture in Action: Symbols and Strategies," American Sociological Review 51:273-86.
- Taylor, Charles. 1999. "Two Theories of Modernity?" Public Culture 11 #1: 153-174.
- , 1985. Human Agency and Language. Philosophical Papers I. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Thelen, Kathleen. 1999. "Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Politics," Annual Review of Political Science 2: 369-404.
- Thelen, Kathleen, and Sven Steinmo. 1992. "Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Politics." In Sven Steinmo, Kathleen Thelen, and Frank Longstreth, eds. Structuring Politics: Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Perspective. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Therborn, Goran. 1980. The Ideology of Power and the Power of Ideology. London: New Left Books.
- Thomas, George, John W. Meyer, Francisco O. Ramirez, and John Boli. 1987. Institutional Structure: Constituting State, Society, and the Individual (Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1987).

Thompson, E. P. 1971. "The Moral Economy of the English Crowd in the Eighteenth Century." Past and Present 50:76-136.

Thompson, E. P. 1963. The Making of the English Working Class. New York, NY: Vintage.

Thornton, Arland 2001. "The Developmental Paradigm, Reading History Sideways, and Family Change," Demography vol 38 #4, pp. 449-465.

Tilly, Charles. Forthcoming. "Historical Analysis of Political Processes," in Jonathan H. Turner, ed. Handbook of Sociological Theory. New York: Plenum.

----- Durable Inequality. 1998. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

-----, 1990. Coercion, Capital and European States, AD 990-1990. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

-----, 1984. Big Structures, Large Processes, Huge Comparisons. New York: Russell Sage.

-----, 1981. As Sociology Meets History. New York: Academic Press.

-----, 1978. From Mobilization to Revolution. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

-----, ed. 1975. The Formation of National States in Western Europe. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

-----, 1964. The Vendee. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Tilly, Charles, Louise Tilly, and Richard Tilly. 1975. The Rebellious Century, 1830-1930. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Tilly, Louise A. and Patricia Gurin, eds. 1990. Women, Politics and Change. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Tilly, Louise A. and Joan W. Scott. 1978. Women, Work, and Family. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Torpey, John. 2000. The Invention of the Passport: Surveillance, Citizenship and the State. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Traubott, Mark. "Determinants of Political Orientation: Class and Organization in the Parisian Insurrection of June 1848," American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 86, No. 1. (Jul., 1980), pp. 32-49.

Trimberger, Ellen Kay 1978. Revolution from Above. Military Bureaucrats and Development in Japan, Turkey, Egypt, and Peru. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

Turbin, Carole. 1992. Working Women of Collar City: Gender, Class and Community in Troy, New York, 1864-1886. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Tyler, Stephen. 1986. "Post-Modern Ethnography: From Document of the Occult to Occult Document," in Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography James Clifford and George E. Marcus, eds. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

United Nations Development Programme. 2000. Human Development Report 2000. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

- Voss, Kim. 1993. The Making of American Exceptionalism: The Knights of Labor and Class Formation in the Nineteenth Century. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.
- Wacquant, Loic. 2002. "Scrutinizing the Street: Poverty, Morality, and the Pitfalls of Urban Ethnography," American Journal of Sociology 107, 6 (May), 1468-1532.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. 1999. The End of the World as We Know It. Social Science for the Twenty-First Century (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press).
- . 1976. "Modernization: Requiescat in Pace," The Uses of Controversy in Sociology, eds. Lewis A. Coser and Otto N. Larsen. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- . 1974. The Modern World System I: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World Economy in the Sixteenth Century. New York: Academic Press.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel et al. 1996. Open the Social Sciences. Report of the Gulbenkian Commission on the Restructuring of the Social Sciences. Stanford CA: Stanford California Press
- Walters, Pamela Barnhouse, David R. James and Holly J. McCammon. 1997. "Citizenship and Public Schools: Accounting for Racial Inequality in Education in the Pre- and Post-Disfranchisement South," American Sociological Review 62(1) (February) : 34-52.
- Walters, Pamela Barnhouse and Philip J. O'Connell. 1988. "The Family Economy, Work, and Educational Participation in the United States, 1890-1940," American Journal of Sociology 93 (5): 1116-1152.
- Watkins, Susan Cotts. 1991. From Provinces into Nations: Demographic Integration in Western Europe, 1870-1960. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Weber, Max. 1958. "Science as a Vocation," in H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills, eds., From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 129-156.
- Weber, Max. 1930. The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism (tr. Talcott Parsons). New York: Harper Collins.
- Weir, Margaret. 1992. Politics and Jobs: The Boundaries of Employment Policy in the United States. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Weir, Margaret, Ann Shola Orloff and Theda Skocpol, eds. 1988. The Politics of Social Policy in the United States. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- White, Harrison C. 1992. Identity and Control: A Structural Theory of Social Action. Princeton, NJ: University of Princeton Press.
- . 1963. An Anatomy of Kinship: Mathematical Models for Structures of Cumulated Roles. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- White, Hayden. 1973. Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.

- Wickham-Crowley Timothy P. 1992. Guerrillas and Revolution in Latin America. A Comparative Study of Insurgents and Regimes since 1956. Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Williams, Fiona. 1995. "Race/Ethnicity, Gender and Class in Welfare States: A Framework for Comparative Analysis." Social Politics 2:27-59.
- Williams, Rosalind H. 1982. Dream Worlds: Mass Consumption in Late Nineteenth-Century France. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Wright, Erik Olin and Luca Perrone. 1977. "Marxist Class Categories and Income Inequality, American Sociological Review 42:32-55.
- Wright, Erik Olin, Cynthia Costello, David Hachen, and Joey Sprague. 1982. "The American Class Structure," American Sociological Review 47:709-726.
- Wu, Lawrence. 2000. "Some Comments on "Sequence Analysis and Optimal Matching Methods in Sociology: Review and Prospect." Sociological Methods and Research 29: 41-64.
- Young, Robert J. C. 2001. Postcolonialism: An Historical Introduction. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Zald, Mayer N. 1996. "More Fragmentation? Unfinished Business in Linking the Social Sciences and the Humanities," Administrative Science Quarterly 41 (2): 251-61.
- Zaret, David. 1984. The Heavenly Contract: Ideology and Organization in Pre-revolutionary Puritanism. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984.
- . 1980. "From Max Weber to Parsons and Schutz: The Eclipse of History in Modern Social Theory," American Journal of Sociology 85 1180-1201.
- Zeitlin, Maurice. 1984. The Civil Wars in Chile, or, The Bourgeois Revolutions that Never Were Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Zelizer, Viviana. 1979. Morals and Markets: The Development of Life Insurance in the United States. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Zerilli, Linda. 1994. Signifying Woman: Culture and Chaos in Rousseau, Burke, and Mill. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Zerubavel, Eviatar. 2003. Time Maps, Collective Memory and the Social Shape of the Past. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.