

Symposium Inequality and Citizenship

T.H. Marshall's classic work argued that expansion of citizenship rights could ameliorate and stabilize inequalities. In October 2011, the United States Congressional Budget Office reported on the distribution of household income, providing more evidence that inequality has significantly increased in the U.S. during the past three decades. Simultaneous Congressional budgetary debates continued pressure on funding for education, health, and income support. The contributions to this symposium address questions about how rising inequality affects the practices of citizenship: In the current environment, does inequality threaten to overwhelm ameliorative effects of citizenship or lead to restrictions on the social, political, or civil rights associated with citizenship? Do recent developments portend a devaluation or reconfiguration of citizenship?

Section Officers

Chair

Robin Stryker

Past Chair

Ron Aminzade

Chair Elect

Judith Stepan-Norris

Secretary-Treasurer

Kenneth T. Andrews

Council

Sean O'Rian

Sarah Sobieraj

Mabel Berezin

Isaac William Martin

Kathleen M. Fallon

Edward T. Walker

Newsletter Editor

Erik Larson

Webmaster

Howard Lune

Newsletter Editor

Erik Larson

larson@macalester.edu

In this Issue

Symposium: Inequality and
Citizenship 1

Book Abstracts 9

Article Abstracts 11

Interview with Award Recipient
James Mahoney 13

Journal Profile: Citizenship
Studies 17

Teaching Political Sociology 19

Section News: ASA Events 20

Recent Ph.D. Profiles 24

A House Divided

Chad Alan Goldberg

University of Wisconsin-Madison / Princeton Institute for Advanced Study

At its 2010 annual meeting, the American Sociological Association hosted a plenary session which I helped to organize to mark the sixtieth anniversary of the publication of T. H. Marshall's "Citizenship and Social Class." Marshall's seminal essay, provided a brilliant analysis of the post-war welfare state and its sociological significance. Marshall's point of departure was the contrast between equal citizenship and class inequality. Continued on page 2.

Other Symposium Articles

- Nicholas Carnes, "Economic Inequality and White-collar Government" 4
- Stephanie Moller and Scott Fitzgerald, "Citizenship and Inequality in a Global Economy" 7

“How is it that these two opposing principles,” he asked, “could grow and flourish side by side in the same soil?” No conflict emerged, he suggested, so long as the core of citizenship was limited to civil rights because “civil rights were indispensable to a competitive market economy.” But, he argued, “the preservation of economic inequalities has been made more difficult by the enrichment of the status of citizenship” over the past two centuries.

By enrichment Marshall had two things in mind. First, political rights—developed and extended to the working class—could then be used to challenge the class inequalities generated by capitalism. Second, social rights were reintegrated into the status of citizenship, which implied “the subordination of market price to social justice.” These social rights did not and were not intended to equalize income, but by guaranteeing equal access to essential goods like education, housing, health care, and so forth, social rights rendered differences in income and market position less important for determining life chances. This analysis of the relationship between citizenship and social class remains relevant more than sixty years later, though perhaps not in the way Marshall might have expected.

Marshall died in 1981, late enough to witness the beginning of Thatcherism in his native Britain but before the brutal crushing of the British miners’ strike in 1984–85. He probably did not foresee how far right-wing social and economic policies would alter the landscape he had described at the midpoint of the twentieth century. Today the consequences of those policies are readily apparent, above all in the US. In October 2002, economist Paul Krugman penned a jeremiad in the pages of the *New York Times Magazine* about America’s growing concentration of privilege and economic power. Using census and income tax data, he showed that the distribution of income and wealth had become increasingly unequal in the United States since the 1970s. Krugman pointed out that America had not always been this unequal.

During the New Deal and the Second World War—the backdrop of Marshall’s essay—income gaps narrowed in what economists call “The Great Compression.” The decreased inequality occurred even as the economy experienced dramatic postwar growth, suggesting that economic growth need not depend on high levels of inequality. But at the beginning of the twenty-first century, Krugman suggested, America was entering a new Gilded Age with levels

of inequality that had not been seen since the nineteenth century. Krugman’s warning was taken up again in the wake of the Great Recession of 2008 by the Occupy Wall Street movement. At about the same time, in October 2011, the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office released a report, “Trends in the Distribution of Household Income Between 1979 and 2007,” which provided additional evidence of growing inequality. The report has since provoked an ongoing debate that Columbia University journalism professor Thomas Edsall surveyed in a recent *New York Times* blog post, “The Fight Over Inequality” (April 22, 2012).

I do not intend to wade into the debate parsed by Professor Edsall about how much inequality has increased or how it is best measured. Instead, reversing Marshall’s question, my purpose is to consider the impact of rising inequality on democratic citizenship. Like Marshall, I do not believe that democratic citizenship requires the abolition of a capitalist market economy. “Apparent inconsistencies,” as Marshall noted, “are in fact a source of stability, achieved through a compromise which is not dictated by logic.” The danger for equal citizenship is not so much compromise with the capitalist class system—a compromise predicated on public regulation of the capitalist market economy and the existence of what in the 1950s John Kenneth Galbraith called countervailing powers—but precisely the lack of compromise when markets are deregulated, countervailing powers are dismantled, and social justice is increasingly, relentlessly, and unbendingly subordinated to the market. If equal citizenship and class inequality have been “at war,” to use Marshall’s phrase, then class inequality has been winning for the past thirty years. And the more extreme that class inequality becomes, I suggest, the more difficult it makes equal citizenship.

What evidence is there of an erosion of citizenship? Isn’t the enactment of the 2010 Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act—disparaged as “Obamacare” by its detractors—prima facie evidence that the social rights of citizenship are continuing to expand in twenty-first century America? Despite its many and significant flaws, this legislation is indeed an historic step toward health insurance for all Americans. It is premature, however, to declare victory. Republicans will indubitably use any political gains in the 2012 elections to repeal or eviscerate the legislation (and, while they’re at it, they will reduce or restrict the already limited social right to unemployment benefits, on which

they blame, in topsy-turvy fashion, the persistence of high unemployment); in some states, like Iowa and Wisconsin, hostile governors or legislators have refused to implement the provision for health insurance exchanges while the law is challenged in the courts; and if the U.S. Supreme Court's four conservatives are joined by swing voter Anthony Kennedy, the court may well strike down the law by a five to four majority.

Even if the court only invalidates the much maligned individual mandate, it will effectively torpedo the law as a whole by making it unworkable. As Professor Krugman and others have pointed out, everyone must buy in if health insurance is to be affordable and universal. If the government does not require everyone to buy health insurance—from private providers by means of an individual mandate or by taxing them to finance compulsory social insurance—then many young and healthy people will decide that they can probably do without insurance and will decline to buy it.

Since the remaining pool of consumers will be made up of older, sicker people with higher health care costs, premiums will go up. As premiums rise, more healthy people will leave the system. This vicious circle, known as adverse selection, eventually creates a situation in which only people who are rich, old, and sick buy insurance but no one else can afford it. The demise of the individual mandate thus means the demise of universal coverage.

If the shaky right to health care is merely in jeopardy, industrial citizenship (or rather its postindustrial equivalent) is at its nadir. It hasn't always been this way. Even as the postwar welfare state limited the inequalities of the capitalist market economy from the outside, Marshall suggested, labor unions challenged inequalities from within. "Trade unionism," he wrote, "created a sort of secondary industrial citizenship, which naturally became imbued with the spirit appropriate to an institution of citizenship. Col-

lective civil rights could be used, not merely for bargaining in the true sense of the term, but for the assertion of basic rights." Consequently, he explained, the principle of social justice was no longer "foreign to the practice of the market;" it was "there already, entrenched within the contract system itself."

In the mid-twentieth century, when Marshall's essay was published, one in three American workers belonged to unions. However, the growth of economic inequality over the past three decades has coincided with organized labor's decline, a trend primarily driven by the hostility of employers and government, not workers. According to the National Labor Relations Board, at least 10,000 workers are illegally fired each year for exercising their right to engage in union activities, a figure that has remained steady since the mid-1970s. A report issued by Human Rights Watch in 2000 documented widespread violations of workers' right to organize in the US. In this environment, union membership, strike activity, and real hourly wages (adjusted for inflation) have all fallen dramati-

cally. More recently, in dozens of states where Republicans gained power after the 2010 midterm elections, including my home state of Wisconsin, legislatures have renewed the assault on unionism, moving to eviscerate bargaining rights, pass so-called "right-to-work" laws, or make it more difficult for unions to collect dues. These attacks aim not only to deny workers a democratic voice in their workplaces, but also to diminish their voice in government.

Coinciding with the Supreme Court's 2010 Citizens United decision that lifted restrictions on independent political expenditures by corporations and unions, these attacks aim in part to de-fund unions and thereby ensure that the big money in American politics is overwhelmingly right-wing money. While the influence of unions on electoral politics is curtailed, the billionaire Koch brothers and the shadowy corporate-funded American Legislative Exchange Council (ALEC) exercise sweeping power over

[M]ore than a dozen states... have enacted new laws requiring voters to show photo identification at polls, curtailing early voting periods, or imposing new restrictions on voter registration drives. Republicans claim that the changes are necessary to prevent voter fraud, but there is little evidence that voter fraud constitutes a serious problem. The real motivation is surely partisan: The new restrictions will likely skew the electorate in Republicans' favor...

public policy and legislation.

Finally, consider the erosion of political rights. Another consequence of Republican gains in the 2010 midterm elections is that more than a dozen states (again including Wisconsin) have enacted new laws requiring voters to show photo identification at polls, curtailing early voting periods, or imposing new restrictions on voter registration drives. Republicans claim that the changes are necessary to prevent voter fraud, but there is little evidence that voter fraud constitutes a serious problem. The real motivation is surely partisan: The new restrictions will likely skew the electorate in Republicans' favor by discouraging the participation of poor, young, and African-American voters, who tend to vote for Democrats. A study released in October 2011 by the Brennan Center for Justice at New York University School of Law estimated that the new measures could make it significantly harder for more than five million eligible voters to cast ballots in the 2012 elections.

As Frances Fox Piven and Richard Cloward showed in their classic study *Why Americans Don't Vote*, these attempts to reshape the electorate are nothing new. When popular electoral mobilization began to threaten the interests of ruling groups in the late nineteenth century, those groups responded by sponsoring what Piven and Cloward

called a "democratic counter-revolution." Elites worked to regain control of electoral politics by means of reforms which, on the one hand, weakened the ability of party machines to mobilize working-class voters (compare today's attacks on unions) and, on the other hand, disenfranchised many of those voters with new restrictions. The reforms were highly effective, contributing to the demobilization of large numbers of poor rural and working-class voters for many years.

What these examples suggest is that the growing concentration of economic wealth and power is making it ever harder to preserve (let alone expand) democratic citizenship in America. When the effects of economic concentration increasingly spill over into civil society and democratic politics, when the compromise that Marshall described in the mid-twentieth century has long since been broken, when the untrammelled flow of corporate money into American politics raises the specter of plutocracy, when public policy does not merely reflect economic inequality but becomes an instrument to deepen it, then Americans must choose between the continuation of these trends or the reinvigoration of the democratic ideal. We cannot have both.

Economic Inequality and White-collar Government

Nicholas Carnes
Duke University

If millionaires were a political party, that party would make up just three percent of American families (Deloitte 2011), but would have a filibuster-proof super-majority in the US Senate (Center for Responsive Politics 2012). If working-class Americans—those in manual labor and service industry jobs—were a political party, that party would have made up more than half of the country since the start of the 20th century, but would never have held more than two percent of the seats in Congress during that time (Carnes 2012a).

Congress is arguably the most extreme example of what I call white-collar government—political institutions made up of people who are significantly better off than the citizens they represent—but it is by no means alone.

In every level and branch of government in the US, our policymakers tend to be vastly more privileged than the rest of us: they are wealthier, more educated, and more likely to have come from a white-collar job. Even at the local level, the makeup of our political institutions is sharply slanted. Fewer than ten percent of city council members come from the working-class occupations that make up a majority of our labor force.

Class-imbalanced political institutions have always been a sore spot in scholarly thought about democratic government. Political scientists (Matthews 1954) and sociologists (Mills 1956; Domhoff 1967) have been speculating about their effects for decades. Political theorists have been talking about them even longer (Aristotle [350 BC] 1953).

During the ratification of the US Constitution, debates about the consequences of government by the upper class grew so intense that Madison and Hamilton eventually had to devote significant portions of *The Federalist Papers* to arguments about how the Constitution would restrain lawmakers' impulses towards class-based factionalism (Federalist #10) and how a white-collar government could still represent the interests of working-class citizens (Federalist #35)—how, as Hamilton put it, “the merchant [would] understand and be disposed to cultivate . . . the interests of the mechanic and manufacturing arts to which his commerce is so nearly allied.”

Although it's easy to understand the appeal of the old idea that politicians pursue the common good regardless of their personal stakes in issues of the day, research on how legislators actually think and behave hasn't been kind to Hamilton's hypothesis. Quite the contrary: the data suggest that, like the rest of us (Hout 2008), lawmakers from different classes tend to think, vote, and advocate very differently, especially on the economic issues that have historically divided Americans along social class lines (Carnes 2011; 2012). Former lawyers in public office tend to think like lawyers, former farmers tend to think like farmers, former blue-collar workers tend to think like blue-collar workers, and so on. As House Speaker John Boehner said while campaigning in 2010, “I'm a small businessman at heart. Always will be. . . . [I]t gave me a perspective on our country that I've carried with me throughout my time in public service.” Merchants and mechanics, it turns out, have different views about the government's role in economic affairs.

These differences have been remarkably stable over time and across different levels of government. Even controlling for party, constituency, and a host of other factors, lawmakers from the working class tend to be more progressive on economic issues—that is, less pro-business and more pro-worker—than lawmakers from white-collar jobs and especially those from the private sector, who tend to bring more conservative economic views to office. These differences in perspective in turn have enormous conse-

quences for economic policy. Business regulations are more relaxed, tax policies are more generous to the rich, social safety net programs are thinner, and protections for workers are weaker than they would be if our political decision makers came from the same mix of classes as the people they represent. Government by the upper class is often government for the upper class.

And government for the upper class may be part of the explanation for the enormous increase in economic inequality in the US since the 1970s. After World War II, forces like globalization, de-industrialization, and technological change created tremendous pressure for wealth and income

As inequality rises, the path to public office (and, therefore, the path to the kind of influence needed to combat rising inequality) may be getting harder for working-class citizens. As American workers lose ground economically, they may also be losing ground politically.

to concentrate in the hands of the most privileged Americans. The legislators who crafted the political response to these changes, however, were drawn overwhelmingly from the classes that stood to benefit from this seismic upward shift in economic resources. Our political institutions probably would have done more to fight inequality if the classes that suffer when inequality rises had had a seat at the table. Class-balanced state legislatures and city councils probably would have directed more of their resources

to social safety net programs. A Congress where working-class people made up their fair share of seats probably wouldn't have passed policies that made inequality worse, like the 2001 Bush Tax Cuts (Carnes 2011, ch. 5). Many other political factors were certainly important as well, including party politics (Bartels 2008, ch. 2), the decline of unions (Western and Rosenfeld 2011), and changes in the pressure system in Washington (Hacker and Pierson 2010). But imbalances in the social class makeup of government also played an important (and often overlooked) role. In an age of soaring inequality, our white-collar government often sat on its hands—and sometimes made matters worse.

These arguments—which essentially boil down to a claim that political power affects a group's economic well-being—will come as no surprise to students of political sociology. Marshall ([1950] 1992) argued over five decades ago that a group's political rights, including holding office, were an important step towards social rights and material well-being.

What might be more surprising—and potentially troubling—is the possibility that economic inequality may be undermining the working class’s political power, that the slow progress that Marshall anticipated from civil and political rights to material security and dignity may actually be reversing for blue-collar Americans. As inequality rises, the path to public office (and, therefore, the path to the kind of influence needed to combat rising inequality) may be getting harder for working-class citizens. As American workers lose ground economically, they may also be losing ground politically.

It has never been easy for working-class citizens to run for office, but as wealth becomes more concentrated and as campaign spending becomes more lavish, the odds against electing candidates of normal means are becoming steeper and steeper. Marshall was acutely aware of the possibility that “wealth can be used to influence an election,” but he was unconcerned about it in mid-twentieth-century England, where “a series of measures was adopted to reduce this influence” and where “working-class candidates [could] get financial support from party and other funds” (230). In twenty-first-century America, campaign donations and campaign spending are at all-time highs. Working-class citizens struggled to get elected when unions were strong, campaigns were cheap (by today’s standards), and parties had more clout in the electoral process. As wealth becomes more concentrated—and as the legal and political environments become more favorable to mega-spending by candidates and interest groups—working-class people are finding it harder than ever to get elected. The erosion of blue-collar Americans’ economic resources and political influence may be creating a sort of positive feedback loop: working-class people seldom hold office, so government lets economic inequality skyrocket, which makes it harder for working-class people to hold office

This vicious cycle isn’t invincible, however. Although scholars don’t know much about the factors that discourage working-class people from holding office (Is it a difference in ambition? free time? recruitment by political gatekeepers?), what little we know is very encouraging. There are at least as many capable, politically-engaged blue-collar Americans as there are politically qualified white-collar people (Carnes 2012b). And when they can muster the resources to run for office, working-class candidates tend to do well at the polls (Sadin 2012). Trailblazing efforts by labor unions

in New Jersey and Connecticut have shown that qualified potential candidates from the working class can be identified, recruited to run for office, and supported in their campaigns at a relatively low cost using many of the resources that working-class organizations already have: membership networks, newsletters, candidate endorsements, and so on. When it comes to helping working-class Americans hold office, a little outreach seems to go a long way.

Programs like these are a rare bright spot in the recent history of working-class representation, and expanding them will probably be, as Marshall said of most efforts to promote the rights of the less fortunate, “a slow and difficult process, which presupposes a change in the climate of thought throughout the upper ranks of society.” People who care about the upper class’s oversized influence in American political life are currently fixated on two culprits: inequalities in routine forms of political participation like voting or contacting elected officials (e.g., “If we could get the working class to vote more, they would have more of a voice in government”) and, more often, lobbying and campaign donations from well-heeled interest groups. (The day I wrote this paragraph, Paul Krugman published an op-ed that made exactly this familiar argument: “money buys power,” he wrote, “and the increasing wealth of a tiny minority has effectively bought the allegiance of one of our two major political parties”). Inequalities in participation and lobbying and donation are extremely important points, and addressing them would undoubtedly bring us closer to the ideal of government that represents everyone’s needs and interests. But even if we somehow equalized routine forms of political participation, even if we somehow stopped wealthy special interests from buying political influence, the laws that affect how millionaires are taxed would still be decided in political institutions made up of mostly millionaires. The laws that govern blue-collar workers’ wages, bargaining power, health care, and workplace safety would still be made by white-collar professionals. We would still be led by a white-collar government, and public policy would still be skewed in favor of the interests of white-collar Americans.

Those of us who care about economic and political inequality need to start talking about the underrepresentation of the working class in public office—and we need to start asking what we can do about it. If we don’t, the millionaire party’s policies will probably keep it in office for a very long time.

References

- Aristotle. [350 BC.] 1953. "Social Classes: A Classical View." *In Class, Status, and Power: A Reader in Social Stratification*, eds. Reinhard Bendix and Seymour Martin Lipset. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.
- Bartels, Larry M. 2008. *Unequal Democracy: The Political Economy of the New Gilded Age*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Carnes, Nicholas. 2011. "By the Upper Class, For the Upper Class? Representational Inequality and Economic Policymaking in the United States." Dissertation. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University.
- Carnes, Nicholas. 2012a. "Does the Numerical Underrepresentation of the Working Class in Congress Matter?" *Legislative Studies Quarterly* 37: 5–34.
- Carnes, Nicholas. 2012b. "Why Are There So Few Working-class People in Political Office? Evidence from State Legislatures." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, IL.
- Center for Responsive Politics. 2012. "Personal Finances: Overview." < <http://www.opensecrets.org/pfds/index.php> > (May 1, 2012).
- Deloitte, LLP. 2011. "The Next Decade in Global Wealth Among Millionaire Households." < <http://www.deloitte.com/us/globalwealth> > (October 17, 2011).
- Domhoff, G. William. 1967. *Who Rules America?* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Hacker, Jacob S., and Paul Pierson. 2010. *Winner-Take-All Politics: How Washington Made the Rich Richer—And Turned Its Back on the Middle Class*. New York, NY.
- Hout, Michael. 2008. "How Class Works: Objective and Subjective Aspects of Class Since the 1970s." In *Social Class: How Does it Work?*, eds. Annette Lareau and Dalton Conley. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Matthews, Donald R. 1954a. *The Social Background of Political Decision-Makers*. New York, NY: Random House.
- Mills, C. Wright. 1956. *The Power Elite*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Sadin, Meredith. 2012. "Voting with Class." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, IL.
- Western, Bruce, and Jake Rosenfeld. 2011. "Unions, Norms, and the Rise in U.S. Wage Inequality." *American Sociological Review* 76: 513–537.

Citizenship and Inequality in a Global Economy

Stephanie Moller and Scott Fitzgerald
University of North Carolina, Charlotte

"I propose to divide citizenship into three parts... I shall call these three parts, or elements, civil, political and social. The civil element is composed of the rights necessary for individual freedom—liberty of the person, freedom of speech, thought and faith, the right to own property and to conclude valid contracts, and the right to justice.... By the political element I mean the right to participate in the exercise of political power, as a member of a body invested with political authority or as an elector of the members of such body... By the social element I mean the whole range from the right to a modicum of economic welfare and security to the right to share to the full in the social heritage and to live the life of a civilized being according to the standards prevailing in the society."

--T.H. Marshall, 1950

As economic and political institutions in the United States adjust to the expanding global economy—leading some to ask whether something should be done about growing economic inequalities—Marshall's classic discussion of traditional citizenship is worth revisiting. T.H. Marshall was clear in his theory of citizenship rights that capitalism, inequality and citizenship are intimately linked.

While the historic pattern identified by Marshall—one that begins with the establishment of civil rights, then political rights and social rights—may have played out by the mid-20th century in the United States what has happened in the intervening years is something altogether different. Additionally, as others before us have argued, the expansion of workplace rights can be seen as a logical extension

of Marshall's initial thesis and one that we think is highly relevant to current political and economic trends. In this essay we focus on three particular points: the right to work and workplace rights, outsourcing, and rising inequality. In Marshall's framework, the social rights of citizenship assume particular economic distributions—generally ones with greater equality and ones that provide for the general welfare of all citizens—and in modern societies these social rights are intimately entwined with civil, political, and workplace rights. A key, but often overlooked, basic right of civil citizenship includes the right to work. Historically, this right was primarily invoked within national economies. Yet, with globalization, civil citizenship rights have expanded geographically. Today, multi-national companies account for over one-fifth of U.S. GDP and civilian employment. Even small businesses, with a fraction of the multinational operating budget, engage in overseas contracts, and in many cases these global contracts have replaced, not complemented, contracts for goods, services, and employment within the United States. As a result, the parameters of civil citizenship rights have expanded for some segments of the population without a corresponding expansion of political and ultimately social rights. This struggle is particularly amplified for immigrant (both documented and undocumented), temporary, contingent, and low-wage workers. Marshall posited that the rise of unions helped strengthen the civil rights of citizenship for laborers. Yet, due to outsourcing and globalization, political attacks on unions (e.g., Wisconsin), and 'right to work' laws in the South (a particularly ironic phrase given Marshall's argument), workplace rights are under serious threat in the United States and elsewhere. Coupled with increased job insecurity, this means that although in one sense the ability to "conclude valid contracts" (an aspect of the civil rights identified by Marshall in the quote above) has expanded through the expansion of global contracts; key segments of society have found their workplace rights curtailed. Not only have their employment rights destabilized, their rights to engage in contracts have destabilized because the owners of the means of production can export contracts.

Do Americans have freedom to work if work is not available? One could argue that citizens are free to produce

their own employment, but is that an empirical reality when innovation in a technologically advanced society requires substantial resources and individuals have uneven access to resources? Indeed, globalization has extended civil citizenship rights for some while diminishing the rights of others. This results in greater resources for individuals who benefit from the extended rights of civil citizenship at the expense of others. Expanding social citizenship rights could boost access to resources, but this is unlikely in a period of constrained civil citizenship rights in a country that actually values civil over social citizenship rights.

One might then ask, is this inevitable? Certainly not. While the Great Recession of 2008 and the ongoing struggles faced by EU countries remind us that no nation is above the fray, it is worth noting that many western European countries have not experienced the same level of polarization of the income distribution as the United States. Income and wealth inequality has risen dramatically in the United States, in part because of a political discourse that continues to invoke neo-liberal economic policies that present a false dichotomy: we can have either economic performance or social citizenship rights. As Marshall reminds us, citizenship rights are intimately linked whereby the prevention of the full expression of any set of these rights will prevent the full expression of other citizenship rights.

As a result, unfettered capitalism and full citizenship rights are at odds. During the past decades U.S. policy has fostered global capitalist development at the expense of citizenship rights, and global citizenship rights have not transpired. In historic times, Marshall suggested that citizenship was local, not national—and one of his great contributions was tracing the rise of national citizenship rights. Perhaps, today, the definition of local has changed. Perhaps, national has become the Marshallian local and global has become the Marshallian national. Perhaps, we should ask ourselves how we can extend rights of global citizenship. Until those rights emerge, transnational corporations will continue to have undue power to outsource jobs and move capital, and the social rights of citizenship, i.e., relatively low inequality, will remain a relic of the past and a dream for the future.

Abstracts

Book and Article Abstracts

BOOK ABSTRACTS

Elizabeth Popp Berman. 2012. *Creating the Market University: How Academic Science Became an Economic Engine*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

American universities today serve as economic engines, performing the scientific research that will create new industries, drive economic growth, and keep the United States globally competitive. But only a few decades ago, these same universities self-consciously held themselves apart from the world of commerce. *Creating the Market University* is the first book to systematically examine why academic science made such a dramatic move toward the market. Drawing on extensive historical research, Elizabeth Popp Berman shows how the government--influenced by the argument that innovation drives the economy--brought about this transformation. Americans have a long tradition of making heroes out of their inventors. But before the 1960s and '70s neither policymakers nor economists paid much attention to the critical economic role played by innovation. However, during the late 1970s, a confluence of events--industry concern with the perceived deterioration of innovation in the United States, a growing body of economic research on innovation's importance, and the stagnation of the larger economy--led to a broad political interest in fostering invention. The policy decisions shaped by this change were diverse, influencing arenas from patents and taxes to pensions and science policy, and encouraged practices that would focus specifically on the economic value of academic science. By the early 1980s, universities were nurturing the rapid growth of areas such as biotech entrepreneurship, patenting, and university-industry research centers. Contributing to debates about the relationship between universities, government, and industry, *Creating the Market University* sheds light on how knowledge and politics intersect to structure the economy.

Cybelles Fox. 2012. *Three Worlds of Relief: Race, Immigration, and the American Welfare State from the Progressive Era to the New Deal*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Three Worlds of Relief examines the role of race and immigration in the development of the American social welfare system by comparing how blacks, Mexicans, and European immigrants were treated by welfare policies during the Progressive Era and the New Deal. Taking readers from the turn of the twentieth century to the dark days of the Depression, Cybelles Fox finds that, despite rampant nativism, European immigrants received generous access to social welfare programs. The communities in which they lived invested heavily in relief. Social workers protected them from snooping immigration agents, and ensured that non-citizenship and illegal status did not prevent them from receiving the assistance they needed. But that same helping hand was not extended to Mexicans and blacks. Fox reveals, for example, how blacks were relegated to racist and degrading public assistance programs, while Mexicans who asked for assistance were deported with the help of the very social workers they turned to for aid. Drawing on a wealth of archival evidence, Fox paints a riveting portrait of how race, labor, and politics combined to create three starkly different worlds of relief. She debunks the myth that white America's immigrant ancestors pulled themselves up by their bootstraps, unlike immigrants and minorities today. *Three Worlds of Relief* challenges us to reconsider not only the historical record but also the implications of our past on contemporary debates about race, immigration, and the American welfare state.

Drew Halfmann. 2011. *Doctors and Demonstrators: How Political Institutions Shape Abortion Law in the United States, Britain, and Canada*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Since *Roe v. Wade*, abortion has continued to be a divisive political issue in the United States. In contrast, it has remained primarily a medical issue in Britain and Canada despite the countries' shared heritage. *Doctors and Demonstrators* looks beyond cultural or religious explanations to find out why abortion politics and policies differ so dramatically in these otherwise similar countries. Halfmann argues that political institutions are the key. In the United States, federalism, judicial review, and a private health care system contributed to the public definition of abortion

Abstracts

as an individual right rather than a medical necessity. Meanwhile, the porous structure of American political parties gave pro-choice and pro-life groups the opportunity to move the issue onto the political agenda.

Alondra Nelson. 2011. *Body and Soul: The Black Panther Party and the Fight against Medical Discrimination*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Between its founding in 1966 and its formal end in 1980, the Black Panther Party blazed a distinctive trail in American political culture. The Black Panthers are most often remembered for their revolutionary rhetoric and militant action. Here Alondra Nelson deftly recovers an indispensable but lesser-known aspect of the organization's broader struggle for social justice: health care. The Black Panther Party's health activism—its network of free health clinics, its campaign to raise awareness about genetic disease, and its challenges to medical discrimination—was an expression of its founding political philosophy and also a recognition that poor blacks were both underserved by mainstream medicine and overexposed to its harms.

Drawing on extensive historical research as well as interviews with former members of the Black Panther Party, Nelson argues that the Party's focus on health care was both practical and ideological. Building on a long tradition of medical self-sufficiency among African Americans, the Panthers' People's Free Medical Clinics administered basic preventive care, tested for lead poisoning and hypertension, and helped with housing, employment, and social services. In 1971, the party launched a campaign to address sickle-cell anemia. In addition to establishing screening programs and educational outreach efforts, it exposed the racial biases of the medical system that had largely ignored sickle-cell anemia, a disease that predominantly affected people of African descent. The Black Panther Party's understanding of health as a basic human right and its engagement with the social implications of genetics anticipated current debates about the politics of health and race. That legacy—and that struggle—continues today in the commitment of health activists and the fight for universal health care.

Isaac Ariail Reed, *Interpretation and Social Knowledge: On the use of Theory in the Human Sciences*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 2011.

For the past fifty years anxiety over naturalism has driven debates in social theory. One side sees social science as another kind of natural science, while the other rejects the possibility of objective and explanatory knowledge. Interpretation and Social Knowledge suggests a different route, offering a way forward for an antinaturalist sociology that overcomes the opposition between interpretation and explanation and uses theory to build concrete, historically specific causal explanations of social phenomena.

Chris Rhomberg. 2012. *The Broken Table: The Detroit Newspaper Strike and the State of American Labor*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation. <https://www.russellsage.org/publications/broken-table>

In an era when strikes in the U.S. have almost disappeared, the 1995 Detroit newspaper strike stands out as one of the largest and longest work stoppages of the past two decades. *The Broken Table* argues that this landmark case represented an historic collision of two opposing institutional orders, between an older New Deal system of industrial relations and a rising corporate anti-union regime. At the same time the strike signaled the new terrain of labor-management conflict, in which disputes that occur now often spill over into wider public arenas in the state and in society. Contemporary strikes are no longer simply about the traditional dollars and cents of contract negotiations but about the survival and future of the collective bargaining relationship. The result illustrates the de-democratization of the institutional regulation of labor disputes, and raises broader questions of workplace governance and accountability.

Abstracts

ARTICLE ABSTRACTS

Michael Blain. 2012 [2005]. "The Politics of Victimage: Power and Subjection in a US Anti-Gay Campaign," *Critical Discourse Studies* special issue.

Critical Discourse Studies was established to develop critical perspectives on the relationships between discourse and social dynamics. This is the starting point for five Virtual Special Issues, which bring together key articles published in CDS over the past eight years. The first of these—Traditions of Discourse and Discourse Analysis—collects eight articles which draw on, and present, different theoretical approaches to discourse, and so steer discourse studies in various different directions.

Leslie C Gates. 2012. "Interest Groups in Venezuela: Lessons from the Failure of a 'Model Democracy' and the Rise of a Bolivarian Democracy" *Journal of Public Affairs*. DOI:10.1002/pa.1410.

Awarded best social science article from Venezuela Section of the Latin American Studies Association.

This article uses the Venezuelan case to shed light on the potential role of interest-group systems in discrediting liberal democracies and to identify challenges that the region's democracies are likely to confront in constructing effective and fair interest-group systems. It first analyzes the role Venezuela's interest groups played in discrediting its 40-year two-party democracy. It argues that the discrediting of a system heralded by many as the region's 'model democracy' cannot be understood by merely assessing how the structure of the group system excluded certain groups. The study shows that the inclusion of certain business interests in visible positions of power also helped discredit the two-party democracy. The article then compares the above system with the new group system which has emerged since 1998 as part of a new democratic system inspired by Latin America's 19th century Liberator Simón Bolívar. This comparison reveals that the current system inverts the former system of inclusion and exclusion, even as it has retained a number of the old system's less virtuous features. The implications of the Venezuelan case for the region's democracies are elaborated in the conclusion.

LaDawn Haglund and Rimjhim Aggarwal. 2011. "Test of Our Progress: The Translation of Economic and Social Rights Norms into Practices." *Journal of Human Rights*. 10:1-27.

The application of the language of "rights" to the economic and social conditions of the world's impoverished populations has gained a great deal of momentum in recent years. Yet given the continuing pervasiveness of basic deprivations for the world's poor, there is a pressing need to examine, from a comparative perspective, how economic and social rights (ESR) norms are translated into practice. This article explores a range of mechanisms, actors, and pathways (MAPs) that promote rights realization, as well as the crucial role played by accountability. We review common MAPs by which civil and political rights have been pursued, as well as discuss some key features of ESR that distinguish them from these other types of rights. We then explore models designed more explicitly for ESR that identify, monitor, and evaluate the legal, institutional, and political means by which development goals may be realized. Models reviewed include the "spiral model" (Risse et al. 1999), the "policy legalization" model (Gauri and Brinks 2010), the Millennium Development Goals, and the "social guarantees" model (World Bank 2007). We conclude by summarizing the strengths and weaknesses of each for promoting enduring social transformation, evaluate the unique contributions of "rights" discourses and practices in this effort, and reveal potential new pathways and strategies for the realization of basic economic and social rights.

Isaac Ariail Reed and Julia Adams. "Culture in the Transitions to Modernity: Seven Pillars of a New Research Agenda." *Theory and Society* 40: 247-272. 2011.

How did cultural dynamics help bring about the societies we now recognize as modern? This article constructs seven distinct models for how structures of signification and social meaning participated in the transitions to modernity in the West and, in some of the models, across the globe. Our models address: (1) the spread, via imitation, of modern institutions around the world (memetic replication); (2) the construal, by socio-cultural forces and by state organizations, of the modern citizen-subject (social subjectification); (3) the continual search for new meanings to replace traditional religious meaning-systems (compensatory reenchantment); (4) repeated attempts, in modern revolutions, to

Abstracts

remake society completely, according to a utopian vision (ideological totalization); (5) the cultural origins and social consequences of scientific and humanistic worldviews (epistemic rift); (6) the gendered politics of state formation (patriarchal supercession); (7) the invention and production of race in the colonial encounter (racial recognition). We explicate the models in reverse chronological order, because in our synthesis, we argue that the original modern break results from a dynamic combination of racial recognition, patriarchal supercession, and epistemic rift; these changes set the stage for the four other processes we theorize. In addition to our synthesis, we also consider, from a more neutral perspective, the kinds of causal arguments upon which these models tend to rely, and thus explicate the analytical undergirding for the application of any of these models to empirical research on transitions to modernity. Throughout the article, we consider how these models might, and might not, mesh with other families of explanation, such as the politico-economic.

Dietrich Rueschemeyer. 2010. "The Present Position and Prospects of Social and Political Theory." In *The Benefit of Broad Horizons: Intellectual and Institutional Preconditions for a Global Social Science* (Festschrift for Björn Wittrock), ed. H. Joas and B. Klein. Leiden: Brill.

Dietrich Rueschemeyer. 2011. "Equality, Political." In *International Encyclopedia of Political Science*, ed. B. Badie, D. Berg-Schlosser, and E. Morlino. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Dietrich Rueschemeyer. 2012. "Democratization." In *Wiley-Blackwell Companion to Political Sociology*, ed. K. Nash, A. Scott, and E. Amenta. Oxford: Blackwell.

Robert D. Woodberry. 2012. "The Missionary Roots of Liberal Democracy." *American Political Science Review* 106(2): 244-274.

This article demonstrates historically and statistically that conversionary Protestants (CPs) heavily influenced the rise and spread of stable democracy around the world. It argues that CPs were a crucial catalyst initiating the development and spread of religious liberty, mass education, mass printing, newspapers, voluntary organizations, and colonial reforms, thereby creating the conditions that made stable democracy more likely. Statistically, the historic prevalence of Protestant missionaries explains about half the variation in democracy in Africa, Asia, Latin America and Oceania and removes the impact of most variables that dominate current statistical research about democracy. The association between Protestant missions and democracy is consistent in different continents and subsamples, and it is robust to more than 50 controls and to instrumental variable analyses.

Call For Proposals to Add Questions to the 2014 GSS

The General Social Survey invites proposals to add questions to its anticipated 2014 survey. Proposals will be accepted on the basis of scientific quality and scholarly interest. Outside funding is not necessary. The deadline for submissions is August 15, 2012. Pending the availability of sufficient funds, the General Social Survey (GSS) project expects to include some items or topical modules designed by users in its 2014 survey, and invites users to submit proposals recommending such items or modules. Proposals submitted in response to this call need not be accompanied by funding that would support costs of data collection and data processing. They will be judged with their scientific merit as a primary consideration.

For further information, please consult:
<http://publicdata.norc.org:41000gss/documents/OTHR/Module%20Competition.pdf>

 Interview with Section Award Recipient

Interview with Section Award Recipient James Mahoney

Interviewed by Shantee Rosado
University of Pennsylvania

James Mahoney was the recipient of the Political Sociology Section's 2011 Book Award for his book *Colonialism and Postcolonial Development: Spanish America in Comparative Perspective* (2010, Cambridge University Press: New York). In his book, Mahoney uses comparative historical methods to analyze colonialism and postcolonial development in 15 Latin American countries. The book offers a new theory of development that explains how different forms of colonialism give rise to countries with varying levels of economic prosperity and social well being. Mahoney is currently a professor of political science and sociology and Fitzgerald Professor of economic history at Northwestern University.

Your previous work has focused on political regimes, institutions, and methodology. What was your inspiration for the research question that led to this book?

JM: I have had the question of this book in the back of my mind since I was in graduate school. When I was in graduate school I read Guillermo O'Donnell's work on development and political outcomes in South America and he suggested that certain countries have been richer than others for a long, long time and that always intrigued me. It always struck me that if one wanted to explain why people live longer in Argentina than in Bolivia, you could answer this by pointing to things that existed in the present day, but if you really wanted to understand how Argentina got on a better track in the first place you would have to go way back into the past. I always had that in my mind and I always suspected that colonialism had a lot to do with it. There is a certain sense in which graduate school and writing my first book on Central America derailed me from this project, in part because colonialism was so big of a topic. It was just too big to pursue in graduate school for a doctoral dissertation. But ever since graduate school I have wanted to work on this topic and write this kind of book.

You have written extensively on different methods for conducting social science and, in the book, you describe a preference for comparative historical methods. Why were these

methods most suitable for the topic of postcolonial development in Spanish America?

JM: I always thought that if one wishes to explain why particular cases have the outcomes that they do, which is what I wanted to pursue, you are best off using comparative historical methods.

I would break scientific methods into two camps. On the one hand, there are methods that grow out of the experimental tradition, which would include experimental research and most statistical research like regression analysis. Those methods are designed to estimate the average effect of treatments or independent variables within a population—they are never designed to say why specific cases have the outcome that they do. But I am interested, and always have been, in explaining why specific cases have the outcomes that they do. I want to know why Costa Rica ends up doing a lot better on many dimensions that I care about than, say, Nicaragua. If that is the research goal, then comparative historical methods are ideally suited for that purpose; they are the right set of tools for explaining why specific cases have the outcomes that they do.

One of my goals in writing about methods over the last ten years or so has been to try to emphasize this difference. Experimental methods and their offshoots like regression analysis simply are not designed to explain why cases have the outcomes that they do. So if you are asking a question like “why is Costa Rica different from its neighbors in Central America,” you need to understand why cases have the outcomes that they do. That is where comparative historical methods come in.



Interview with Section Award Recipient

With regard to comparison, what was useful about choosing cases that were close geographically and similar in terms of their historical backgrounds?

JM: One thing that made it useful was that they were all colonized by Spain, at least all of the countries that I looked at in the work. So, when I was comparing the Spanish American countries with one another, I did not have to hold constant or try to control for different European colonizers, for the most part. Of course the Portuguese meddled in Spanish America, as did the British. But for the most part I was able to stay focused on Spain. I was lucky that Spanish America also exhibited the full range of variation across the variables that I cared about. For example, on the outcome variable, Spanish America, among non-European countries, has relatively prosperous areas like Uruguay and Argentina. It also has quite poor areas. So there is good variation on the dependent variable. The independent variables that I looked at concerned things such as the complexity of pre-colonial indigenous societies and there was also wonderful variation there—from very sophisticated, complex, state-like societies with the Aztecs and the Incas, all the way to large chiefdoms, to small chiefdoms, and to hunter-gatherer groups. The range of variation of the variables that I cared about was encompassed by these cases.

I also think that in order to get arguments right it matters that you know something about the cases and I had been working on Latin America since I was 19 years old—as an undergraduate I got interested in Latin America—so I had been reading about these countries and traveling in the region for many years. I tried to bring that case expertise to bear. Having said all of that, the book also ends up having a chapter on British colonialism and Portuguese colonialism; those cases were treated more briefly.

In the book, you discuss prevailing theories of development that focus either on geography or institutions. How does your theory differ from these perspectives? How did you develop this alternative theoretical approach?

JM: I engaged both geographic and institutional perspectives because those were the reigning theories as I was

writing the book. I was dissatisfied with both of those approaches because I thought they were not historical enough—they were relatively ahistorical. People had assumed constant effects for geography across time and they also thought that geography directly affected development.

In my work, I made two moves with the geographic perspective: first, I argued that the effects of geography are not constant across time. Depending on context and especially the institutional context, a given geographic factor can have opposite effects during different eras. So you cannot generalize about geographic effects without situating them within a certain temporal context. Secondly, I argued that geography tends not to have direct effects on development. It tends to have its effects run through institutions. So, in my scheme, geographic factors play a causal role in the construction of institutions and those institutions then affect development.

Institutional perspectives are everywhere in contemporary social science. With the institutional argument, I tried to make a move toward a distributional understanding of the effects of institutions, as opposed to a coordinating understanding of institutional effects. So, institutions shape behaviors and shape outcomes because they distribute resources and they inevitably do so unevenly. By virtue of that uneven distribution of resources, institutions can have the effect of creating collective actors. In particular, groups of people who are commonly disadvantaged by an institution can come to identify with one another and see themselves as a group and this can promote collective action. By the same token, groups of actors who benefit from institutional arrangements can cohere into an elite that has an interest in upholding institutions. And so I wanted to move away from an understanding of institutions as coordinating devices that enable collective action to a view of institutions as distributional instruments that have the capacity to literally create collective actors with certain interests in preserving or destroying the existing institutional arrangements. That was kind of my meta-theoretical approach to institutions.

I had been working on Latin America since I was 19 years old—as an undergraduate I got interested in Latin America—so I had been reading about these countries and traveling in the region for many years.

Interview with Section Award Recipient

The biggest move I made was to argue that we have to pay attention to two sets of institutions: the institutions of the pre-colonial societies and the institutions of the colonizing societies. I became very interested in looking at the fit or non-fit between pre-colonial (indigenous societies') institutions and the European colonizers' institutions.

One of the things that I discovered was that a country like Spain, to the extent that it was a country, was drawn to the Aztec and Incan Empires in part because the institutions of these empires were remarkably similar to the institutions of Spain. Whereas a European colonizer such as England would not be attracted to the Aztec Empire because England's institutions, which were increasingly capitalist, were quite a mismatch for the Aztec Empire. So the institutional logics or institutional fit between colonizer and colonized became a big theme of the book.

Can you go over your findings regarding levels of colonialism in different countries and their effect on post-colonial development?

JM: I had known for a long time that colonizers do not colonize to the same degree in different territories. For example, Mexico City was the heartland of Spanish colonialism for pretty much the entire colonial period, whereas Buenos Aires was virtually ignored until the last fifty years of the colonial period. Level of colonialism refers to the extent of colonization as measured both by settlements (how many people the colonizer implants in an area), as well as institutional implantation in that area (the extent to which the colonizer sets up new economic, political, and socio-cultural institutions in the region that it is colonizing). That is the concept of level of colonialism. Surprisingly, it is a concept that has not received attention in the literature and so I tried to do a good job of carefully defining it and illustrating its variation across the cases that I chose.

In terms of the consequences of the levels of colonialism, I argued that it varied depending on the European colonizer. If you were colonized by what I called a mercantilist European colonizer like Spain, especially during the first 200 years of Spanish colonialism, you wanted less, not more, colonialism if you wanted to become a rich country later on. If you were colonized by what I called a liberal or capitalist colonizer, like England, what you would want is a lot of colonialism if your goal was to have a territory that

was rich later on. A lot of colonialism was always devastating for the indigenous population, but if you were heavily colonized by a place like England, the post-colonial society tended to be rich. So the British settler colonies—Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and to a lesser extent the United States—have ended up as some of the richest places in the world.

In the book, you take a comparative historical approach to analyze colonialism and postcolonial development in 15 Spanish American countries. Can you tell us about the process of writing a book of this scope and depth?

JM: It's a lot of work. I started working on a series of articles, just trying out versions and pieces of the argument. I started publishing articles around 2001, I started writing the book in 2005, and the book came out in 2010. So I would say that for ten years I was more or less continuously working on this. One of the challenges that I faced was having a huge amount of material and having to condense it into a small amount of space. The sections on Spanish America are 150 pages or so and cover 500 years of history for the cases. They go through all 15 cases and try to engage the historiography at some depth. My goal was always to keep the writing focused squarely on the argument that I was trying to make and address alternative explanations and arguments that I was countering to try and keep the writing punchy and not go off on boring tangents.

The way I wrote was that each paragraph in the book probably went through 20 or 30 drafts. I would just print things out and reread it, reread it, reread it, because I would never come close to getting it right the first time when I typed something out. I couldn't tell you how many drafts the actual book went through [chuckle]. Each section, each paragraph, and each sentence got scrutinized. So the reading and the writing of this book were both a mission and a labor of love in a way that no other project has ever been for me. I felt like this was something I had wanted to do since I was a young man, to write this book. I felt lucky to have the opportunity to do it and I wanted to do my best and put everything I had into it. I wanted the craftsmanship side of the book to achieve excellence. I felt, as I was writing, that this might be the most significant piece of substantive work in my career and so, if this is worth saying and worth doing, it is worth doing really well.

Interview with Section Award Recipient

I think the book is not on a topic that everyone is intensely interested in, but people who have engaged the book and read it tend to appreciate it. A number of people have told me they like the craftsmanship side of it, which very much includes the writing. I have thought about things such as how many paragraphs should go under each subsection and I thought it would be easier on the readers if I never had more than five paragraphs without another subsection appearing. At various points I printed out all of the headings and subheadings of the book and just read through those. At other points I would read the first sentence of each paragraph just to imagine a reader who was reading it that way. The only reason I was able to do this was because this was a labor of love for me.

It sounds like you really had the reader in mind as you were writing. How did this process differ from that of writing articles? Did you encounter any setbacks or surprises along the way?

JM: Writing this book, I was able to provide more detail and go over all of the cases in at least some depth. When I have written articles a lot of times I end up presenting the argument and then giving a gloss of the cases without being able to go into depth. One of the earlier versions of this argument came out in AJS in 2003 and they let me publish three or four appendices to the article in which I referenced the bibliography of works that readers would want to look at if they wanted to see why I coded cases the way that I did in the article. In the book, I did not have to have those appendices because I was able to go over why I felt that, for example, the mercantilist elite was very strong in Mexico City.

I did have the reader in mind the whole time. One of the ways I try to write history in book form is that I try to never tell the reader a history for its own sake. My goal is to use history as a way of developing the analytic argument that I am trying to make. This was a book that used only secondary sources; none of the historical material was new. I tried to keep that in mind at all times, that if the reader wanted to learn about the event and its history for its own sake, the reader could go to the secondary sources that I cited. What I was trying to do was use the history that is out there as a basis for formulating a new comparative argument and utilizing new theoretical principles to put it all together in a novel way.

One surprise was that I had to break Spanish colonialism into two different periods, which I initially did not anticipate. That is when I realized that oh, actually, Spain itself evolved during the 300 years that it held these colonies and I needed to pay attention to that. This led to a theoretical breakthrough with the overall model and it helped me elucidate different types of European colonizers. If you read the 2003 AJS article, at that point I had not yet learned that Spanish colonialism formally needs to be broken down into two different periods in order to get the cases right.

Going back even further, the original incarnation for this book started with an NSF Career Award when I was an Assistant Professor in sociology at Brown University. The NSF Sociology Program funded this project for five years and the original grant proposal for the project had all these fancy reasons why the indigenous population might not be that important. In the actual book, of course, the indigenous population is showcased as much as, or more than, any other actor because their fate can be traced from before contact with Europeans, to contact with Europe, and finally to what remains of the indigenous societies. So, they are the centerpieces of the overall analysis. When I wrote the original proposal in 1999, I downplayed the indigenous population. So, when you go dig in and do the research, things change.

I want to emphasize that this particular book gave my work, and even my whole life, great purpose. It was a giant project that I really wanted to do and that I really cared about and I cared about doing it as well as I could. So, working on this book for all of those years was a wonderful experience for me because it infused all of my days with lots of meaning. As I was working on it, I could sense that I had some good ideas and that this was definitely an argument worth making and worth making well. One thing I would say having finished the book—I have moved onto some other projects and am doing other things now—is that I miss it because it was with me for so long, and it was such a big piece of who I was and what I was doing for all of those years. I guess the lesson here is, if ever you can find a project that you think has an argument truly worth making and that you love working on, even though as with all forms of work it has its ups and downs, take your time and give it your all. At the end, the final product is better as a result and you can look back on it as a rewarding period of life.

Journal Profiles

Journal Profile: Citizenship Studies

Chen-Yu Wu

University of Minnesota

Citizenship Studies (CS) was first published in 1997 as a response to the lack of available scholarly venues for work on the broad issue of citizenship: at the time, citizenship studies was viewed as a topic, rather than the research field it has become. The need for such a venue has become increasingly apparent over time: although CS started out publishing three issues per year, it now publishes eight issues per year in order to meet growing demand for its articles, as well as to accommodate the large number

Findings and Ideas from Political Power and Social Theory

Ho, Elaine Lynn-Ee. 2011. "Caught between Two Worlds: Mainland Chinese Return Migration, Hukou Considerations and the Citizenship Dilemma." *Citizenship Studies*, 15(6/7): 643–58.

Chinese emigres who acquire a different citizenship forfeit Chinese citizenship and the entitlements that accompany hukou (a household registration). Hukou rights include free education for children, social security, and the freedom to work. Many Chinese emigres to Canada make the decision to seek Canadian citizenship because they plan never to permanently return to China. Financial or familial considerations may change these plans, resulting in a return to China without hukou entitlement, no authorization to work, and a requirement to leave China every three months for visa renewal. Ironically, some emigres naturalize as Canadian citizens so they can spend more time in China, because, as Canadian citizens, they are not required to return to Canada as frequently to renew their permanent residency. Ho argues that Canada, as well as China, should take steps to ease the plight of Chinese emigres by altering existing requirements and naturalization processes.

- Marie DeRousse-Wu

of manuscripts that are being submitted.

When it was first established, CS aimed to publish articles addressing issues such as multiculturalism, migration, minority rights, and aboriginality. Over time, the field of citizenship studies have changed and grown; today, the journal tackles complex

Findings and Ideas from Political Power and Social Theory

Lee, Chulwoo. 2012. "How Can you Say you're Korean? Law, Governmentality and National Membership in South Korea." *Citizenship Studies*, 16(1): 85–102.

Lee analyzes South Korean immigration laws in practice, illustrating how states make distinctions among co-ethnic immigrants. Immediately post-independence, policies encouraged immigration of co-ethnics. However, lawmakers became concerned that low-skilled co-ethnic immigrants could flood the labor market and cause social unrest, which led to a prohibition on the immigration of low-skilled immigrants. Additionally, the practice of issuing visas distinguished between co-ethnic immigrants based on their countries of origin. H-2 visas, which allow former nationals and children and grandchildren of Korean nations to enter for family reunions and to work in a variety of jobs have been issued only to co-ethnics from China or the CIS, despite the law formally applying to coethnics from any country. Similarly, the F-4 status was created to accommodate Korean-Americans who were denied dual citizenship by granting an ability to reside and gain employment in skilled labor. Beyond these restrictions, co-ethnic immigrants who hope to naturalize are required to provide proof of their Korean descent, including official documentation and photographic and DNA evidence. No matter how much evidence they provide, however, Lee argues that they remain second-class citizens.

- Marie DeRousse-Wu

issues about federalism, open borders, and cosmopolitanism, as well as the changing definitions of citizenship (e.g. semi-citizenship, quasi-citizenship, post-national citizenship, etc.). As a result of these foci, CS is very much an interdisciplinary and international journal. According to Bryan Turner, one of CS's founding editors, it is difficult to study citizenship from a purely sociological perspective, as the different interpretations of citizenship are defined by the laws, philosophies, and histories of different societies. Additionally, citizenship is a broadly-applicable concept: it can speak to literature in gender studies, labor studies, environmental studies, and much more. The journal's interdisciplinary

Journal Profiles

Findings and Ideas from Political Power and Social Theory

Turner, Bryan S. 2011. "Judith N. Shklar and American Citizenship." *Citizenship Studies*, 15(6/7): 933–43.

As part of the "Thinking Citizenship" series, this article explicates Judith Shklar's approach to citizenship, acknowledging its limitations while identifying its unique strengths. While Turner starts by noting the distinction often attributed to American theorists—a focus on rights protecting citizens from government interference—he introduces nuances between American theorists to show Shklar's unique contributions. While many American scholars argue that the state has the responsibility to protect individual rights (rather than social rights) of vulnerable citizens, such as minorities, Shklar's framework incorporates both. She distinguishes between misfortune and injustice—injustice can exacerbate misfortune, as in the case of FEMA's response to Hurricane Katrina—and she highlights the responsibilities of citizens, not just their rights. Thus, the government has the duty to protect the vulnerable, as many other American scholars would argue, but citizens must also actively participate and contribute to their community of fellow citizens.

- Marie DeRousse-Wu

nature is perhaps best reflected by the wide range of fields that CS has received manuscripts from, including Political Science, History, Cultural Studies, Anthropology, and scholars of Education Theory, as well as Sociology. The international focus of CS is also reflected in the international composition of the CS editorial board, whose members are based all over the world.

Generally speaking, CS seeks manuscripts that ideally can advance the field's existing debates on theory, methods, and topics in general. Many of the journal's successful manuscripts are focused on a wide range of empirical issues, although the editorial board is seeking to recruit more manuscripts from scholars of political theory. Authors are also invited to contribute to a new section in the journal called "Thinking Citizenship." The purpose of this new section is to highlight people (particularly those less well-known) who have made key contributions to the study of citizenship.

For many reasons, a deep understanding of citizenship values and institutions is vital to understanding almost all of the modern world's political and economic crises, as it is nearly impossible to dissociate any large-scale national or multinational issues from citizenship. Today, CS remains one of the few publications that seeks to shed light on how citizenship relates to other empirical issues of interest to researchers. In the words Bryan Turner, "Citizenship Studies offers some of the best academic reflection on the growth of citizenship, its character and importance, and the contemporary crisis of citizenship (in terms of unemployment, low incomes, poverty, alienation, distrust of politicians, marginalization, etc.)... The field is politically important and theoretically dynamic." Based on these factors, any manuscript that is accepted for publication by CS is likely to have a wide international readership.

Call for Submissions and Ideas: States, Power, and Societies

If you have thoughts about a theme for a Symposium, a suggestion for a journal that you would like to see featured in a profile, or ideas for a "Teaching Political Sociology" column, please pass them along.

Also, please continue to send abstracts of your recently published books and articles, announcements of meetings, and other opportunities that you think would be of interest to our section members.

Please send your comments and submissions to Erik Larson at: larsone@macalester.edu.

Teaching Political Sociology

Teaching Undergraduate Political Sociology: Powerful Revelations

David Cook-Martín
Grinnell College

How political power affects individuals' lives is often invisible to them, which constitutes a key challenge to teaching political sociology. How does one go about revealing to students institutions and arrangements of power as taken for granted as citizenship? My approach in an upper level seminar entitled Political Sociology of Citizenship has been to historicize relations and institutions of power, to offer models of understanding power as seen in political membership, and to demystify the process of building such models. To this end, I select readings that build students' reservoir of empirical knowledge, choose activities and films that subvert students' beginning of semester standpoint, and share my own work-in-progress to model engagement in current conversations about political sociology.

As a colleague has noted in this column (see Alexandra Hrycak's column in 17(1) of *SPS*), undergraduates—even at selective institutions—have limited knowledge of US (let alone world) history. How then to historicize an institution like the “state” which students tend to treat as if it was the same as it is now? My strategy has been threefold. First, I use Latin American case studies as a convenient entry point into a history of how state organizations developed in a particular context and what this has meant for political membership. Typically students judge these histories by their own, generally US-based, sense of how states unfold; but they also begin to question familiar cases in view of the unfamiliar ones. Second, I encourage students to develop country case studies based on their own interests and final research project topic. Third, students use analytic memos to place the cases with which they are now familiar in explanatory frameworks like Lachman's *States and Power* to understand the longer trajectories and patterns of state development.

Complementing the historical comparative framework, video clips and films can help destabilize students' assumptions about state formation, related political representations of the world, and people's identifications. A *West Wing* episode shows

White House staffers baffled by a kindly group of geographers and their contention that conventional maps misrepresent the proportions of countries and continents, and give moral weight to cardinal orientations. Combined with readings on maps and censuses from Benedict Anderson's *Imagined Communities*, the episode sparked questions in students' minds about how the size of discrete units on maps are proxies for importance and power, and why people are schooled in these misrepresentations. The German film *Europa, Europa* poignantly shows how identifications change according to the dilemmas faced by the protagonist who identifies alternatively as Jewish, communist, German, and, reluctantly, as a student in the elite Hitler Youth Academy. In discussion, students grappled with their essentialist assumptions about identities and groups and the role of states in shaping such views.

Students at the seminar level may also begin to participate in as well as contribute to key conversations in political sociology. To this end, I share key chapters from my own book manuscript on citizenship and dual nationality to demystify the scholarly process and to show the construction of knowledge. At the point of the term in which this activity is introduced, students have been working on their own research projects and appreciate the challenges of building one's own explanations. Their criticisms typically move from terrier-like fixations on standard critiques to a more considered weighing of theoretical options. In fact, this past fall students' ideas were fresh and relatively unhindered by disciplinary convention. The invitation to enter a conversation around my own work but in the context of a larger discussion of the subfield of political sociology paid off for me as I was able to benefit from the responses of that elusive “smart, lay reader” that editors often tout as an audience. More importantly, students felt less intimidated by the prospect of participating in knowledge construction.

Political Sociology Section Events at ASA

Political Sociology Section Events at ASA

Saturday, August 18th, 8:30-10:10

Beyond the Nation-State:

Cosmopolitanism as a Real Utopia

Organizer/Discussant: Thomas Edward Janoski (University of Kentucky)

Hiro Saito (University of Hawaii-Manoa) and Yoko Iida Wang (University of Hawaii-Manoa), "An Actor-Network Theory of Cosmopolitics"

Lindsey P. Peterson (Mississippi State University), "Health and Development for All: The Role of Foreign Aid Attractiveness and INGOs"

Nicole Doerr (University of California-Irvine), "How Ordinary Cosmopolitans Practice Democracy: Multi-lingual Deliberation in Social Movements"

Shiri Noy (Indiana University-Bloomington), "Imagined Communities, Nationalism and Cosmopolitanism: A Multilevel Analysis of Macro-identity"

Saturday, August 18, 10:30-12:10

Is There a Politics of Law or a Legality of Politics?

Organizers: John Skrentny and Robin Stryker
 President: John Skrentny

Panelists:

Edwin Amenta (University of California-Irvine)

Mounira Maya Charrad (University of Texas-Austin)

Terence C. Halliday (American Bar Foundation)

Joachim J. Savelsberg (University of Minnesota)

Panelists will engage in panel discussion about similarities and differences in the way political and legal sociologists conceive of "law," "the state," and the relationship between the two. The panel will reflect on such questions as "Is anything important lost or gained by separating law from political sociology?" "What is law and is it (or how is it) different from public policy?" "What are/should be the most important research questions at the intersection of law and politics or the state?" and "If you as a political/legal sociologist had to choose one insight mostly missing from the other sub-field, what would it be and why?"

Saturday, August 18, 12:30-2:10

Electoral Politics: Structure, Context, and Social Movements

Organizer: Nancy DiTomaso (State University of New Jersey-Rutgers)
 President: Jennifer Laird (University of Washington)

Naomi Hsu (University of California-Berkeley), "Local Contexts and Asian American Under-participation in Electoral Politics"

Jungyun Gill (Mountain State University) and James DeFronzo (University of Connecticut), "Obama's Election, Local Military Tradition, and the Human Costs of War"

Susan Olzak (Stanford University), Sarah A. Soule (Stanford University), Marion Coddou (Stanford University), and John Muñoz (Stanford University), "Protest, Organizations, and Legislative Success"

Elizabeth Pearson (University of California-Berkeley), "Saying 'Yes' to Taxes: The Politics of Tax Reform Campaigns in 3 Northwestern States, 1965-1973"

Deana Rohlinger (Florida State University) and Leslie A. Bunnage (Seton Hall University), "Virtual Power Plays: Social Movements, Internet Communication Technology, and Political Parties"

Saturday, August 18, 2:30-3:30

Refereed Roundtable Sessions

Organizer: Judith Stepan-Norris (University of California-Irvine)

Table 1: Political Discourse and Memory

Theodore P. Gerber (University of Wisconsin-Madison), "Divided Historical Memory among Youth in Estonia: Ethnic, Socioeconomic, Linguistic, and Political Sources of Ideational Cleavage"

Ritchie Paul Savage (New School for Social Research), "From McCarthyism to the Tea Party: Interpreting Anti-leftist Forms of Populism in the United States"

Political Sociology Section Events at ASA

Darcie Vandegrift (Drake University), "Inclusion, Liberty, and Socialism: Young Adults, Politics, and Symbolic Boundaries in Contemporary Venezuela"
 Jasmón Bailey (Texas State University), "Political Discourse and Social Behavior: How College Students Hear and Talk about President Obama"

Erika Marquez (University of Massachusetts-Amherst), "Citizenship in the Security State: Notes on the Colombian Case"

Table 2: Electoral Politics and Legitimacy

Matthew A. Painter (University of Wyoming), "Madam Senator: Growth in Women's State Senate Representation, 1978-2010"

Moira B. Mackinnon (Tulane University), "Congress in Action: Representativeness and Effectiveness in Chile and Argentina, 1900-1930"

Martina Kunovic (University of Wisconsin-Madison), "Constructing Legitimacy Following Regime Change: The Cuban State's Framing of Economic and Social Reforms Post-Fidel"

Sourabh Singh (State University of New Jersey-Rutgers), "Indira Gandhi's Rise in Indian Politics: Examining A Woman Leader's Quest for Political Legitimacy"

Table 3: Political Mobilization and Political Policy

Fred Brooks (Georgia State University), "Analyzing the Community Organization ACORN through a Real Utopia Lens"

Gabriel Bodin Hetland (University of California-Berkeley), "From Populist Mobilization to Participatory Democracy"

Angela Elisabeth Anderson (Northwestern University), "A Canker in the Body Politic: Ideas, Institutions, and Child Labor Reform in Massachusetts and Prussia"

Natalia Forrat (Northwestern University), "Global Trends or Regime Survival: The Reforms in Russian Higher Education"

Mark Stephen Treskon (New York University), "Politics and Markets: Advocacy, Finance, and Predatory Lending Legislation in U.S. States"

Table 4: Politics and Race

Angela Jones (State University of New York-Farmingdale State College), "The Black Power Elite"

Jeremy R. Levine (Harvard University) and Carl E. Gershenson (Harvard University), "Race, Ethnicity, and Neighborhoods' Engagement with Government: Identifying Racial Disparities in Requests for Public Goods"

Jungmiwha Bullock (University of Southern California), "The 'Multi-racial' Vote: The Political Significance of the Two or More Races Population, Election 2012"

Table 5: Global Politics

Phillip B. Gonzales (University of New Mexico), "Liberalism and Imperialism: The U.S. Annexation of the Nuevomexicanos, 1820-1867"

David Ost (Hobart & William Smith Colleges), "Class and Social Order: Political Consequences of the Move from Class to Culture"

Yan Long (University of Michigan), "From Suppression to Manufacturing Civil Society: The Impact of Transnational AIDS Governance on Authoritarian State Repression"

Katarzyna Polanska (University of Minnesota), "Global Scripts and Nationalist Aspirations in the Middle East: The Case of the Kurds"

Table 6: Cross-National Analyses of Politics

Jacob Apkarian (University of California-Riverside) and Robert Alan Hanneman (University of California-Riverside), "Political Conditions for Successful Military Coups 1940-1984: A Boolean Classification Analysis"

Diana Naomi Douglas (University of North Carolina-Charlotte), "Health Policy and Theories of Welfare Development: An Analysis of 18 OECD Countries from 1980-2000"

Seungbong Jeon (University of Virginia), "Social Trust and the Nations: Three Essential Factors of Social Trust"

Political Sociology Section Events at ASA

Rakkoo Chung (State University of New York-Albany), "The Third Wave of Democratization: Consolidation of Nominal Democracy?"

Table 7: Political Attitudes and Behavior

Carl W. Stempel (California State University-East Bay), Guido H. Stempel III (Ohio University), and Hargrove Thomas (Scripps Howard News Service), "Media Use and Issue Knowledge in the 2008 Presidential Campaign: A Field Analysis"

Timothy L. O'Brien (Indiana University), "Assessing the Relationship between Religion and Science within the American Public"

Jennifer Laird (University of Washington), "Occupational Closure and Voter Turnout"

John Taylor Danielson (University of Arizona), "The Boundaries of Being American: National Identity, In-group Bias, and Attitudes Toward Domestic Policy"

David Jacobson (University of South Florida) and Natalie Delia Deckard (Emory University), "The Prosperous Hardliner: A Study of Muslim Communities in Western Europe"

Table 8: Political Parties and U.S. State Politics

Patrick Bergemann (Stanford University), "The Birth of the 2nd Party System: The Role of Boardinghouses During the Jackson Era"

Christopher Wetzel (Stonehill College), "Failing to Make a Market: The Liminal Lottery in 1950s Massachusetts"

Brian D. Harris (Brigham Young University) and Charlie V. Morgan (Brigham Young University), "Evidence of Political Moderation over Time: Utah's Immigration Debate Online"

Benjamin Michael Marks (University of California-Riverside), "Structural and Hidden Constraints on Third Parties in American Elections"

Lulzim Traga (University of California-Santa Barbara), "The New Non-competitors: The Rise of Clientelist Parties"

Table 9: Politics in China

Reza Hasmath (University of Melbourne) and Jennifer Y.J. Hsu (University of Alberta), "From Central to Local Power: An Analysis of the Development of Contemporary State-NGO Interactions in China"

Hongbo Wang (Hong Kong University of Science and Technology) and Jun Li (Hong Kong University of Science and Technology), "Home-ownership and Political Participation: Neighborhood Democracy in Urban China"

Qiang Fu (Duke University) and Nan Lin (Duke University), "Homeowners' Associations in Urban China: A Move Toward Civil Society?"

Licheng Qian (University of Virginia), "State Legitimacy and Regime Types: Based on the Chinese Government Report (1950s to Present)"

Table 10: Politics and Religion

Sinem Adar (Brown University), "Governing Religious Diversity and Nation-State Formation in Istanbul and Alexandria, 1920- late 1970s"

Nima Baghdadi (Florida International University), "Secularism Revisited: State as the New Church"

Table 11: Politics and Immigration

Veronica Terriquez (University of Southern California) and Hyeyoung Kwon (University of Southern California), "Youth Organizations and the Political Socialization of Immigrant Families: Implications for the 2012 Elections"

Seonmin Kim (University of California-Berkeley), "Towards a Relational Model of Political Participation: Tackling "Identity-to-Politics Link" through Latent Class Models"

Sheilamae Reyes (Ohio State University), "The Political Incorporation of the Foreign Born in the United States within an Immigrant Context"

Jennifer Correa (University of Wisconsin-Parkside), "Securing America's Border: The State as a Lived Experience Along the Texas-Mexico Border"

Political Sociology Section Events at ASA

Sunday, August 19, 8:30-10:10

The Politics of Global Human Rights

(co-sponsored with Section on Human Rights)

Organizer/Discussant: Christopher Nigel Roberts (University of Minnesota)

Zakiya T. Luna (University of Wisconsin),
“Domesticating Human Rights: When Move-
ments Make Unexpected Framing Choices”

Alexandra Hrycak (Reed College) and Kelsey Zorn (Reed College), “How Protest Participation Dynamics Changed in Georgia and Ukraine after Electoral Revolutions”

Juan Fernandez (University Carlos III of Madrid) and Mark Lutter (Max Planck Institute), “Supranational Cultural Norms, Domestic Value Orientations, and the Diffusion of Same-sex Union Rights in Europe, 1988–2009”

Brian Gran (Case Western Reserve University),
“Why Are Children’s Rights Taken Seriously?”

Sunday, August 19, 10:30-12:10

Civility and Incivility in American Politics

Organizer/Presider: Sarah Sobieraj (Tufts University)

Discussant: Robin Stryker (University of Arizona)

Amy L. Stone (Trinity University), “My Gay Neighbors and Dangerous Men in Dresses: Religious Right Messaging During Ballot Measure Campaigns”

Jason L. Mast (Zeppelin University), “The ‘Meanness Problem’: Performing the Boundaries of Civility in American Politics”

Elisabeth Chaves (Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University), “Shannon Cain’s Tucson: A Citizen Participates in Her Democracy”

Darin Mather (University of Minnesota) and Eric Tranby (University of Delaware), “A New Approach to the Study of Tolerance”

Political Sociology Section Business Meeting and Reception

All section members are invited and encouraged to attend the section’s business meeting, which immediately follows the refereed roundtables. The following evening, we will have our annual section reception—please plan to attend.

Saturday, August 18, 3:30-4:10

Section on Political Sociology Business Meeting

Sunday, August 19, 6:30-8:30

Joint Reception (with Section on Collective Behavior and Social Movements and Section on Human Rights)

Recent Ph.D. Profiles

Recent Ph.D. Profiles

The Political Sociology Section is pleased to feature the following profiles of Section members who have recently completed the Ph.D. In addition to providing exposure for Section members who have recently completed a doctorate, the feature may be of interest to members whose departments are in the process of hiring or who want to learn of emerging research.

Tiffany Bergin

Criminology,
University of Cambridge

tb363@cam.ac.uk
www.tiffanybergin.com

Dissertation Summary

Dr Bergin's dissertation explores why research sometimes influences, and sometimes fails to influence, the policymaking process. She employed both quantitative methods (in particular, event history analysis) and qualitative methods (narrative analysis) to explore why correctional boot camps—prisons for civilian offenders modelled after military boot camps—spread so dramatically in the United States in the 1980s and 1990s, despite a lack of evidence indicating their effectiveness. A monograph based upon this dissertation, *The Evidence Enigma: Correctional Boot Camps and Other Failures in Evidence-Based Policymaking*, is under contract with Ashgate Press.

Other Research Interests: Policymaking in criminal justice; the role of research evidence in policy decisions; the relationship between alcohol and violence; the prevention of environmental crimes; cost-benefit analysis in social policy.

Recent Ph.D. Profiles

Medani P. Bhandari

Sociology Department,
Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University

mbhandar@syr.edu
medinibhandari@hotmail.com

Dissertation Summary

In my dissertation (“Exploring the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN’s) National Program Development in Sustainable Development and Biodiversity Conservation: A Comparative Study of India, Pakistan, Nepal, and Bangladesh”), I examine IUCN’s role in national program development in sustainability and biodiversity conservation in India, Pakistan, Nepal and Bangladesh. I explore how nature protection priorities and approaches are promoted or addressed by IUCN, an international organization, and how biodiversity conservation policies are created and maintained in states with different capacities of South Asia. This study is the first detailed scholarly study on the IUCN as an organization as well as on its efforts in climate change adaptation. Despite its utter lack of visibility to the American public, I came to conclude that IUCN has been instrumental in the formation of international environmental policy, and for promoting environmental conservation globally. It has been particularly effective in strengthening the capacity of the developing world to prepare conservation strategies and other policy instruments, fostering global policy formulation, and ultimately cultivating an international environmental regime. Further the findings also indicate that through its principle of people first, the IUCN has been advancing conservation by supporting cutting-edge conservation science, particularly on biodiversity, ecosystems, and how they relate to human wellbeing.

Dissertation Committee: Steven R. Brechin (Chair), Marjorie DeVault, Cecilia A. Green, Hans C Buechler, A.H. Peter Castro, Stuart Ira Bretschneider (Defense Chair)

Other Research Interests: Urban sociology, environmental sociology, organizational sociology, the sociology of globalization, political sociology, qualitative methods. Other fields include: risk analysis, public policies, and behaviors that contribute to the goal of catalyzing action across the global community, increase public awareness and change public attitudes on global climate change; natural resource governance issues, human rights abuse, and environmental degradation.

Recent Ph.D. Profiles

Jeremiah Bohr

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

jbohr@illinois.edu

Dissertation Summary

My dissertation studies the political battle over climate change mitigation policy in the United States, particularly how the organization of climate skepticism plays a key role in obstructing the diffusion of emissions trading policy. In political contexts, groups often exploit the scientific uncertainty surrounding various aspects of climate change. This has led to the construction of three particular definitions of carbon in relation to American economic growth and environmental policy: (1) as the basis of wealth production, (2) as a limiting risk factor, or (3) as the motivation for innovation and national competitiveness. Inspecting these political grammars will give insight into how contrasting visions of growth and prosperity exist in addition to the direct material interests of groups at the helm of capital accumulation, connecting disputes over carbon policy with popular disputes over deficits, tax rates, and the interplay between regulation and market efficiency.

Dissertation Committee: Zsuzsa Gille, Anna-Maria Marshall, Brian Dill, Markus Schulz

Other Research Interests: My next project will use focus groups to explore of why the cultural authority of science is breaking down along ideological lines. I am currently working on a project looking at the feasibility of connecting food waste and climate change mitigation policies. My previous research on the United Nations' Clean Development Mechanism appeared in *Perspectives on Global Development and Technology*.

Recent Ph.D. Profiles

Emily Brissette

University of California, Berkeley

ebrisset@berkeley.edu

Dissertation Summary

My dissertation examines the qualitatively different kinds of politics that are enabled by different state imaginaries—the widespread assumptions about the nature of the state and its relation to civil society that circulate within a given era. Comparing the eras of the Vietnam and Iraq Wars, I excavate and reconstruct the state imaginaries particular to each by examining the shared assumptions across presidential addresses, popular media, and social movement discourses and by using the theories of Gramsci and Habermas as languages to make those assumptions legible. I argue that the dominant state imaginary during the years of the Vietnam War was of a mobilizing, educative state in a relation of mutuality with civil society while the dominant imaginary during the years of the more recent Iraq War was of a colonizing state, threatening the social and cultural reproduction of civil society through its predation. In addition to illustrating the existence of these two very different state imaginaries, I examine their effects on the configuration, style, and tactics of war resistance in the two eras, through case studies of the draft resistance and counter-recruitment movements.

Dissertation Committee: Michael Burawoy (chair), Laura Enriquez, Raka Ray, and Wendy Brown

Other Research Interests: I am broadly interested in political culture and its effects on political subjectivities and social movements. I am particularly interested in exploring the gendered nature of charisma in social movements; different forms of populism and anti-statism; and the changing role of (especially, prophetic) religion in social movements and public life.

Recent Ph.D. Profiles

Jennifer Carlson

Department of Sociology,
University of California, Berkeley

<http://jdawncarlson.com>

Dissertation Summary

My dissertation (“Clinging to their Guns? Gender, Race and the Politics of Policing”) examines the politics of gun carry in the United States. Millions of Americans, mostly white conservative men, now hold licenses to carry guns concealed – more than at any previous point in U.S. history. Scholars have analyzed guns as a response to concerns about crime, an expression of cultural worldviews and dispositions, and a means of addressing anxieties associated with the declining status of white men. However, none of these frameworks interrogate how guns allow Americans to supplement, and in some cases supplant, public law enforcement. Linking the micro-level practice of gun carry with macro-level developments associated with the War on Crime, this research forges a new direction by placing policing at the center of gun politics. Synthesizing political sociology, the sociology of gender and critical criminology, I analyze gun carry as an embodied politics that both reflects and contests the state’s power to police. Rather than nostalgic relics of an imagined American past, I show that guns are actively constructed as racialized, masculine objects in relation to public law enforcement. Critically, the embodied politics of gun carry allow gun carriers to imagine and enact alternative social orders centered on private, rather than public, policing. Focused on Michigan, this study takes a mixed-methods approach, including 71 interviews, five months of participant observation at activist events, firearms classes, shooting ranges and Internet gun forums, and archive data from news sources and legislative documents.

Dissertation Committee: Raka Ray (Chair), Ann Swidler, Loic Wacquant, Jonathan Simon, Brian Delay

Other Research Interests: Conservative Politics; Crime, Law and Deviance; Gender; Theory.

Recent Ph.D. Profiles

Amy Cooter

University of Michigan

cooterab@umich.edu

www.amycooter.com

Dissertation Summary

Militia ideology lauds an historical mythos whereby white men had a monopoly of social power, even as its members claim to support equality and inclusion. My dissertation, “Race, Gender, and Nationalism in the Michigan Militia,” examines questions related to nationalism’s impact on members’ ability to accept other groups with increasing social power. My data are more than 300 hours of ethnographic fieldwork at Michigan Militia meetings, trainings, and camping events, along with 40 in-depth, open-ended interviews with militia members across the state, countless informal conversations with dozens of other members and their associates, posts from internet forms, and archival materials. I find that militia members often genuinely try to be egalitarian, but many ultimately fail. When and how they fail is instructive for discerning how this demographic understands continuing racism and other social problems. I give particular attention to militia members’ conceptions of masculinity, and to their responses to Michigan’s Black and Muslim populations. I find that men use the militia as a safe space to test their conceptions of masculinity, and that nationalistic sentiment in this group is not necessarily coded language for racism, but does prevent some members from accurately identifying and addressing racism in other sources.

Dissertation Committee: Genevieve Zubrzycki, Alford Young Jr., Kiyo Tsutsui, Matthew Countryman

Other Research Interests: My research interests include political sociology, conservative social movements and movements’ interactions with the State, deviance, and the intersection of identities, especially race, gender, and nationalism. In other work, I’ve analyzed neo-Nazi organizations and am doing preliminary research into anti-Muslim movements’ rhetoric and organizational strategies.

Recent Ph.D. Profiles

Sarah K. Cowan

Sociology and Demography,
University of California, Berkeley

sarahkcowan@berkeley.edu

www.sarahkcowan.com

Dissertation Summary

My dissertation revives the sociology of secrets from the micro-sociology of 1950's and by documenting Americans' frequent and systematic secret-keeping of common demographic events, I make contributions to theories of public opinion change and demographic change. With funding from the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health, I conducted a nationally representative survey of over 1600 American adults who provided information on their experience with and knowledge of others' abortions and miscarriages. I find that though abortion is a more common event that affects more women than miscarriage, many more Americans report knowing someone who has had a miscarriage than an abortion. Furthermore, individuals who are pro-life are much less likely than their pro-choice counterparts to report knowing someone who has had an abortion. Abortion secrets are kept more often than miscarriage secrets; as a means of managing stigma, they are frequently kept from people who are pro-life. As such, even within the same social circle, even within the same family, individuals can perceive – and hence experience – varying levels of diversity. Individuals' attitudes determine whether they experience a diverse or homogenous community not because they have chosen to be with people who agree with them or behave as they like, but because the people they are with imply that they do. With respect to attributes that can be kept secret, diversity is then not just a characteristic of a community but also a characteristic of individual experience of a community. The opinion change predicted by inter-group contact is thwarted when characteristics can be kept secret.

Dissertation Committee: Michael Hout (Sociology and Demography), Claude Fischer (Sociology and Demography), Ronald Lee (Demography), Jane Mauldon (Public Policy)

Other Research Interests: Extending the project on secrets from abortion and miscarriage to sexual minority status and cancer secrets; Political conversations (with Delia Baldassarri); Demography of sex and sexuality in the United States.

Recent Ph.D. Profiles

Andrew Dawson

McGill University

andrew.dawson@umontreal.ca

Dissertation Summary

My dissertation entitled “State Authority Structures and the Rule of Law in Post-Colonial Societies: A Comparison of Jamaica and Barbados” examines the social determinants of the rule of law by comparing Jamaica and Barbados, two countries with many similarities, but with divergent outcomes concerning the rule of law. The research takes a comparative historical approach, specifically investigating the origins of the divergence of the rule of law between Jamaica and Barbados by focusing on the late colonial period (1937-1966). Using new data collected from archival research, state legitimacy is identified as the key factor that helps explain the divergent trajectories of the rule of law in Jamaica and Barbados post-independence. Going beyond state-based explanations of the rule of law, the analysis suggests that the rule of law not only depends on characteristics of the state, but also on characteristics of society and the fit between the two.

Dissertation Committee: Matthew Lange (supervisor), John A. Hall, Axel van den Berg

Other Research Interests: Political Sociology, Sociology of Development, Political and Ethnic Violence, and Comparative Historical Sociology.

Recent Ph.D. Profiles

Laura R. Ford

Sociology,
Cornell University

lrf23@cornell.edu

Dissertation Summary

In my dissertation (“A Case of Semantic Legal Ordering: The Emergence and Expansion of Intellectual Property”), I undertake an historical and comparative investigation of the emergence and expansion of intellectual property (patents, copyrights, trademarks, and trade secrets). The historical and geographic sweep of the dissertation is broad, ranging from guild protections in medieval European city-states to the English Statute of Monopolies (1624), patent and copyright laws of the early French Revolutionary period, the World Intellectual Property Organization, and the America Invents Act (2011). From a theoretical perspective, I seek to accomplish two things: (1) to formulate a thesis about the causal process through which formal law makes a difference in social relationships, and (2) to show how that causal process either complements or conflicts with contemporary North American sociological theories. I argue that formal law makes a difference in social relationships through a causal process of “semantic legal ordering,” focusing on the ways that legal interpretation shapes institutions, organizations, and intentions.

Dissertation Committee: Richard Swedberg (Chair), Mabel Berezin, Stephen L. Morgan

Other Research Interests: My other interests include (1) sociological theory, especially classical theory, (2) economic sociology and sociology of law, (3) sociological, political, and cultural history, (4) counterfactualist methods and the identification of causes in sociological theory, and (5) a broad range of “law and society” topics, particularly in relation to the contemporary “welfare state.”

Recent Ph.D. Profiles

Todd Nicholas Fuist

Loyola University Chicago

tfuist@luc.edu

Dissertation Summary

The vast majority of religious groups in the U.S. regularly engage in what Kniss and Numrich (2007) call “moral projects,” or the execution of beliefs and values in the social world based on an understanding of “where moral action or influence should be targeted” (56). This ranges from the distribution of voter guides, to conducting volunteer work, to organizing and participating in protest marches. Despite this, we have little academic work comparing how different faith communities enact these social and political projects in the world, as well as how they understand themselves and their sacred communities with regard to the social issues they confront. To address this, my dissertation (“Ordinary Radicals: Faith, Culture, and the Struggle for Justice in Urban Religious Communities”) examines six urban, religious communities from a variety of faith traditions as they conduct social justice-oriented work. While all these groups seek to create a more just and equal society, the strategies and pathways faith groups may take to confront social problems are not always clear. The research explores how religious organizations both construct these pathways and are also changed through their social action using a comparative qualitative method. Through this I contribute an analysis of how religious culture shapes strategies for political action.

Dissertation Committee: Rhys H. Williams (chair), Kelly Moore, J. Talmadge Wright.

Other Research Interests: My main area of interest lies at the intersection of religion, social movements, and culture. Additionally, I am interested in the sociology of media and subcultures, particularly with how they factor into shaping the political identities of groups and individuals.

Recent Ph.D. Profiles

Andrew A. Gunnoe

Department of Sociology,
University of Tennessee

agunnoe@gmail.com

Dissertation Summary

Over the past three decades a significant change has taken place in the ownership structure of industrial timberlands in the United States. The once widely held belief that significant timberland ownership was a necessary ingredient for success in the forest products industry came to an end as millions of acres of productive land were sold from industrial forest products firms to institutional investment organizations, known as Timberland Investment Management Organizations (TIMOs) or Real Estate Investment Trusts (REITs). This dissertation examines this large-scale transfer of timberland ownership through a multi-level analysis of financialization and the rise of shareholder value ideology in corporate management. Part I of the dissertation provides a critical synthesis of these two literatures in order to construct a historical sociological framework for analyzing institutional change in modern corporations. Part II employs this framework to examine the historical development of the US forest products industry over the course of the second half of the 20th century. This includes an analysis of corporate land ownership strategies during the postwar era of managerial capitalism, the impact of the hostile takeover movement, and the rise of shareholder capitalism in recent decades.

Other Research Interests: My research interests concern a number of issues related to the political economy of natural resources. This includes the relationship between historical dynamics of capital accumulation and ecology, historical comparative methodologies, dialectics, imperialism, and world systems theory.

Recent Ph.D. Profiles

Laura Heideman

University of Wisconsin-Madison

lheideman@wisc.edu

<http://www.ssc.wisc.edu/~lheidema/>

Dissertation Summary

How is community-level peace constructed in the aftermath of conflict? My dissertation (“Making Society ‘Civil’: NGOs, Donors, and Peacebuilding in Croatia”) uses the case of peacebuilding in Croatia to examine the post-Cold War system of peacebuilding, where funding for democratization, civil society, and local NGOs form the backbone of international interventions. I find that the transnational to local connections in peacebuilding pushed local peace activists to form NGOs as a means of gaining access to key sets of transnational flows: money, expertise, and legitimacy. While the process of becoming formalized and professionalized organizations allowed peacebuilding groups in Croatia to gain access to international resources, it also created obstacles for engaging in community-level peacebuilding work. The project-based nature of donor-funded NGO work, the lack of critical reflection encouraged by the funding cycle, the need for constant innovation both to match changing donor priorities and to secure donor interest, and the heavy bureaucracy required to handle international donor funds make it difficult for NGOs to engage in effective community peacebuilding work. While the donor-NGO system of peacebuilding gives local NGOs access to resources, it also makes it difficult for NGOs to play their expected roles, both as community peacebuilders and as a part of a stable and inclusive civil society.

Other Research Interests: Peace, War and Social Conflicts; Human Rights; Qualitative Methodology; Collective Behavior and Social Movements; Democracy, Civil Society, and Social Capital; Transitional Justice; International Studies; Gender; Human Security; Development

Recent Ph.D. Profiles

Wesley Hiers

University of California—Los Angeles

whiers@gmail.com

<http://www.soc.ucla.edu/students/WESLEY%20HIERS/?id=97>

Dissertation Summary

Using a long-run, comparative approach, my dissertation (“Political Institutions and Legal Racial Exclusion: The US in Comparative Perspective, 1600s to 1900s”) directs sociology’s political-institutional turn to the puzzle of “legal racial exclusion” (LRE)—i.e., enduring arrangements whereby states classify their populations by race and assign unequal rights to dominants and subordinates on this basis (e.g. apartheid South Africa). Part one employs a comparative approach to explain why LRE emerged in some former European settlement colonies but not others. The basic argument links LRE to colonial contexts where settlers established autonomous, representative governments. The next two parts focus on the US and examine the political institutions and alliances that sustained LRE until the 1960s. LRE first made it onto the national political agenda in the aftermath of the Civil War, but the effort to eliminate LRE failed in the face of a powerful pro-exclusion alliance. The second part argues that the institutional logic of the two-party system explains why such a powerful pro-exclusion alliance emerged and dominated racial policy for over a century. Once this exclusionary alliance broke apart in the 1930s, LRE returned to the national political agenda. The third part explores the break-up of this alliance and examines how, even after this dissolution, the structure of legislative veto points prolonged LRE and fundamentally shaped the process by which it was eventually overcome. In relation to explanatory approaches that emphasize working class competition, elite conflict, racial demography, or public opinion, this dissertation demonstrates the indispensable explanatory contribution that a political-institutional approach makes to our understanding of the emergence, endurance, and demise of LRE.

Dissertation Committee: Andreas Wimmer (Chair), Rogers Brubaker, Michael Mann, Karen Orren (Political Science)

Other Research Interests: My next two projects will examine (1) the historical roots of country-specific patterns of xenophobia across Europe; and (2) the re-making of race and power in the post-civil rights US South. The first project will be carried out with the generous support of the Foundation for Population, Migration and Environment.

Recent Ph.D. Profiles

Crystal A. Jackson

Department of Sociology,
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

cajackso@unlv.nevada.edu
<http://faculty.unlv.edu/wpmu/cjackson/>

Dissertation Summary

My dissertation (“Sex Workers’ Rights as 21st Century Labor Activism: How Contingent, Independent Laborers are Re-Defining Labor & Identity”) explores how sex workers and allies in the U.S. contest the legal and cultural meanings of “sex” and “work,” and on a larger scale, how this represents a re-shaping of labor movement in late capitalist society. While sociologists have examined sex worker activism in other countries, few have studied U.S. sex worker rights organizations. Between 2010 and 2012, I engaged in ethnographic research, including participation observation and interviews with sex worker rights activists and allies across the country. The sex worker rights movement is a critical example of how labor activism is shifting focus from businesses to the state. Contingent, semi-autonomous, and/or independent workers cannot target an employer as traditional unions did. In addition to legislative actions and labor support, sex worker rights organizations also build and advocate for particular identities. Activists attempt to shift the label from criminals and deviants to deserving laborers and “everyday” people, i.e., “good citizens.” Overall, I argue that the dominance of abolitionist anti-trafficking ideology in the U.S. hinders these efforts and the range of collaborations necessary for national level legal changes.

Dissertation Committee: Barb Brents (Chair)

Other Research Interests: I study the political economy of intimate labor, including erotic dance, adult film (queer and heterosexual), and legal brothels (*The State of Sex: Tourism, Sex, and Sin in the New American Heartland* (Routledge 2010), with Brents and Hausbeck-Korgan). My areas include sexuality and gender, law and work, inequalities, and qualitative methods.

Recent Ph.D. Profiles

Lorien Jasny

Sociology
University of California, Irvine

ljasny@ucdavis.edu

Dissertation Summary

My dissertation (“Propositional Structures in Political Culture”), explores the networked structure of relationships within sets of actions and/or beliefs at the population level. The dissertation is divided into three sections that share the use of propositional structure, the focus on political culture, and the exploitation of temporal data. In the first section of the dissertation, I explore patterns in political participation and test theories about the relationship between protest and other forms of engagement. In the second paper, I reexamine a classic construction of “postmaterialist” values and social change to show what propositional structure adds to our understanding of the relationships between these variables and our capacity to compare these structures cross-nationally. By using propositional structures, I examine differences between national cultures based on the patterns in which beliefs are held, rather than differences in the rates in which beliefs are held. Having established that propositional structures are relatively stable (within the space of possible configurations), and explain something different about the nature of beliefs than the current methodologies, the third paper posits and tests theories about how we can expect these patterns to change over time.

Other Research Interests: As a postdoc at the University of California, Davis, Department of Environmental Policy and Behavior, I am running an experiment looking at the change of individual belief structures during a group conversation and management planning meeting. I examine the relationships between the structure of conversation and individual belief changes as well as the results of the planning meeting.

Recent Ph.D. Profiles

Jennifer Keahey

Colorado State University

Jennifer.Keahey@colostate.edu

www.cfat.colostate.edu

Dissertation Summary

For my dissertation (“Emerging Markets, Sustainable Methods: Political Economy Empowerment in South Africa’s Rooibos Tea Sector”), I conducted participatory action research with a team of South African practitioners and Rooibos tea farmers throughout 2010. Engagement enabled me to develop a commodity networking approach for sustainable development that draws from complementary political economy traditions. The perspectives framing this approach include: (1) commodity network analysis, (2) sociopolitical theories of power, (3) the human capabilities approach, (4) participatory action research, and (5) participatory action training-of-trainers. Stakeholders consisted of emerging farmers of color, their communities, and related industry and organizational groups. By conducting research in conjunction with democratically elected farmer leaders from project communities, I synthesized the conceptual framework via a process of grounded action and reflection. My dissertation presents findings in order to discuss Rooibos network challenges and opportunities and problematize means for improving emerging farmer representation. Trade is increasingly driven by sustainability standards and certification systems that require rapid and coordinated responses to market and development trends; yet information exchange and action planning protocols remain nascent. Commodity networking will enable actors to meet complex sustainability directives and more effectively capture market trends. Scholars with an interest in applied development may collaborate with practitioners and producers to socio-culturally adapt this approach within multiple product sectors and regions.

Dissertation Committee: Laura Reynolds (Chair), Douglas Murray, Lori Peek, and Mary Littrell

Other Research Interests: Agriculture and Food; Commodity Networking; Diversity; Empowerment; Fair and Alternative Trade; Globalization; Localization; Multilateral Governance and Organization; Participatory Action Research; Political Economy; Race, Ethnicity, and Gender; Social Justice; Society and Environment; Sustainable Development

Recent Ph.D. Profiles

Michael Levien

Department of Sociology,
University of California, Berkeley

mlevien@berkeley.edu

Dissertation Summary

The dispossession of land is an increasingly central aspect of economic transformation and political contestation in many parts of the world. My dissertation, based on 18 months of fieldwork in India, examines the causes and consequences of dispossession in India today and its implications for our understandings of the state, economic development and politics. Using extensive interviews and government archives, I first show land dispossession to be a central though neglected feature of both the developmental and neoliberal states, but argue that the neoliberal period has seen the emergence of a distinct regime of dispossession. From expropriating land for state-led projects of industrial transformation (dams and steel towns), the Indian state has now become a land broker for increasingly real estate-driven and non-labor absorbing growth (information technology and housing). The heart of the dissertation illustrates the nature and consequences of the neoliberal regime of dispossession through an ethnography and surveys of four village in Rajasthan who had their land dispossessed for an Information Technology SEZ. I examine the relationship between accumulation in the SEZ and dis-accumulation within the agrarian economy, the peculiar transformation of rural villages through real estate speculation, and the fate of dispossessed peasants in India's knowledge economy. I conclude with an overview of India's "land wars" in which I illustrate the elementary features and variable forms of dispossession politics.

Dissertation Committee: Michael Burawoy (Chair), Peter Evans, Raka Ray, Michael Watts

Other Research Interests: My fieldwork on rural land brokers has prompted me to undertake a project comparing the implications for development of Pierre Bourdieu and Robert Putnam's distinct theories of social capital. I have also co-authored with Marcel Paret an article using the World Values Survey to evaluate Karl Polanyi's hypothesis that liberalization generates public demand for "re-embedding" markets.

Recent Ph.D. Profiles

Nicolette D. Manglos

The University of Texas at Austin

nmanglos@gmail.com

Nicolette.D.Manglos@williams.edu

www.nicolettedmanglos.com

Dissertation Summary

Religion's political potential has been alternately conceived of as broadly inclusive and deeply divisive. In order to explain this paradox, my dissertation ("Ritual and Trust: How Religion Shapes Belonging in Africa and the Diaspora") focuses on grassroots dynamics of trust network formation within religious communities. Using a mixed-methods case study of transnational Africa, I advance a view of collective participation in religious communities as a basis of trust network formation, and develop a conception of agency in religious spaces as ritualized and deeply relational. Thus the work also speaks to the interplay of structure and individual decision-making. The dissertation has two major parts. The first uses Afrobarometer data to show that religious participation positively effects political engagement, but also that religious group differences vary by country, flouting earlier understandings of certain traditions as more or less political. The second part uses ethnographic data from African congregations in Accra and Chicago to show how individuals decide where to participate and how their decisions develop through interactions in the congregational space. I show that parallel needs for expanding the network and instilling deep trust result in certain boundaries being bridged but others—like race—being deepened and reinforced. Thus, religion matters most in its participation dimension rather than elite political involvement or top-down ideology.

Dissertation Committee: Mark Regnerus, Javier Auyero, Alex Weinreb, Mounira Maya Charrad, and Thomas Tweed

Other Research Interests: Religion and education in Africa, inter-ethnic marriage in Africa, religious experiences among young adults in the U.S., theories of human personhood and motivation

Recent Ph.D. Profiles

Candace K. May

Sociology,
Colorado State University

candace.may@colostate.edu

Dissertation Summary

Researchers studying common pool governance argue that the absence of resource dependent people from natural resource governance regimes is inversely related to the sustainability of those resources. In accord with the vast body of research illustrating this, the United States fisheries management system promotes co-management practices as the pathway to sustainable fisheries governance. Nevertheless, empirical evidence illustrates that fishers and their communities are increasingly displaced from the fisheries they depend on, which are, at the same time, experiencing substantial degradation. This project examines the contradiction between the promotion of the participation of a community of local fishers in North Carolina in governance processes and the displacement of fishers from the fishing industry and the increased degradation of fisheries. The concepts visibility, legitimacy, and power are used to capture the multiple levels and scales of structure and agency that effect the participation of local fishers in governance activities and lead to environmental degradation. Data was collected through observations, interviews and document and policy review. An important observation is that many local fishers practice active non-participation – intentional noninvolvement in formal political activities while participating in informal governance activities that profoundly affect the resource, local social and natural environment, and formal governance system.

Dissertation Committee: Peter L. Taylor (Chair), Michael Carolan, Michael G. Lacy, Dimitris Stevis (Political Science)

Recent Ph.D. Profiles

Matthew F. Nichter

Department of Sociology,
University of Wisconsin - Madison

mnichter@ssc.wisc.edu

Dissertation Summary

In my dissertation (“Rethinking the Origins of the Civil Rights Movement: Radicals, Repression, and the Black Freedom Struggle, 1930-1970”), I argue that a mass movement for African-American equality had begun to emerge by the mid-1940s, largely under the auspices of labor unions and leftist political parties. However, the repression of radicals during the McCarthy era delayed the emergence of this nascent civil rights movement and weakened its ties to the labor movement. Notwithstanding these discontinuities, I demonstrate that many activists with backgrounds in the Old Left struggles of the 1930s and 1940s also played key leadership roles in the resurgent civil rights movement of the 1960s. These findings challenge canonical analyses of the origins of the civil rights movement, and shed new light on the historical roots of contemporary racial inequality.

Dissertation Committee: Erik Olin Wright (advisor), Pamela Oliver, Chad Alan Goldberg, William P. Jones (History)

Other Research Interests: Political Sociology, Comparative & Historical Sociology, Social Movements, Race, Labor, Political Economy, Theory, Philosophy of Science

Recent Ph.D. Profiles

Shiri Noy

Indiana University, Bloomington

snoy@indiana.edu

www.shirinoy.com

Dissertation Summary

This multimethod dissertation (“Globalization, International Financial Institutions and Health Policy Reform in Latin America”) uses the case of health sector reform in Latin America to test the thesis that international financial institutions (IFIs) have used their coercive financial power to uniformly impose neoliberal policies in developing nations. I use cross-section time-series models to examine the overall impact of IFIs on health spending. I then draw on evidence from 300 policy documents and over 100 interviews with policy makers and stakeholders in Argentina, Costa Rica and Peru to account for cross-national variation in health policy reform. To date, I have three main findings. First, contrary to conventional wisdom, international financial institutions have little effect on health expenditures in Latin America. Second, IFI policy prescriptions are neither uniformly applied across countries, nor are they strictly “neoliberal.” Neoliberal concerns with market efficiency, privatization and individual responsibility are discussed in tandem with a state-responsibility discourse on equity and poverty-reduction. Third, institutional arrangements such as degree of decentralization and state autonomy and capacity – that is, whether the state formulates clear goals for the health sector and whether it is able to carry those goals to fruition – shape the extent to which IFIs are able to influence health policy reform in Argentina, Costa Rica and Peru.

Other Research Interests: Political Sociology; Sociology of Development; Globalization; Health Policy; Comparative Methods; Latin America

Recent Ph.D. Profiles

Jung Mee Park

Cornell University

<https://sites.google.com/site/jmp2114/>

Dissertation Summary

In my dissertation, I examine 19th century bilateral treaties as they pertain to the development and standardization of international law globally. After writing treaties with Western states (US, Great Britain, Germany, etc.), East Asian countries (China, Japan, and Korea) adopted new legal terminologies, radically reorganized, and institutionalized new models of statehood. During this time, China's status within Asia declined, Japan emerged as a world power, and Korea, a once sovereign nation, became a colonial site. For the dissertation, I constructed a dataset of 228 treaties involving 123 unique dyadic relations for countries from Europe, Asia, North America, and South America. The treaties were coded for legal, diplomatic, political, commercial, and social provisions. Over time, the concluded treaties corresponded to specific categories such as arbitration, consular, delimitation, and extradition treaties to handle various claims. My analysis shows that intra and inter-regional tensions shaped treaty provisions and determined whether the treaty was symmetrically beneficial or asymmetrically beneficial. Treaties tended toward mutual benefits by the early 20th century as inter-regional tensions declined. My analysis also explores how the treaties allowed foreign nationals to establish lasting educational, scientific, and religious institutions in East Asian countries.

Dissertation Committee: David Strang (chair), Mabel Berezin, and Katsuya Hirano (history)

Other Research Interests: I previously wrote on the history of Christianity (particularly in Korea), religion and nationalism, post-colonialism, and sociology of culture (particularly American musical theatre). Currently, I am writing a paper on the dyadic network ties in international diplomatic exchanges from 1817 to 2005, which examines the stability of symmetric and asymmetric ties.

Recent Ph.D. Profiles

David Pettinicchio

Sociology,
University of Washington

http://www.soc.washington.edu/people/grads_detail.asp?UID=davidpet

Dissertation Summary

Given that the US has often been portrayed as a laggard in social welfare, why was it a policy innovator on disability rights? The central thesis of my dissertation is that, beginning in the late 1960s, institutional entrepreneurs (specifically activists in the government) pursued policies (such as the Architectural Barriers Act and later, the Rehabilitation Act) which created subsequent opportunities for grassroots mobilization. My dissertation, funded in part by a National Science Foundation Dissertation Improvement Grant, combines historical- institutional analyses with quantitative methods. Using original longitudinal data, I find that the emergence of disability rights does not begins with “radical” outside organizations and the use of disruptive tactics to pressure the government to act. Rather, political elites helped redefine disability as a rights-based issue which politicized a constituency. This politicization is important because when congressional zeal appeared to slow, new disability challengers rose to the occasion and targeted the government to ensure continued protection and expansion of equal rights that the government had promised. My dissertation speaks to a variety of audiences including those interested in political and organizational sociology, welfare state politics, social movements, disability studies, and socio-legal studies.

Dissertation Committee: Robert Crutchfield and Debra Minkoff (Co-Chairs), Steven Pfaff, Edgar Kiser, Suzanne Staggenborg, Sharron Brown

Other Research Interests: The relationship between institutional arrangements and individual and collective behavior is a theme that links my broader interests in ethnic nationalism, social policy and social psychology. For instance, in a recently published and award-winning paper, I examine the effects of ethno-nationalist political and economic policies on Anglophone out-migration from the province of Québec between 1971 and 1981.

Recent Ph.D. Profiles

Oren Pizmony-Levy

Indiana University

opizmony@indiana.edu

www.orenpizmonylevy.com

Dissertation Summary

International assessments of students' achievements (IASA) – such as Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) and Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) – appear to be a vital catalyst in the globalization of education. Currently, one-third of all countries participate in these assessments. Still, empirical research on the IASA is less extensive than might be expected. My dissertation (“Testing for All: The Emergence and Development of International Assessments of Students' Achievements 1958-2008”) investigates the emergence and global diffusion of IASA over the past five decades. My point of departure is neo-institutional theory and its application to globalization; I extend this theoretical framework by exploring processes taking place at both global and local levels. Using archival research and interviews with 45 key-informants, I demonstrate how the field of IASA has developed in two phases. In the early decades (1960s-1980s), actors working in the field framed their work in terms of academic and intellectual endeavor (e.g., official reports were guided by specific research questions). Since the mid-1990s, however, actors working in the field frame their work in terms of global governance and auditing of educational systems (e.g., official reports include more ranking tables and less research questions). Furthermore, using original quantitative dataset, I find that regional and global factors, rather than national characteristics, affect the likelihood of countries to participate in IASA.

Dissertation Committee: Brian Powell (Co-Chair), Margaret Sutton (Co-Chair), Arthur Alderson, Heidi Ross, and Pamela Barnhouse Walters.

Other Research Interests: Political Sociology, Sociology of Education, Comparative Sociology / Education, Environmental Sociology, LGBT Studies, Quantitative and Qualitative Methods, Social Networks

Recent Ph.D. Profiles

Jennifer Rosen

Sociology Department,
Northwestern University

jenniferrosen2014@u.northwestern.edu

<http://www.sociology.northwestern.edu/people/marketphds.html#rosen>

Dissertation Summary

“Political Institutions, Development Thresholds, and Women’s Political Representation” offers a new explanation of cross-national and over-time variation in levels of female political representation. It shows that key causal mechanisms have different -- even contradictory -- effects on female representation across countries with diverse socio-economic histories. Using a nested analysis that combines quantitative and qualitative methods, it systematically examines the interaction between political institutions and economic development in mitigating or reinforcing social inequalities. The dissertation pays particular attention to women’s political empowerment in African and Latin American post-conflict societies. Results indicate that the specific kinds of political institutions that enhance female political representation are radically different in developed vs. less developed countries. Hence, institutional designers need to take into consideration the economic context of a country in order to promote more balanced political representation for women.

Dissertation Committee: James Mahoney (chair), Monica Prasad, Jeremy Freese, and Alberto Palloni.

Other Research Interests: Jennifer has a forthcoming article (sole author) on the topic of women’s representation in *Political Research Quarterly*. Generally, her research interests focus on the intersection of politics, gender, and international development, as well as the use of innovative social science research methods.

Recent Ph.D. Profiles

Steven Samford

University of New Mexico

ssamford@unm.edu

www.unm.edu/~ssamford

Dissertation Summary

“High Road Development in a Low Tech Industry: Policymakers, Producer Networks, and the Co-Production of Innovation in the Mexican Ceramics Sector” When faced with the integration of international markets, some small producers in the developing world respond with “low road” strategies that undermine wages and working conditions while others take the “high road” to become globally competitive. Existing explanations – macroeconomic policy, human capital development, geography – are unable to account for this variation both across and within sectors. I address this variation by examining workshop-level responses to a government effort to develop and disseminate a lead-free glaze in the Mexican ceramics sector. Many producers have failed to adopt the glaze despite the fact that it promises to improve both their health and their export prospects. I draw on a variety of data to understand which workshops adopt the improved glaze technology: social network and statistical analysis of an original survey; interviews with state and federal officials and workshops in several villages; observation of training programs and meetings of producer groups. I find that upgrading is most likely where state agents work through existing networks of producers, using these social ties as conduits for the flow of information about technology and markets. Among the key implications is that, along with market failure, “network failure” should be a key concern for sectoral development programs.

Dissertation Committee: Andrew Schrank (Chair)

Other Research Interests: Globalization and development, along with multiple approaches to their study. One recent paper uses QCA to assess the causes of rapid trade liberalization in Latin America (“Averting Disruption and Reversal,” *Politics & Society* 2010), and another uses traditional econometrics to explore patterns of foreign investment in Mexico.

Recent Ph.D. Profiles

Ritchie Savage

Department of Sociology,
The New School for Social Research

savar647@newschool.edu

<http://www.newschool.edu/nssr/subpage.aspx?id=70857>

Dissertation Summary

My dissertation, "A Comparative Analysis of Populist Discourse in Venezuela and the United States," investigates the way in which political discourse is structured in order to appeal to the people. Through an analysis of speeches and articles covering Betancourt's Democratic Action, Chávez, McCarthyism, and the Tea Party, I argue that there is an essential structure to populist discourse revealed in references to the 'opposition' as a representation of the persistence of social conflict. In the discourses of these politicians and social movements, references to the opposition are posed against a 'founding moment of the social,' which serves as a collective memory of the origins of democracy and the strive for freedom or liberation. With evidence provided that this binary structure is present in all of the aforementioned cases, I conclude that populism is a case of a universal discursive formation, which can emerge in administrations, social movements, and ideologies with vastly different characteristics. I then utilize this definition of populism to reveal that instances of populism, which once proved to be exceptional phenomena within modern forms of political rule, are now becoming part of the institutionalized structure of democratic politics, evidenced by a number of cases taken in comparative-historical perspective.

Dissertation Committee: Orville Lee (Chair), Andrew Arato, Sarah Daynes, Federico Finchelstein

Other Research Interests: My interests include an ongoing inquiry into the role of 'language' as an analytic construct in the social sciences and how it has been deployed within social and cultural theory in such a manner to create a fundamental set of recurring antinomies between its structuralist, psychoanalytic, Marxist-historical, performative, and phenomenological applications.

Recent Ph.D. Profiles

Megan G. Swindal

Cornell University

meg64@cornell.edu

Dissertation Summary

I am interested in the political sociology of development and how power shapes the types of development strategies that are pursued by state and civil society—and accordingly, the types of socio-economic outcomes that can be expected for different class and occupational groups. My dissertation addresses this question from a regional perspective; I analyze the continuing cultural and institutional role of inequality in the crafting of development policy in historically stratified regions of the US. More specifically, I explore how consensus for a capital-subsidy paradigm is created and maintained in the state of Alabama, and how the underlying economic ideology is rhetorically framed by political leaders and media such that it resonates across a variety of income groups. My findings call into question theories that recent Southern politics has been shaped by pragmatic goals such as job creation and economic development; it appears traditional cultural expectations still play an important but under-acknowledged role in some locations. Accordingly, uneven development and poor preparation for the 21st century economy may continue in such areas despite recent gains in aggregate growth. This research is timely because the capital-subsidy approach is being proposed as a model for national development policy, perhaps without due consideration of local power relationships and cultural traditions.

Dissertation Committee: Tom Hirschl, Development Sociology, Cornell; David Brown, Development Sociology, Cornell; Elizabeth Sanders, Government, Cornell

Other Research Interests: Comparative regional research is a recurring focus of my work, particularly comparative issues of governance and development in the US and EU. Recent work has focused on the structural and institutional factors shaping regional responses to migratory flows in the US and UK, and participatory possibilities of governance in historically stratified places within these areas.

Recent Ph.D. Profiles

Bahar Tabakoglu

Department of Sociology,
The New School For Social Research

tabab174@newschool.edu

Dissertation Summary

My dissertation (“Social Constituents of Religious Politics: The Cases of Islamist Labor Unionism in Turkey and Hindu Labor Unionism in India”) concerns religious politics, which gained increasing strength in recent decades in Turkey and India (political Islam and Hinduism, respectively). The rise of both Islamism and Hinduism has been accompanied by the emergence of social, political, and economic organizations in their support and has been supported by various social classes in institutionalized forms, of which religious labor unions are one. Although religious politics in both countries has addressed the class interests of its constituents, it did so, wearing the face of a cultural project, by framing these interests as a means of furthering the larger vision of instituting an Islamic/Hindu society and the concomitant change in social life. But just how widely is this vision shared among political Islam/Hinduism’s varied constituents? How have the different social classes and groups responded to the political call for undertaking this project? With the exception of a few studies, the existing line of research that has rested largely on the state and state-society conflict in relation to secularization in both countries has, in isolating the field from its sociological elements, been prone to institutionalist reductionism. By contrast, political Islam/Hinduism’s social constituents has been understudied. Therefore, in contradistinction to those analyses that consider political Islam/Hinduism as a monolithic and homogeneous formation, and to those that limit the analysis to the sphere of debates around secularism, I examine religious labor unionism in Turkey and India with an eye to filling the gap in the literature on religious politics by analyzing its social constituents, the working class component in particular.

Dissertation Committee: Andrew Arato (chair), Carlos Forment, Iddo Tavory, John VanderLippe

Other Research Interests: Political Sociology, Economic Sociology, Sociology of Labor, Sociology of the Middle East, Modern Social Movements, Civil Society and State Theory, Classical Sociological Theory, Research Methods

Recent Ph.D. Profiles

Xiaohong Xu

Yale University

xiaohong.xu@yale.edu
<http://xiaohongxu.org/>

Dissertation Summary

Based on an empirical study of the Chinese Revolution, my dissertation (“Revolutionizing Ethos: Making ‘New Men’ and New Politics in the Chinese Revolution”) argues that the revolutionary process can best be understood with reference to the dynamic triadic relationship among civil society, competitive party politics, and evolving state institutions. I investigate the organizational emergence of the ‘new men’ who made their way from civic activism into politics, and the process in which these Communist revolutionaries developed a new organizational ethos and diffused it into civil society and eventually into the party-state. Based on extensive use of archival and historical materials and interviews, I discover that Chinese Communism emerged from youth activist organizations with strong sectarian ethical culture; their agenda of social transformation was fused with a group ethos derived from this sectarian base. Their rise in the political arena disrupted the weak parliamentary politics of the time, and reconfigured the relationship between civil society and party politics. Finally, I examine the formation and consequences of the resulting Maoist political culture: its resurgent sectarian ethics fostered a highly disciplined cadre crucial for its rise to power yet also incurred organizational dynamics within the Party which, after the ‘new men’ took power, frequently led to policy disasters.

Dissertation Committee: Julia Adams, Philip Gorski, Peter Perdue, Steve Pincus

Other Research Interests: My next project will draw on organizational theory and network analysis to analyze the transformation and reproduction of cultural institutions and cultural elites in contemporary China in order to understand why the major political rupture taking place in 1989 has given way to political resilience in the following two decades.