

**Macalester College**  
**Department of Sociology**  
**SOCI275/POLI250**  
**Comparative and Historical Sociology**

Fall 2006  
TTH 1:00-2:30pm  
Carnegie Hall, Room 204

Professor Terry Boychuk  
207A Carnegie Hall, x6154  
boychuk@macalester.edu

**Synopsis**

The course surveys four, broadly focused topics.

**I. The Comparative Method**

The class begins with a survey of the basic methodological orientations that distinguish various modes of analysis in the social sciences. The lectures and discussions in this section provide a general introduction to the logic of causal analysis, explore the comparative strengths and weaknesses of differing methodological approaches to understanding social phenomena, and specifically, consider in greater detail the distinctive blend of theoretical, methodological, and empirical concerns that inform comparative-historical social science.

**II. The Nature and Historical Origins of the Modern State**

The second section of the course bears witness to social scientists' efforts to define the nature of state sovereignty. What is distinctive about the organization, jurisdiction, and ideology of modern states relative to political systems that preceded them in human history? A second, interrelated focus of this section concerns the specific historical contexts in which states were called into existence. How we do explain the appearance of state systems in modern times? What cultural, social, and economic forces unique to Europe prefigured the emergence of a community of states there? A schematic overview of these incipient efforts at state building provides the backdrop for a comparative analysis of political modernization outside the confines of Europe.

**III. The Sociology of Democracy and Authoritarianism**

Beyond advancing interpretations of when and how state-building occurs, this portion of the course addresses the important, related question: how and why do the outcomes of political modernization differ? Why does state-building lead to the institutionalization of parliamentary democracies in some nations, in others, right-wing dictatorships, and in others still, left-wing variants of authoritarian government?

#### IV. The Sociology of Revolution

The fourth topical focus of the class explores the sudden and dramatic transformations of political institutions so frequently essential to the historical process of state building: revolutions. How have more general changes in the global political, social, and economic order combined with immediate historical events to precipitate revolutionary conflict over the ends, ways and means of government from one nation to another? The section of the course begs an understanding of the transformative role of violence in shaping the destiny of modern polities: how geopolitical confrontation between warring regimes progressively expanded the institutional capacities of reconstituted governments to finance and organize military campaigns, to secure national borders, and to police their citizenry; and how revolutionary insurgencies -- violent conflict within polities among competing factions over control of the state -- also propelled the reconstruction of state sovereignty in modern times.

#### V. The Rise of the Welfare State

Taking the coercive dimensions of state sovereignty as read, the last set of assigned readings turn our attention to the apparently more benign, civil aspects of state development in the last two centuries. Through the late nineteenth century into the Cold War era, the governments of the advanced industrial democracies progressively extended the public fisc to accommodate demands for guaranteeing a social minimum to their citizenry. The idea of citizenship -- at first confined to specific property, civil, and political rights -- assumed a much more expansive definition, now including rights to such necessities as food, housing, health care, education and other protective services. The costs of social rights are high. Social policies -- policies countervailing economic and market inequalities and alleviating abject poverty -- now account for most public spending among the advanced industrial democracies. What common ground do we witness among these countries in the development of the welfare state? What are the key differences between them? This concluding section seeks to conceptualize and explain the varied trajectories of social policy development from one nation to another in Western Europe and North America.

#### **Required Texts Available for Purchase**

Moore, Barrington. 1966 [1993]. *The Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy: Lord and Peasant in the Making of the Modern World*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

[HN15 .M775 1966](#)

Skocpol, Theda. 1979. *States and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia, and China*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

[HM283 S5.6](#)

## **Assignments/Grading**

Class attendance and participation count for 20% of your grade.

Six short assignments (5 pages) represent another 60% of your grade. These essays require that you answer questions on the readings for weeks 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10. You have the option of writing an essay for either week 4 or 5. Each short assignment equals 10% of your final grade. Asterisks in the syllabi remind you of the readings for which assignments are due.

One class presentation and term paper, due on the last day of class, accounts for the remaining 20% of your grade. This paper should not exceed 15 pages. Your choice of a major comparative-historical study in sociology, political science, or any other field of social science of contemporary significance will be the subject of your class presentation in the final weeks of the course. In your term paper, you will present a more detailed written summary and analysis of your chosen study.

## **Readings and Assignments**

### **I. Methodological Foundations of Comparative Sociology**

#### **Week 1. The Epistemology of the Social Sciences**

September 7

No readings.

#### **Week 2. Variable-Oriented Social Science**

September 12, 14

No readings.

#### **Week 3. Case-Oriented Social Science and the Comparative Method**

September 19, 21

Ragin, Charles C. 1987. *The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press. Pp. 1 – 68.

Theoretical Building Blocks: The Nature of Social Power

Poggi, Gianfranco. 1990. *The State: Its Nature, Development and Prospects*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, pp. 3-18.

**Part II. The Great Transformation: The Rise of Capitalism, Industrialism and the Modern State in Europe**

**\*Week 4. Social Power in Pre-Industrial Societies**

September 26, 28

The Primacy of Political Power in Agrarian Societies

Lenski, Gerhard. 1966. *Power and Privilege: A Theory of Social Stratification*. New York: McGraw-Hill. pp. 189-296.

European Feudalism

Poggi, Gianfranco. 1978. *The Development of the Modern State: A Sociological Introduction*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. pp. 16-35.

The Investiture Conflict and the Beginnings of the Modern European State

Strayer, Joseph. 1970. *On the Medieval Origins of the Modern State*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. pp. 12-56.

Answer the first two questions, and one of the following two questions.

1. Poggi recognizes three distinct and (potentially) independent sources of social power. The capacity of some people to dominate others has multiple origins: political, economic, and ideological. In Lenski's writings he observes that political power, economic power and ideological power are not very much differentiated from each other in agrarian societies. They fuse in the monarchy and the landed aristocracy. Moreover, political power subsumes and subordinates economic and ideological power, and not vice versa. Identify and synthesize the arguments and evidence in *Power and Privilege* that substantiate this thesis.

2. Lenski shows that political power did not wholly dominate the economic and ideological realms of agrarian societies. To demonstrate this point, compare and contrast relations between the peasants and the landed aristocracy to the relations between the urban classes (merchants and guilds) and the landed aristocracy. How does the former represent an amalgamation of the means of coercion with economic domination? How

does the latter demonstrate limits to the warrior caste's monopoly over economic resources?

And further, briefly describe the apparently conflicted position of the Roman Catholic Church in European feudal society. How was the Church both subject to political power and supportive of it, but at the same time, attempt to limit the exploitative power of the monarch and the landed aristocracy?

3. European feudalism constituted one manifestation of agrarian rule. The extreme fragmentation of political power among the landed aristocracy distinguished European feudalism from other agrarian societies. What was responsible, according to Poggi in his writing on feudalism, for the pronounced anarchic tendencies of European feudalism?

4. Strayer offers an interpretation of the origins of the modern state emphasizing the growing importance of the separation of church and state in Europe, beginning with the Investiture Conflict. In his estimation the differentiation of political power from other forms of social power begins with the administration of justice and the securing of domestic order and peace. Briefly recapitulate Strayer's central arguments about how this historical process unfolded. Pay attention to how the separation of church and state changed the legitimating ideology of monarchy. Why was the administration of justice a likely starting point of the origins of the state insofar as it was consistent with "the proprietary theory of the state", as described in Lenski?

### **\*Week 5. From Feudalism to Liberalism**

October 3, 5

#### Standestaat, and Absolutism

Poggi, Gianfranco. 1978. *The Development of the Modern State: A Sociological Introduction*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. pp. 36-85.

#### War-Making and the Rise of the Absolutist State

Tilly, Charles. 1990. *Coercion, Capital and European States, AD 990-1992*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell. pp. 67-91.

#### The Liberal-Constitutional State

Poggi, Gianfranco. 1990. *The State: Its Nature, Development and Prospects*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. pp. 52-68.

Carnoy, Martin. 1984. *The State and Political Theory*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. pp. 10-23.

A Comparative Interpretation of the Rise of the Capitalist-State in Europe

Hall, John and G. John Ikenberry. 1989. *The State*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. pp. 22-42.

Answer any three questions.

The rise of the modern state attended the collapse of the landed aristocracy. The aristocracy lost its political role as European monarchs progressively established a monopoly over the means of violence. Monarchs gathered unto themselves the exclusive prerogatives of political power: the undivided capacity to wage war; to collect taxes; and to establish courts and other legal instruments to maintain domestic order. The political disenfranchisement of the aristocracy paralleled their economic demise. The economic dominance of the nobles rested upon their power to extract rents from peasants working the land within their fiefs. As lands were the principal source of wealth in the feudal age, landlordism underpinned the political power of the nobility. With the commercialization and urbanization of the European economy, the bourgeoisie eclipsed the aristocracy as the dominant economic force. The rise of capitalism and of the modern state occurred simultaneously.

1. Poggi describes the growing importance of towns in the feudal polity and in the polity of estates. With the growing economic strength of capitalist entrepreneurs within the urban economy, the bourgeoisie began to redefine its social identity from that of an *estate* to that of a *class* and then sought to undermine the polity of estates and to endorse the growth of the absolutist state. Why did the towns at first seek a corporate form of self-government within the feudal polity? What distinguishes a *class* from an *estate* in Poggi's estimation? Why did the capitalist class lose its interests in directly possessing powers of self-government in favor of vesting political rule in a unitary state that stood "apart and above" class in a distinctive "public sphere."
2. The bourgeoisie had vested interests in expanding the sovereignty of absolutist monarchs. But monarchs also had a reciprocal interest in expanding trade and commerce according to Charles Tilly. The financing of war prompted a close alliance between monarchs and the bourgeoisie. What changes in military technology rendered the landed aristocracy relatively useless to the crown in prosecuting wars? And why did these changes increase the dependence of monarchs on capitalists, and as such, witness absolutist states encourage to the greatest extent the growth of monetarized economies? How did war making within the context of commercial economies progressively expand and reform the administrative apparatus of newly emerging states?
3. The development of the modern state in England diverged from the pattern evident in continental Europe. What was different about the English experience of state building? And how did it culminate in liberal-constitutionalism, and subsequently, liberal democracy? The political thought of Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau mirror the evolution

of the modern state from absolutism, to constitutional liberalism, to liberal democracy. Recapitulate briefly how these political theorists arrived at different interpretations of the legitimacy of state power. (Or, to put it another way, what does each political theorist say the state should and must do to preserve the good society?) How do these different accounts of state power correspond to the evolutionary stages mentioned above?

4. Peter Hall and John Ikenberry attempt to identify the unique causes of European state development through comparison with other agrarian societies. In their estimation, what was distinctive about the political and cultural contexts of Europe that allowed for the rise of capitalism and the modern state there as compared to Chinese, Indian and Islamic civilizations?

### **III. The Sociology of Democracy and Authoritarianism**

#### **\*Week 6. The Social Origins of Democracy**

October 10, 12

Moore, Barrington. 1966. *The Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy: Lord and Peasant in the Making of the Modern World*. Boston: Beacon Press. pp. xi-xix; 413-432; 3-155.

Answer both questions.

1. English and French paths to capitalist democracy differed greatly. Recapitulate the key differences between English and French landed aristocracies and explain why England progressed to political democracy without the benefit of peasant revolutions from below while France required a violent, bloody revolution to clear away the impediments to a democratic polity.

2. As Moore notes, the plantation economy of the South and the industrial economy of the Northeast United States complemented one another in the first century of the new republic. The American Civil War need not have taken place. A specific set of political circumstances precipitated the war, namely, Southern politicians' intransigence over granting Northern capitalists favorable economic policies, which only the federal government had the power to enact. What was the essence of the conflict between the South and the North over national economic policy? Why was it that the North could see no way out of the impasse other than to conquer and then reform the Southern economy and society? Or, in other words, what was different about the United States, as compared to Japan and Germany, which prevented a compromise solution between the Northern bourgeoisie and Southern plantation elites (reliant on labor-repressive agriculture) culminating in fascism?

## **\*Week 7. The Social Origins of Communism and Fascism**

October 17, 19

Moore, Barrington. 1966. *The Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy: Lord and Peasant in the Making of the Modern World*. Boston: Beacon Press. pp.433-483; 162-313.

Answer one of the two questions.

Japanese and Chinese societies modernized without the benefit of autonomous, self-governing cities that emerged in late feudal Europe. The Japanese and Chinese bourgeoisie did not initially become the dominant economic class in these societies. No (dominant) bourgeoisie, no democracy, as Moore observes. Nevertheless, the reach and power of European states forced upon these Asian societies a reactive program of state building if they were to establish and defend successfully their sovereignty. Japan and China eventually found very different solutions to the problems of national unification, military security, and economic modernization.

### China

1. Imperial China did not develop vassalage along European lines, i.e. grants of land in return for military service. What then provided bonds of loyalty between the landed gentry and the Emperor under the Manchu dynasty? Why did the Imperial system breakdown in the early twentieth century and usher in an era of anarchic warlordism?

The failure of Kuomintang's regime efforts at national unification provided an opportunity for the Communists to harness the revolutionary potential of the Chinese peasantry in their bid for power. Why were peasant rebellions so endemic to China? Account for the relationship between the peasants and the upper classes in your answer as well as various factors which united and divided peasants. Why did such anarchy express itself in terms of gangsterism as opposed to a coherent political program for restructuring political power in China?

How did the communists forge peasant solidarity and convert it into a political and economic base for their eventual triumph? How did the Japanese occupation advance the fortunes of communist leadership?

### Japan

2. Tokugawa Shogunate effectively tamed the turbulence of Japanese warlords during its long reign (1600-1868). How did the relationship between the Shogunate and the major warlords (daimyo) parallel in many respects the relationship between the French monarchy and the land aristocracy under Louis XIV? How did this relationship weaken

the position of the samurai and daimyo and permit the emergence of a vigorous merchant class in Japan?

The Meiji Restoration eventually completed the work (first begun under the Tokugawa Shogunate) of erecting a centralized state, and further embarked upon an aggressive campaign of economic modernization. How did the Meiji government successfully promote capitalist development without undermining important elements of the old order?

The Japanese political elite squeezed ever greater surpluses out of the peasantry to modernize the economy. Why did the state, in concert with the rural landlords, consistently expropriate more rice from the peasantry without ever risking peasant uprisings and rebellions akin to that of China? Identify the key aspects of social and political control over the peasantry operating in the Japanese countryside, which prevented peasant insurrection. Also discuss the contributions of Japanese riziculture to lessening the deprivations of the peasantry in spite of their shouldering the economic burden of industrialization.

#### **IV. Sociology of Revolutions**

##### **\*Week 8. The Causes of French, Russian, and Chinese Revolutions**

October 24

Skocpol, Theda. 1979. *States and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia, and China*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press. Pp. 3 – 157.

Answer both questions.

1. Why does Skocpol find inadequate these three approaches to understanding revolution: aggregate-psychological theories; systems/value consensus theories; the political conflict perspective.
2. Skocpol identifies three specific causes of state breakdown in modernizing agrarian bureaucracies: breakdown of social control; peasant revolts from below; and radical political movements. Briefly summarize why agrarian bureaucracies were prone to collapse while seeking to modernize their political and social orders. How did foreign pressures trigger revolutionary situations in France, Russia and China? What was it about peasant communities in each of these societies which made them vulnerable to mass insurrections?

**Midterm Break, October 26-29**

### **Week 9. The Causes of French, Russian, and Chinese Revolutions (cont.)**

October 31, November 2

### **\*Week 10. Revolutionary Outcomes**

November 7, 9

Skocpol, Theda. 1979. *States and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia, and China*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press. Pp. 161 – 293.

What was common about the social origins of the radical elites which lead these three revolutions, and therefore, common about the outcomes of each revolution? How does Skocpol explain the key difference between French, Russian and Chinese revolutions, namely, democracy in the first instance, and communism in latter cases?

### **V. Sociology of the Welfare State**

### **\*Week 11. Liberal Democratic, Social Democratic, and Corporatist Welfare States**

November 14, 16

Esping-Andersen, Gosta. 1991. *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press. pp. 1-78.

Quadagno, Jill. 1987. "Theories of the Welfare State." *Annual Review of Sociology* 13: 109-28.

Answer both questions.

1. Esping-Andersen presents a typology of welfare states: liberal; corporatist; and social democratic. Briefly describe the key differences between these types with respect to decommodification and stratification. Esping-Andersen also identifies three causal variables that account for why some countries espouse liberal social policies, others, corporatist, and others still, social democratic. The three variables are historical legacies of state formation; working class mobilization; and class coalitions. Describe how these factors vary (or do not vary) among the three types of welfare states in their historical development.

2. What three factors have distinguished American welfare state development from other countries according to Jill Quadagno? What areas of agreement do you see between Quadagno and Esping-Andersen in her explanation of America's laggard status among the advanced industrial democracies in establishing comprehensive and coherent social policies?

**Week 12. Sociology of the Welfare State (cont.)**

November 21

**Thanksgiving Break: November 23-26.**

**Week 13. Class Presentations**

November 28, 30

**Week 14. Class Presentations**

December 5, 7

**Week 15. Class Presentations**

December 12, 14

**Fall Term Ends**

**Last day to submit course work: December 14th**

## **Guide to Writing the Term Paper Comparative and Historical Sociology**

Your choice of a major comparative-historical study in sociology, political science, or any other field of social science is the subject of a detailed analysis that encompasses four principal discussions: the object(s) of explanation, theoretical frameworks, method, and case selection.

### **1. Object(s) of Explanation**

Define as specifically as possible the phenomenon that the author seeks to explain. For example, Moore accounts for the emergence of three paths to political modernization: democracy, fascist/right-wing authoritarian regimes, and communist/left-wing authoritarian regimes. Skocpol endeavors to explain the absence or presence of state *and* social revolutions in the course of state building among modernizing agrarian bureaucracies. Esping-Andersen identifies three types of welfare state among capitalist nations as objects of explanation: the liberal democratic variant, the social democratic variant, and the conservative or corporatism variant. Evaluate the degree to which the author of your chosen study renders explicit, precise descriptions of the dependent variables, or outcomes, under consideration. For example, Moore is least precise in defining his outcomes, relying on our common understanding of regime types as a point of departure. Skocpol is more precise in her description of the difference between a state *and* social revolution as opposed to a political revolution. And, Esping-Andersen is quite exact in his use of the concepts of decommodification and stratification as defining attributes of these three kinds of welfare state.

### **2. Theoretical Frameworks**

Theoretical statements present the main causal arguments of the study. In terms of the comparative method, theories are clusters of propositions that specify a range of causal factors (independent variables) presumed to explain the outcomes under study (dependent variables) and what combinations of causal forces produce these outcomes.

Theories entail abstract models of social processes that guide empirical study and description of research findings. Understanding the total complexity of social phenomenon far exceeds the unaided faculties of human cognition. Theories are parsimonious. They offer elegant (that is, simple and precise) accounts of social behavior that reduce its complexity to intellectually manageable proportions. Theories focus our attention on fewest possible causal influences presumably most relevant to understanding any given set of outcomes, and as such, allow us to concentrate our powers of observation and description on more discrete social phenomenon. Theory presents highly selective and partial (not exhaustive) accounts of the social world.

For Moore, economic classes, class interests, and class coalitions are the focal points of his theoretical approach to explaining the emergence of political regimes. For Skocpol, international contexts, mass insurrections, and relationship between political elites and dominant economic classes are the key elements of her theoretical account of state breakdown. For Esping-Andersen, legacies of state formation, working class mobilization, and cross-class alliances are the central explanatory variables in his explanation of the differences between welfare states.

### 3. Method

We examined four major approaches to substantiating causal arguments that stem from the distinctions between interpretive and explanatory social science and between idiographic and nomothetic forms of explanation: Mill's method of agreement, Mill's method of difference, particularizing comparisons, and single case studies (N=1).

More pronounced emphasis on scientific modes of analysis:

#### *Nomothetic Explanations*

##### i. Method of Agreement

The method of agreement seeks to identify the various combinations of relatively few causal factors that produce the same outcome across a range of cases.

##### ii. Method of Difference

The method of difference seeks to identify the various combinations of relatively few causal factors that produce differing outcomes across a range of cases.

More pronounced emphasis on descriptive modes of analysis:

#### *Interpretive/Descriptive Comparisons*

Particularizing comparisons examine a few cases where the author's objectives are less concerned with testing theory – that is, identifying and examining a select few causal variables that presumably account for differing outcomes among the chosen cases. Rather, the author is more interested in presenting a "thick description", or, sustained focus on detailed contrasts that emphasize complexity and reveal the peculiarities or distinctiveness of each case.

#### *Idiographic Explanations (N=1)*

Idiographic explanations approximate historical modes of explanation of single cases or events. Where the outcome is, by definition, invariant or unique because it occurs only once, idiographic explanation is an acceptable choice. Overarching historical processes

that transcend societal/national boundaries and are global in their reach may fall into this category. For example, the development of the world economy, the Cold War, the rise of international forms of political governance, and the evolution of the world state system would all qualify as unique, invariant processes that might arguably be explained historically, but not scientifically.

#### 4. Appropriate Case Selection

Choosing cases for comparison can conform to a number of rationales closely associated with the methods listed above.

For single case studies, unique historical events or historical processes make the idiographic mode of explanation the only possible approach. Nevertheless, you must arrive at your own judgment about whether the objects of explanation of your chosen case study are unique or invariant. Substantiate your reasoning whatever you decide. If you do not believe this to be true, specify what other kinds of cases that you imagine could be studied to produce instructive comparisons with the original one.

Select cases in particularizing comparisons commonly focus on extremely rare phenomenon in social contexts that vary dramatically. Descriptive comparisons suggest that too few cases appear in tandem with so many causal influences of potential significance to render the task of elaborating a convincing theoretical account problematic. As with single case studies, you must come to a reasoned opinion as to whether or not the possible set of applicable cases necessarily precludes the construction of a causal explanation in favor of an interpretive one. You may also reflect on whether or not an explanatory account, as opposed to a descriptive one, is warranted given the arguments presented in the study. Does it appear that a few variables explain the outcomes under consideration? Or, does the complexity of the cases render a theoretical approach impossible?

In studies that use the method of *agreement* to generate causal arguments about similar outcomes, discussing the question of sampling cases revolves around whether or not you imagine the author has a compelling argument about the *equivalence* of the outcomes in every case. Further, you may also suggest the addition or substitution of other cases that you imagine would strengthen or qualify the theoretical arguments of the study.

In studies that use the method of *difference* to generate causal arguments about dissimilar outcomes, discussing the question of sampling cases revolves around whether or not you imagine the author has a compelling argument about the *variance* of the outcomes in every case. And as with the method of agreement, you may also suggest the addition or substitution of other cases that you imagine would strengthen or qualify the theoretical arguments of the study.

**Recent Titles in  
Comparative and Historical Sociology**

**Sociology of Democracy and Authoritarianism**

Bratton, Michael and Nicolas Van de Walle. 1997. *Democratic Experiments in Africa: Regime Transition in Comparative Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.  
JQ1879.A15 B73 1997

Centeno, Miguel Angel. 2002. *Blood and Debt: War and the Nation-State in Latin America*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.  
F1410.5 .C46 2002

Collier, Ruth Berins. 1999. *Paths Toward Democracy: The Working Class and Elites in Western Europe and South America*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.  
JN94.A91 C62 1999

Collier, Ruth Berins, and David Collier. 1991. *Shaping the Political Arena: Critical Juncture, the Labor Movement, and Regime Dynamics in Latin America*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.  
AUG/CSC:HD8110.5 .C65 1991

Downing, Brian M. 1992. *The Military Revolution and Political Change: Origins of Democracy and Autocracy in Early Modern Europe*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.  
JN7 .D69 1991

Ekiert, Grzegorz. 1996. *The State Against Society: Political Crises and Their Aftermath in East Central Europe*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.  
HX240.7.A6 E44 1996

Ertman, Thomas. 1996. *The Birth of the Leviathan: Building States and Regimes in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.  
JN5 .E77 1997

Finer, S.E. 1997. *The History of Government, III: Empires, Monarchies, and the Modern State*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.  
JF51 .F57 1999 v. 1-3

Glenn, John K. 2001. *Framing Democracy: Civil Society and Civic Movements in Eastern Europe*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.  
JN96. A58 G58 2001

- Gould, Andrew. 1999. *Origins of Liberal Dominance: State, Church, and Party in Nineteenth Century Europe*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.  
JN94. A58 G68 1999
- Haggard, Stephan and Robert R. Kaufman. 1995. *The Political Economy of Democratic Transitions*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.  
JC423 .H29 1995
- Herbst, Jeffrey. 2000. *States and Power in Africa: Comparative Lessons in Authority and Control*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.  
JQ1875 .H47 2000
- Ikenberry, G. John. 2001. *After Victory: Institutions, Strategic Restraint, and the Rebuilding of Order after Major Wars*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.  
D363 .I46 2001
- Linz, Juan J. 1996. *Problems of Democratic Transition and Consolidation: Southern Europe, South America, and Post-Communist Europe*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.  
JC421.L56 1996
- Luebbert, Gregory M. 1991. *Liberalism, Fascism, or Social Democracy: Social Class and the Political Origins of Regimes in Interwar Europe*. New York: Oxford University Press.  
JN94. A2 L84 1991
- Mahoney, James. 2001. *The Legacies of Liberalism: Path Dependence and Political Regimes in Central America*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Press.  
JL1410. M34 2001
- Morgan, Edmund S. 1988. *Inventing the People: The Rise of Popular Sovereignty in England and America*. New York: WW Norton.  
JF1059.G7 M67 1988
- Rueschemeyer, Dietrich, Evelyne Huber Stephens, and John D. Stephens. 1992. *Capitalist Development and Democracy*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.  
JC423 .R78 1992
- Silberman, Bernard S. 1993. *Cages of Reason: The Rise of the Rational State in France, Japan, the United States, and Great Britain*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.  
JF1341 .S55 1993
- Waldner, David. 1999. *State-Building and Late Development*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.  
JC131 .W36 1999

Wood, Elisabeth Jean. 2000. *Forging Democracy From Below: Insurgent Transitions in South Africa and Brazil*. New York: Cambridge University Press.  
JQ1981. W66 2000

Yashar, Deborah J. 1997. *Demanding Democracy: Reform and Reaction in Costa Rica and Guatemala, 1870s-1950s*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.  
JL1456. Y37 1997

Young, Crawford. 1994. *The African Colonial State in Comparative Perspective*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.  
JV246 .Y68 1994

### **Sociology of Revolutions and Rebellions**

Armstrong, David. 1993. *Revolution and World Order: The Revolutionary State in International Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.  
JX3091 .A77 1993

Colburn, Forrest D. 1994. *The Vogue of Revolution in Poor Countries*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.  
JF60 .C645 1994

Farhi, Farideh. 1990. *States and Urban-Based Revolutions: Iran and Nicaragua*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.  
DS318.825 .F35 1990

Foran, John, ed. 2003. *The Future of Revolutions: Rethinking Radical Change in the Age of Globalization*. London: Zed Press.  
HM876. F88 2003

Goldstone, Jack A. 1991. *Revolution and Rebellion in the Early Modern World*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.  
D210 .G58 1991

Goldstone, Jack A., Tedd Robert Gurr, and Farrokh Moshiri, eds. 1991. *Revolutions of the Late Twentieth Century*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.  
D848 .R48 1991

Goodwin, Jeff. 2001. *No Other Way Out: States and Revolutionary Movements, 1945-1991*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.  
JC491. G64 2001

Halliday, Fred. 1999. *Revolution and World Politics*. London: Macmillan.  
JC491. H188 1999

Katz, Mark. 1997. *Revolution and Revolutionary Waves*. New York: St. Martin's Press.  
On order

Paige, Jeffrey M. 1975. *Agrarian Revolution: Social Movements and Export Agriculture in the Underdeveloped World*. New York: Free Press.  
HD1417. P34 1978

Paige, Jeffrey M. 1997. *Coffee and Power: Revolution and the Rise of Democracy in Central America*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.  
HD9199.C82 P35 1997

Parsa, Misagh. 2000. *States, Ideologies, and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of Iran, Nicaragua, and the Philippines*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.  
JC491. P36 2000

Tilly, Charles. 1993. *European Revolutions, 1492-1992*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.  
D214 .T54 1993

Selbin, Eric. 1993. *Modern Latin American Revolutions*. Boulder, CO: Westview.  
F1414.2 S39 1999

Walt, Stephen. 1996. *Revolution and War*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.  
D21.3 .W27 1996

Wickham-Crowley, Timothy. 1992. *Guerrillas and Revolution in Latin America: A Comparative Study of Insurgents and Regimes Since 1956*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.  
980 W637g

### **Sociology of Welfare States**

de Swaan, Abram. 1988. *In Care of the State: Health Care, Education, and Welfare in Europe and the USA in the Modern Era*. New York: Oxford University Press.  
HN373.5.S88 1988

Hicks, Alexander. 1999. *Social Democracy and Welfare Capitalism: A Century of Income Security Politics*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.  
HB846 .H53 1999

Huber, Evelyne and John D. Stephens. 2001. *Development and Crisis of the Welfare State: Parties and Policies in Global Markets*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.  
JC479. H83 2001

Mishra, Ramesh. 1990. *The Welfare State in Capitalist Society: Policies of Retrenchment and Maintenance in Europe, North America, and Australia*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

BCL: 361.6 M678q HAM: HN17.5 .M58 1990

O'Connor, Julia S., Ann Orloff and Sheila Shaver. 1999. *States, Markets, Families: Gender, Liberalism, and Social Policy in Australia, Canada, Great Britain, and the United States*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

HN17. 5. 0258 1999

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

HV700.G7 P43 1993

Rimlinger, Gaston V. 1971. *Welfare Policy and Industrialization in Europe, America, and Russia*. New York: Wiley.

HD7091. R48 1993

Swank, Duane. 2002. *Global Capital, Political Institutions, and Policy Change in Developed Welfare States*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

JC479 .S9 2002

### **Sociology of Economic Systems and the World System**

Chaudhry, Kiren Aziz. 1997. *The Price of Wealth: Economies and Institutions in the Middle East*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

HC415. 33. C49 1997

Guillen, Mauro F. 2001. *The Limits of Convergence: Globalization and Organizational Change in Argentina, South Korea, and Spain*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

HD70.A65 G84 2001

Haggard, Stephan. 1990. *Pathways from the Periphery: The Politics of Growth in the Newly Industrializing Countries*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

HC59.7 .H275 1990

Hopcroft, Rosemary L. 1999. *Regions, Institutions, and Agrarian Change in European History*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

HD1333. E85 H66 1999

Karl, Terry Lynn. 1997. *The Paradox of Plenty: Oil Booms and Petrol-States*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

HD9574.V42 K37 1997

Lachmann, Richard. 2000. *Capitalists in Spite of Themselves: Elite Conflict and Economic Transitions in Early Modern Europe*. New York: Oxford University Press.  
HC240 .L253 2000

Pomeranz, Kenneth. 2000. *The Great Divergence: Europe, China, and the Making of the Modern World Economy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.  
HC240 .P5965 2000

Richard, Alan and John Waterbury. 1990. *A Political Economy of the Middle East: State, Class, and Economic Development*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.  
HC415.15 .R53 1996

Stark, David and Laszlo Bruszt. 1998. *Postsocialist Pathways: Transforming Politics and Property in East Central Europe*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.  
HD4140.7 .S73 1998

Wade, Robert. 2004. *Governing the Market: Economic Theory and the Role of Government in East Asian Industrialization*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.  
HD3616. E182 W33 2004

### **Comparative Research on Related Subjects**

Bergquist, Charles W. 1986. *Labor in Latin America: Comparative Essays on Chile, Argentina, Venezuela, and Columbia*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.  
HD8256 .B47 1986

Brubaker, Rogers. 1992. *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.  
JN2919 .B78 1992

Charrad, Mournira. 2001. *States and Women's Rights: The Making of Postcolonial Tunisia, Algeria, and Morocco*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.  
HQ1236.5 A355 C43 2001

Clark, Samuel. 1995. *State and Status: The Rise of the State and Aristocratic Power in Western Europe*. Montreal and Kingston, Canada: McGill-Queens University Press.  
HT653. E9 C53 1995

Dobbin, Frank. 1994. *Forging Industrial Policy: The United States, Britain, and France in the Railway Age*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.  
HE2757. D63 1994

Htun, Mala. 2003. *Sex and the State: Abortion, Divorce, and the Family under Latin American Dictatorships and Democracies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

HQ590. H78 2003

Lustick, Ian. 1993. *Unsettled States, Disputed Lands; Britain and Ireland, France and Algeria, Israel and West Bank-Gaza*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.  
JX4088 .L87 1993

Marx, Anthony W. 1998. *Making Race and Nation: A Comparison of the United States, South Africa, and Brazil*. New York: Cambridge University Press.  
HT1521 .M283 1998

Seidman, G. 1994. *Manufacturing Militance: Workers Movements in Brazil and South Africa, 1970-1985*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Steinmo, Sven. 1993. *Taxation and Democracy: Swedish, British and American Approaches to Financing the Modern State*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.  
HJ2305 .S85 1993