

**HIST 2732: Power & Inequality Core Course**  
**Fall 2016, University of Pittsburgh**

Mondays, 1-3:30 pm

Instructor: Lara Putnam, [LEP12@pitt.edu](mailto:LEP12@pitt.edu)

Office Hours: Mondays 10 am-noon and by appointment  
Posvar 3702

How have scholars approached the study of power and inequality? How has historical research incorporated and added to theoretical insights coming from other disciplines in this regard? This seminar focuses on four distinct dimensions of power and inequality—class, race/ethnicity, gender, and global disparities—each of which has inspired wide-ranging academic debate on definitions, mechanisms, and the possibility of change. We will survey key scholarly interventions generated by historians, sociologists, anthropologists, feminist theorists, critical geographers, and others, giving priority to the last two decades of theoretical debate and empirical investigation.

How are systematic patterns of inequality generated and sustained? What roles do cultural beliefs, social practice, political institutions, and macroeconomics play? How do different kinds of inequality—such as those around class, racism, ethnicity, and gender—interact? How do differently scaled systems of inequality—within the household, community, nation, and international system—interrelate?

This course counts towards certificate programs in Cultural Studies, Gender Sexuality and Women's Studies, and Latin American Studies.

Course calendar:

1. Aug. 29: Introduction
2. Sept. 12: Class: Marx and Marxian debates
  - a. Anthony Giddens and David Held, eds., *Classes, Power, and Conflict: Classical and Contemporary Debates* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982).
3. Sept. 19: Class: Thompson and Thompsonian approaches. Note: Lisa Lindsay will join our seminar discussion of her book.
  - a. E. P. Thompson, "Preface," in *The Making of the English Working Class* (IICA, 1963), 9-14.
  - b. Emilia Viotti da Costa, "Experience versus Structures: New Tendencies in the History of Labor and the Working Class in Latin America: What Do We Gain? What Do We Lose?" *International Labor and Working-Class History* 36 (Fall, 1989): 3-24.
  - c. Lisa Lindsay, *Working with Gender: Wage Labor and Social Change in Southwestern Nigeria* (Heinemann, 2003).
  - d. Complementary reading (not required): Jeff Gould, *To Lead as Equals: Rural Protest and Political Consciousness in Chinandega, Nicaragua, 1912-1979* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1990).

FIRST COMMENTARY DUE

4. Sept. 26: Gender: Third-wave feminism and its theorizations. Note: Liz Hutchison will join seminar discussion of her book.
  - a. Sherry B. Ortner, "Is Female to Male as Nature Is to Culture?" *Feminist Studies* 1, no. 2 (1972): 5-31.
  - b. Heidi Hartman, "Capitalism, Patriarchy, and Job Segregation by Sex," *Signs* 1, no. 3 (1976), excerpted in Giddens and Held, *Classes, Power, and Conflict*, 446-69.
  - c. Jane Humphries, "Class Struggle and the Persistence of Working-Class Family," *Cambridge Journal of Economics* 1 (1977): 241-58, rpt. in Giddens and Held, *Classes, Power, and Conflict*, 470-90.
  - d. Audre Lorde, "The Master's Tools Will Never Dismantle the Master's House," in *Sister Outsider* (The Crossing Press Feminist Series, 1984), 110-13.
  - e. Joan Wallach Scott, "Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis," *American Historical Review* 91, no. 5 (1986): 1053-75.
  - f. Elizabeth Quay Hutchison, *Labors Appropriate to Their Sex: Gender, Labor, and Politics in Urban Chile, 1900-1930* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2004).
5. Oct. 3: Gender through the discursive turn
  - a. Judith Butler, "Preface" and "Introduction," in *Bodies that Matter* (Routledge, 1993), viii-xxx.
  - b. Kathleen Canning, "Feminist History After the Linguistic Turn," *Historicizing Discourse and Experience*, *Signs* 19, no. 2 (1994): 368-404.
  - c. Linda Nicholson, "Interpreting Gender," *Signs* 20, no. 1 (1994): 79-105.
  - d. Kathleen Canning, "The Body as Method? Reflections on the Place of the Body in Gender History," *Gender & History* 11, no. 3 (1999): 499-513.
  - e. Afsaneh Najmabadi, *Women with Mustaches and Men without Beards: Gender and Sexual Anxieties of Iranian Modernity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005).
  - f. Complementary reading (not required): remainder of Kathleen Canning, *Gender History in Practice: Historical Perspectives on Bodies, Class, and Citizenship* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2006)

## SECOND COMMENTARY DUE

6. Oct. 10: Race/Ethnicity: Beginning with ethnicity
  - a. Frederik Barth, "Introduction," in *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries. The Social Organization of Culture Difference*, ed. Fredrik Barth (Boston: Little, Brown, 1969), 9-38.
  - b. John L. Comaroff, "Of Totemism and Ethnicity: Consciousness, Practice, and the Signs of Inequality," *Ethnos* 52 (1987): 301-23.
  - c. Katherine Verdery, "Ethnicity, Nationalism, and State-Making: Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: Past and Future," in *The Anthropology of Ethnicity: Beyond "Ethnic Groups and Boundaries,"* ed. H. Vermeulen and C. Govers (Amsterdam: Spinhaus, 1994), 33-58.
  - d. Richard P. Jenkins, *Rethinking Ethnicity* [orig. pub. 1997], 2nd ed. (New York: SAGE Publications, 2008).
7. NOTE: MEET TUESDAY Oct. 18: Race/Ethnicity: Beginning with racism

- a. Barbara J. Fields, "Slavery, Race, and Ideology in the United States of America," *New Left Review* 181 (1990): 95-118.
  - b. Excerpts from George Fredrickson, *Racism: A Short History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002).
  - c. Eduardo Bonilla-Silva, *Racism without Racists: Color-Blind Racism and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in America*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. (Rowman and Littlefield, 2009).
  - d. Complementary reading (not required): George Fredrickson, *Racism: A Short History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002).
8. Oct. 25: Different approaches to multidimensional analysis
- a. Kimberlé Crenshaw, "Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics," *University of Chicago Legal Forum* (1989): 139–67.
  - b. Nancy A. Hewitt, "Compounding Differences," *Feminist Studies* 18, no. 2 (1992): 313-26.
  - c. Viranjini Munasinghe, "Culture Creators and Culture Bearers: The Interface Between Race and Ethnicity in Trinidad," *Transforming Anthropology* 6, nos. 1-2 (1997): 72-86.
  - d. Nancy Leys Stepan, "Race, Gender, Science, and Citizenship," *Gender & History* 10, no. 1 (1998): 26-52.
  - e. Rogers Brubaker and Frederick J. Cooper, "Beyond Identity," *Theory and Society* 29 (2000): 1-47.
  - f. Hae Yeon Choo and Myra Marx Ferree, "Practicing Intersectionality in Sociological Research: A Critical Analysis of Inclusions, Interactions, and Institutions in the Study of Inequalities," *Sociological Theory* 28, no. 2 (2010): 129-49.

### THIRD COMMENTARY DUE

9. Oct. 31: Spatial disparities: Critical geography and urban sociology. Note: Waverly Duck will join seminar discussion of his book.
- a. Excerpts from Neil Smith, *Uneven Development: Nature, Capital, and the Production of Space* [orig. pub. 1984] 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2008).
  - b. Doreen Massey, "Space, time and political responsibility in the midst of global inequality," *erdkunde* 60, no. 2 (2006): 89-95.
  - c. Tom Slater, "Your Life Chances Affect Where You Live: A Critique of the 'Cottage Industry' of Neighbourhood Effects Research," *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* (2013).
  - d. Waverly Duck, *No Way Out: Precarious Living in the Shadow of Poverty and Drug Dealing* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2015).
10. Nov. 7: Global disparities: Dependency and world-systems. Note: Roger Rouse will join us to lead discussion of Wallerstein.
- a. Joseph Love, "Origins of Dependency Analysis," *Journal of Latin American Studies* 22, no. 1 (1990): 143-68.
  - b. Immanuel Wallerstein, *World-Systems Analysis: An Introduction* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2004).
11. Nov. 14: World systems theory: Social historians respond
- a. Frederick Cooper, Allen F. Isaacman, Florencia C. Mallon, William Roseberry, and Steve J. Stern, *Confronting Historical Paradigms: Peasants, Labor, and the*

*Capitalist World System in Africa and Latin America* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1993).

- b. Frederick Cooper, "What Is 'Globalization' Good For? An African Historian's Perspective," *African Affairs* 100 (2001): 189-213.
- c. Frederick Cooper, "Modernity," in *Colonialism in Question: Theory, Knowledge, History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005), 113-51.

#### FOURTH COMMENTARY DUE

12. Nov. 21: Global disparities: Economic historians look east and west

- a. Kenneth Pomeranz, *The Great Divergence: China, Europe, and the Making of the Modern World Economy*, rev. ed. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001).
- b. Patrick O'Brien, "Ten Years of Debate on the Origins of the Great Divergence," (review no. 1008), *Reviews in History*, 2010.  
<http://www.history.ac.uk/reviews/review/1008>
- c. Leo Lucassen, "Working Together: New Directions in Global Labour History," *Journal of Global History* 11, no. 1 (March 2016): 66-87.

13. Nov. 28: Global disparities: Economic historians look north and south

- a. Charles Kenny and David Williams, "What Do We Know About Economic Growth? Or, Why Don't We Know Very Much?" *World Development* 29, no. 1 (2001): 1-22.
- b. Stanley Engerman and Kenneth Sokoloff, "Factor Endowments, Inequality, and Paths of Development Among New World Economies," *NBER Working Paper* 9259, 2002.
- c. Daron Acemoglu, Simon Johnson, and James Robinson, "Reversal of Fortune: Geography and Institutions in the Making of the Modern World Income Distribution," *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 118 (2002): 1231-94.
- d. Complementary reading (not required): Robert C. Allen, *Global Economic History: A Very Short Introduction* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011).

14. Dec. 5: Power, inequality, and scales of analysis

- a. Roberto Patricio Korzeniewicz and Timothy Patrick Moran, *Unveiling Inequality: A World-Historical Perspective* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2009).

15. Dec. 12: No class meeting

#### FIFTH COMMENTARY DUE

#### **Course requirements and grade weighting:**

First commentary: 5%

Second, third, and fourth commentaries: 10% each

Fifth commentary: 15%

Discussion leadership: 10%

Weekly participation: 40%

#### *Participation*

As in any graduate seminar, active and collegial participation in class discussions is essential.

Also as with every graduate seminar, I presume students will only miss class under highly exceptional circumstances involving medical or family emergencies.

#### *Discussion leadership:*

Each student must volunteer to lead or co-lead discussion for at least one week. Leadership requires preparing questions that you will use to lead the first 20 minutes or so of group discussion. You may wish to circulate your questions to your fellow students in advance. You may also wish to distribute in class an outline of the key points of the week's readings as you see them.

*Extra discussion leadership:*

If you are someone who finds it difficult to jump into seminar discussions, or prefers to hang back and listen rather than sharing your own ideas throughout a session, you should consider volunteering to serve as discussion leader on more than one day. I'll count this as extra credit toward your participation grade. Come talk to me if you have questions about this (or anything else).

*Writing:*

Students will complete five short commentaries, each around 1500 words in length, that must draw connections between the various readings assigned that week and be submitted by 11 pm on the day before we meet. (Email submission is encouraged. You are responsible for making sure emailed submissions have been received. If I don't acknowledge receipt, follow up.) Late submissions will not be accepted except in cases of medical or family emergency.

Each commentary should address the core question/s raised by the multiple required readings for this and the previous weeks in this cluster. Are all the authors urging us to answer the same questions? To what extent are the approaches proposed as routes to answering those questions the same, or different? To what extent are the various authors' proposals complementary, and to what extent contradictory? Do you find certain authors' proposals particularly persuasive (or particularly unpersuasive), and if so, why?

NOTE FOR GRADUATE STUDENTS IN HISTORY PREPARING A COMPS FIELD IN POWER AND INEQUALITY: Rather than writing a fifth paper focused only on the readings on global disparities, you may choose to incorporate revised versions of your earlier short papers into a 12 to 15-page essay that synthesizes all the readings covered by this course, and serves as a first draft of your comprehensive exam essay in this field. If you are considering this option, discuss it with me in advance.

*Readings*

Assigned books are available for purchase at the Book Center and also on reserve at Hillman Library. To access articles in digitized form, connect to <http://www.library.pitt.edu>, select Reserves and then click Course reserves, choose "Putnam, Lara" from the drop down Instructor box, and click search. Click on E-RESERVES FOR POWER & INEQUALITY. Then click on E-RESERVES LINK. The password will be given in class.

Key terms and guidelines for written work appear below.

## WRITING FROM WRITTEN SOURCES

### Key Concepts and Guidelines for Citation

**Secondary sources** are descriptions or analyses written by authors removed in time or space from the process, event, or person we wish to study. Examples: an encyclopedia article, a textbook, a scholarly article, a college student's essay, a newspaper article.

**Primary sources** are descriptions or analyses written by authors who are personally engaged with the process, event, or person we wish to study. Examples: a diary, a government agent's report, an eyewitness account, a census.

**Claims** are statements that *describe* large-scale patterns or the direction of change over time (*descriptive* claims) or *explain* the impact of one thing on another (*causal* claims).

**Evidence** is concrete information on which all observers would agree. Evidence may take the form of a quotation from a participant whose views you are describing; a statistic; an image. Statements published by scholarly experts can also be used as evidence.

**“To put into your own words”** refers to using new vocabulary to express someone else's ideas. Changing the order of words, changing the form or tense of verbs, or changing adverbs into adjectives with the same root word (e.g., “retroactively” to “retroactive”) does not constitute using new vocabulary. In all of these cases, the key vocabulary is simply replicated from the original text. These kinds of changes do not count as “putting it into your own words.”

**Key vocabulary:** The nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs selected by an author to express a specific meaning. For example, in the sentence: “Racial ideologies are employed to justify retroactively historical inequalities in the distribution of political power and material resources,” the key vocabulary words are *racial ideologies, employed, justify, retroactively, historical, inequalities, distribution, political power, and material resources*.

**Quotation** reproduces someone else's words. Any time you replicate four or more consecutive words from a written source, you must encase these words in quotation marks. Material encased in quotation marks must be precisely identical to the original. An ellipsis ( ... ) must be used to mark points where you have skipped over text from the original, and brackets ( [ ] ) must encase any new words or letters that you have added. (If nine lines or more of a written source are to be quoted, they should be preceded and followed by paragraph returns and indented on both the right and left sides. Quotation marks are not employed in this long-quote format.) All quotations must be followed by a citation in parenthetical or footnote/endnote form indicating the source of the quotation, including the page number on which the original text appears in that source.

**Legitimate paraphrase** replicates an idea an author expresses in 1-3 sentences in 1-3 sentences of your own, with no more than one-fourth of your key vocabulary drawn from the original text. Paraphrases are not encased in quotation marks. All paraphrases must be followed by a citation in parenthetical or footnote/endnote form indicating the source of the quotation, including the page number on which the original text appears in that source. Ideas that an author expresses in 4 or more sentences may not be paraphrased: they must be summarized or quoted.

**Illegitimate paraphrase** replicates an idea an author expresses in 1-3 sentences in 1-3 sentences of your own, with two-thirds or more of your key vocabulary drawn from the original text. Illegitimate paraphrases are unacceptable regardless of the presence or absence of a citation to the original source.

**Borderline paraphrase** replicates an idea an author expresses in 1-3 sentences in 1-3 sentences of your own, with between one-fourth and two-thirds of your key vocabulary drawn from the original text. A single borderline paraphrase in a multi-page essay is not cause for alarm (although it should be eliminated once noticed). Multiple borderline paraphrases within a multi-page essay are unacceptable, regardless of the presence or absence of citations to the original sources. Furthermore, multiple borderline paraphrases are evidence of a serious underlying problem: they indicate that the student's writing strategy relies far too heavily on selecting and reproducing individual passages from the text under consideration.

**Parenthetical citation.** Supplies the author's last name and the page number/s referenced within parentheses, located within the text following a quotation, paraphrase, or summary. Must be accompanied by an alphabetical list of Works Cited, located at the end of your text, which gives full publication data for all sources cited. Any of the variations on parenthetical citation format listed in the Chicago Manual of Style or MLA Handbook may be used in this course, but whichever variation is chosen must be used consistently throughout any given paper.

*Example:* The author argues that ethnicity must be understood in relation to nationalism and with reference to modern processes of state-formation (Verdery, 43).

Works Cited

Verdery, Katherine. "Ethnicity, Nationalism, and State-Making." In The Anthropology of Ethnicity: Beyond 'Ethnic Groups and Boundaries'. Edited by Hans Vermeulen and Cora Govers. Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis, 1994.

**Footnote or endnote citation** Supplies the author's name, full publication information, and the page number/s referenced in a numbered note located either at the bottom of the page or at the end of your essay. The footnote or endnote marker (i.e., the small raised number) immediately follows the quotation, paraphrase, or summary. Subsequent references to the same source may supply only the author's last name and page number. Any of the variations on footnote or endnote citation format listed in the Chicago Manual of Style or MLA Handbook may be used in this course, but whichever variation is chosen must be used consistently throughout any given paper.

*Example:* The author argues that ethnicity must be understood in relation to nationalism and with reference to modern processes of state-formation.<sup>1</sup> In this her argument echoes the earlier work of anthropologist John Comaroff, who likewise saw patterns of hierarchical political incorporation as fundamental to the creation of ethnicity.<sup>2</sup> Unlike Comaroff, though, Verdery gives great importance to modern states' attempts to impose cultural homogeneity.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Katherine Verdery, "Ethnicity, Nationalism, and State-Making," in The Anthropology of Ethnicity: Beyond 'Ethnic Groups and Boundaries', ed. Hans Vermeulen and Cora Govers (Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis, 1994), 43.

<sup>2</sup> John Comaroff, "Of Ethnicity and Totemism," in Ethnos 52 (1987): 301-23.

<sup>3</sup> Verdery, "Ethnicity, Nationalism," 43-49.