

TIMELINES



The History of Sociology as a Bi-Focal Project (Part 2)

Message from the Chair

Charles Camic, Northwestern University

In the November 2008 issue of the section newsletter, I tried to draw attention to the need for historians of sociology to devote greater effort to studying the history of the discipline's various subfields. In this issue, I would like to elaborate this argument by spelling out what I think we stand to gain by turning more of our focus in this direction.

Before I do so, however, I would say again that I am juxtaposing this focus on the history of sociology's subfields to the dominant focus in the existing literature of the history of sociology: namely, the prevailing concern with the major intellectual traditions, schools of thought, ideas, theories, concepts, and (more recently) research methods that figured in the development of Sociology-at-Large and (by extension) the concern in the literature with the various thinkers and institutions that took part in these major historical developments. As I hope my previous editorial made clear, my point is not to take even the slightest issue with research on the history of sociology-at-large, but rather to urge that we conjoin scholarship in this vein with more systematic research into the development of the discipline's specialty areas—so that the history of sociology becomes a more thoroughly bi-focal project.

Since the gains that we derive from the study of the history of sociology-at-large are familiar to HoS members, however, I would like to like to comment briefly on the advantages that I see as likely to accrue from greater attention to the development of sociology's subfields.

In part, I offer these comments by way of background to the two sessions that I have organized and am chairing at our meeting in San Francisco this August. The first of these sessions is entitled "Deconstructing Sociological Constructions of American Community" and deals with how the sociological study of communities in the United States has changed over the course of the last 75 years; the second is entitled "Historicizing Historical Sociology" and examines research in historical sociology before and after the area became a recognized subfield. Now, if we use the ASA's current listing of 46 sections as a rough metric of the number of subfields in the discipline, these two sessions open a historical window onto only a small range of the specialty areas of sociology. But my claim is precisely that, when it comes to subfields, there are vast territories that still lie in wait for careful examination by historians of sociology. What is more, research on the development of subfields promises, I think, several important benefits for historians of sociology.

First, research of this kind would enable historians of the discipline to investigate sociology at the level where most sociologists, now as in the past, actually practice sociology. The 46 sections that currently make up the ASA are not empty shells; they represent the research and teaching interests that occupy most sociologists, day in and day out, for most of their professional lives as they study population, immigration, families, communities, occupations, education, religion, culture, law, medicine,

Continued on page 9

INSIDE

2
SAN FRANCISCO
SESSIONS

10
AWARDS

10
ELECTIONS

11
OFFICERS AND
COMMITTEES

Newsletter editor
Jeff Pooley, Muhlenberg College
pooley@muhlenberg.edu

Sessions

History of sociology in San Francisco

Section Meetings

Business Meeting (including awards presentation)

Monday, August 10

8:30 am to 9:30 am

Parc 55 Hotel

Council Meeting

Monday, August 10

9:30 am to 10:10 am

Parc 55 Hotel

Reception

Monday, August 10

6:30 pm to 8:10 pm

Parc 55 Hotel

The Section's reception, hosted jointly with the Section on Comparative and Historical Sociology and the Section on Political Sociology.

Saturday, August 8

Issues in Classical Theory (Roundtable)

10:30 am to 11:30 am

Hilton San Francisco

Vincent Jeffries (California State University-Northridge), "Holistic Public Sociology: Pitirim A. Sorokin's Analysis of Culture, Social Structure, and Altruism"

A holistic model of the discipline of sociology is presented in Michael Burawoy's Presidential Address to the American Sociological Association. This model defines sociological practice as consisting of four forms: professional, policy, critical, public. The system of thought of Pitirim A. Sorokin is an exemplar of this model of holistic sociology. Sorokin's ideas are considered as an example of the interdependence of the forms of practice and how they reinforce each other to provide a more complete and powerful system of sociology.

Paul Stanley Kasun (University of Texas, Austin), "Mead's 'Me' and 'Generalized Other' in the Thought of the Young Marx, Emphasis on Religion"

One-hundred and sixty years after the publication of *The Communist Manifesto*, Marx remains relevant to politics and sociology. As Marx predicted, it appears religion continues to side with the Bourgeoisie over the Proletariat in his days as well as ours. In this paper, I attempt to better understand Marx's atheism, so as to help make Marx's other ideas innocuous for religious believers. I do this in five steps. I give some background information on Marx. Second, I give brief information on Friedrich Hegel. Third, I briefly summarize the social psychology of George Herbert Mead. Fourth, I use Mead's basic theoretical concepts of the "me" and the "generalized other" to get a better picture of how Marx forged his worldview. This fourth step contains two parts. In the first part, I use Mead's concepts to examine the Young Hegelians and Marx's general ideas on religion. Second, I use Mead's concepts to examine how Marx forged his worldview from his interactions and relationships with the Young Hegelians. In my last section, I pull together these ideas and offer where my paper may generate enthusiasm for more sociological research.

Leon H. Warshay (Wayne State University), "Neglected Theorists Because of Gender, Race, and Changing Political Contexts: An Argument for Herbert Spencer"

Recent efforts to make up for the neglect of some early sociologists, such as Harriet Martineau, because of gender prejudice and of others, such as William E.B. DuBois, because of race, have overlooked the neglect of Herbert Spencer. While changing intellectual fashion has undoubtedly been involved in the neglect of Spencer; ideological prejudice (such as depicting him a "conservative") and incorrectly typing him as a nominalist and reductionist appear also to have been the case. Spencer's intellectual contributions tower over those of, say, Auguste Comte, this being said without minimizing Comte's contributions to the discipline. Among Spencer's many efforts, his contributions in the later years of the nineteenth century on both sides of the Atlantic, in three chapters in his *Synthetic Philosophy* and in other writings, helped establish sociology as a legitimate discipline. Ideology in sociological theory is inevitable but attempts to lessen its influence in ignoring and/or dismissing the sociology of so towering a figure as Spencer ought to be made. Ideology is difficult to deal with but substantive errors, such as depicting him as a nominalist, are clearly erroneous and ought to be corrected.

Sessions

Continued

Ryu Sung Hee (Korea University), "The Max Weber's Sociological Methodology as understanding historical events"

It has been 89 years since Max Weber died. Many of the studies achieved on Weber's Theory that part of sociology, law, politics, history and even economy. So, Weber was known as the last general genius in sociological part. But Weber's influence on other academic areas caused many disputes which connected to Weber's theory. Especially, Weber's methodology has aroused a controversy for a long time. Even though, Weber's methodology influenced positively many of the study fields. The matter is beyond dispute. Weber's methodology view was so complicated and difficult. If understand of Weber's point of view, should premise the apprehension of German history school and national economy's view. And we should understand what difference between marxism and German historical philosophy. But, In the paper, I will show to minimum's access to Weber's methodology. Instead of, in this paper, with Max Weber's methodology view, I willing to understand historical events. So, this paper attempts to show that understanding Weber's methodology, accessing to historical events (as Weber's methodology), and providing specific example (South Korea's candlelight vigil).

The roundtable is sponsored by the Theory Section.

Historical Sociology

10:30 am to 12:10 pm

Parc 55 Hotel

Roger A. Salerno (Pace University), "Was There A Black Chicago School?"

Little has been written on the importance of black sociology at the University of Chicago. While Chicago had been a scene of segregated dormitories, fraternities and social clubs, the few black students who attended the University of Chicago's graduate program in sociology excelled and became important international figures. Many came under the strong influence of teachers such as Robert E. Park, Ernest Burgess, W. Lloyd Warner and Louis Wirth. At Chicago's premier graduate program in sociology Charles S. Johnson, E. Franklin Frasier, Allison Davis, Hyland Lewis, Horace Cayton and St. Clair Drake were among those to do groundbreaking work on the black urban experience. Interestingly only one of the aforementioned ever held a full-time academic post at the University despite that academy's progressive leanings and pioneering ventures into the

study of race relations. In a way all were exiles. Does the work of this group share common elements? In what way does their work reflect Chicago school sociology? Why has it been critically neglected and excluded from the traditional image of Chicago school scholarship?

The session is an Open Refereed Roundtable.

Sunday, August 9

Deconstructing Sociological Constructions of American Community

8:30 am to 10:10 am

Hilton San Francisco

President: Charles Camic (Northwestern University)

Discussant: David Grazian (University of Pennsylvania)

Zandria Felice Robinson (Northwestern University), "Looking Away, Looking Back: Black Communities in the Urban South, 1940-2000"

Nicole P. Marwell (City University of New York-Baruch College), "Excavating a Wrong Turn in the Chicago School Approach to the Study of Community (1940-2000): What Urban Sociologists Should Have Learned from Morris Janowitz"

David Paul Haney (University of Texas-Austin), "Out of Dystopia: American Sociology and Popular Conceptions of Suburbanization in the 1950s and 1960s"

Carol Greenhouse (Princeton University), "Communities Without Publics: Turning Points in Late 20th-Century U.S. Ethnography"

Sessions

Continued

Social Thought: New Perspectives

12:30 pm to 2:10 pm

Parc 55 Hotel

Presider: Marcel Fournier (Université de Montréal)

Richard Swedberg (Cornell University) & Wendelin Reich (Uppsala University-Sweden), "Georg Simmel's Aphorisms"

In this paper we present and analyze Georg Simmel's contribution to a special genre, that of the aphorism. Simmel wrote around 300 aphorisms, most of which were published after his death thanks to the work of his close friend Gertrud Kantorowicz. Through a rough content analysis we suggest that Simmel's aphorisms deal with topics such as Man, love, art, philosophy and *Lebensphilosophie*. Simmel was very skillful in constructing aphorisms, a skill that primarily relies on the capacity of the author to compress some observation into a minimal number of words (form) and a minimal number of thoughts (content). We also speculate that Simmel himself was attracted to the genre of aphorisms for the same reason that he said his contemporaries were. This is that the aphorism hints at unknown worlds—which in Simmel's case was closely related to his view of Life.

Chad Alan Goldberg (University of Wisconsin-Madison), "Durkheimian Sociology as a Response to French Anti-Semitism"

The paper argues that European sociology and European anti-Semitism emerged in response to the same revolutionary changes and in dialogue (sometimes explicit, but more often implicit) with each other. Support for this thesis is provided by a case study of one sociologist, Emile Durkheim, in a single country, France. Reactionary and radical forms of anti-Semitism are distinguished and systematically contrasted to the sociological perspective that Durkheim was developing. On the one hand, Durkheim's remarks about the Jews directly addressed anti-Semitic assumptions about them and their relationship to modernity. On the other hand, Durkheim was engaged in a reinterpretation of the French Revolution and its historical legacies that indirectly challenged other tenets of French anti-Semitism. In other words, Durkheim not only confronted anti-Semitic claims about the Jews and their role in French society; he also challenged anti-Semitism in a roundabout way by showing that its tenets were derived from and rested upon a fundamentally flawed understanding of the revolution to which it was, in part, a response. In sum, Durkheim's work contains direct and indirect responses to reactionary and radical forms of

anti-Semitism, and together these responses form a coherent alternative vision of the relationship between Jews and modernity.

Lawrence T. Nichols (West Virginia University), "The Russianness of Sorokin's 'Deviance': Historical and Cultural Context"

Although many historians of sociology in the U.S. have examined the career of Pitirim A. Sorokin, most (with the conspicuous exception of Lewis Coser) have not recognized fundamental linkages between his American publications and his formative years in Russia and the early Soviet Union. The absence of such contextual understanding is arguably a fundamental reason behind the widespread perception of Sorokin as a marginal, even "deviant" figure in social science. The present paper attempts to show how Sorokin's Russian background shaped both stylistic and substantive features of his work. If successful, this may provide a basis for increased dialogue on this topic among sociologists in the U.S., as well as in Russia, where there has in recent years been a "rediscovery" and celebration of Sorokin.

Vicky M. MacLean (Middle Tennessee State University) & Joyce E. Williams (Professor Emeritus Texas Woman's University), "U.S. Settlement Sociology in the Progressive Era: Neighborhood Guilds, Feminist Pragmatism and the Social Gospel"

An understanding of the history of settlement sociology is critical to an understanding of the early roots of American sociology. Between the 1880s and 1920s, when the discipline was first coming to life in the United States, sociology was not confined to the academy but in fact enjoyed a presence in public practice and discourse. In this paper, we trace the development of three distinct models of social settlements differentiated by their philosophical orientations, strategies for social change, and their unique contributions to progressive social reform. Neighborhood guilds were committed to the philosophy of local empowerment; the key to reform was the organization of poor urban citizens into social units in a system of mutual responsibility based on ethical principles. Feminist pragmatism with its emphasis on democracy and social ethics philosophically informed social settlements founded by college-educated women. This philosophy promoted the authentic development of the "neighborly relation" in order to make practical and meaningful changes in the living conditions of immigrants and urban dwellers. Finally the social gospel model of settlement work embraced Christian sociology, a means for transforming the structural barriers to social justice envisaged as the kingdom of God on earth.

Sessions

Continued

Wendy J. Harrod (Iowa State University), "The Impact of Wrong's 'Oversocialized Conception of Man in Modern Sociology' A Citation Analysis"

Dennis H. Wrong's (1961) "The oversocialized conception of man in modern sociology" is one of the most-cited articles ever published in *American Sociological Review*. I collected citation data from Web of Science, and analyzed the bibliometric impact of this paper across time, place, and discipline. Results show that Wrong's paper is a "citation classic," with 450 citations, and impact that continues to be strong even 47 years after it first appeared. Most citations come from authors with affiliations in North America or Europe, and most citing journals cover sociology or another social science. High citation counts, however, do not necessarily reflect high conceptual impact. I considered the possibility, opined by Wrong (1983) himself, that the "oversocialized" paper is popular because it is often misread. I coded and content analyzed a sample of 48 citing papers, and found support for Wrong's explanation. Most citing papers ignore the Freudian grounding of Wrong's argument, and use "oversocialized" to mean an approach that overemphasizes structure and underemphasizes agency.

University), "Nazi Germany and the Transformation of German and American Sociology"

Ann Shola Orloff (Northwestern University), "The Three Waves of Historical Sociology"

Julia Adams (Yale University), "James Coleman, Historical Sociologist"

In this session, historians of sociology focus on the subfield of historical sociology, examining defining moments in the subfield's development, how the subfield has changed overtime, and possible future lines of development. Co-sponsored by the Section on Comparative and Historical Sociology.

Boundary Work and Rhetorical Demarcations (Roundtable)

2:30 pm to 3:30 pm

Hilton San Francisco

Kyle Siler (Cornell University) & David Strang, "A Structural Content Analysis of *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1956-2007"

This paper analyzes how articles in *Administrative Science Quarterly* (ASQ)—the flagship journal in organization studies—have changed over the course of development of its scholarly community, theories and methods. Early articles tended to be essays theoretical and discursive in nature, as scholars attempted to define, justify and demarcate the nascent field. Over time, essays increasingly were replaced by research reports, which focused on presenting new empirical research interpreted by a growing base of theories, analyzed via a variety of empirical tools appropriated by the coalescing scholarly community. Despite this increasing empirical focus, the proportion of text and space devoted to the discussion of results has continually dwindled. Over time, larger proportions of text and space were devoted to theories, as ideas and past research continue to be formulated and assimilated into the scholarly community at rates faster than countervailing forces of creative destruction. Increasing text and space are also devoted to discussions of methods, which increased in quantitative scope and complexity. The prominent methods and units of analysis have changed continually, with primary foci and niches emerging. What is valued as research, and how scholarly work has been communicated has been a historically fluid entity in ASQ, and to some degree by extension, organization studies in general. This article tracks these changes and provides a new model for examining and understanding the

Monday, August 10

Business Meeting (including awards presentation)

8:30 am to 9:30 am

Parc 55 Hotel

Council Meeting

9:30 am to 10:10 am

Parc 55 Hotel

Historicizing Historical Sociology

10:30 am to 12:10 pm

Parc 55 Hotel

President: Charles Camic (Northwestern University)

Discussant: Alan Sica (Pennsylvania State University)

Craig Calhoun (Social Science Research Council),
"Historical Sociology before It Became a Subfield"

George Steinmetz (University of Michigan) & Daniel
Aaron Sherwood (Graduate Faculty of New School

Sessions

Continued

development of a scholarly community, its profession and knowledge.

Brian Douglas Dick (University of California, Davis), "The Rhetorical Demarcation of the Boundaries of Physics"

This paper explores the ways in which the boundaries of science are negotiated by examining the debate over superstring theory. Superstring theory emerged in the mid-1980s as a popular approach for overcoming the limitations of the standard model, specifically the lack of a quantum theory of gravity. However, superstring theory quickly became a subject of controversy because of its inability to be tested experimentally. My analysis of the controversy frames it as an episode of boundary work (Gieryn 1983; 1999) in science, where the divisions between science and non-science or distinctions within science (such as between disciplines) are the result of their ongoing rhetorical demarcation (Taylor 1996). I argue that traditional criteria for demarcation, such as falsification or scientific norms, are not universal ways of defining science, but are instead rhetorical resources for actors to draw upon during a scientific controversy.

The roundtable is sponsored by the Section on Science, Knowledge & Technology.

History of Sociology

4:30 pm to 6:10 pm

Parc 55 Hotel

Presider: Marcel Fournier (Université de Montréal)

Peter Beilharz, "Miss Craig goes to Chicago"

Jean Martin (*nee* Jean Craig) was the founding mother of Australian sociology. She trained in Anthropology with A.P. Elkin at the University of Sydney, conducting pioneering work into rural sociology at the age of 22. In 1947, she travelled to the University of Chicago. Her subsequent interests shifted from internal migration to international migration, multiculturalism and displacement. This paper, part of research in progress for an intellectual biography, enquires into the question of what she learned in Sydney and what she learned in Chicago, and how these two knowledge bases and cultures combined to generate one of the most important founding sociologies in Australia.

Matteo Bortolini (Università di Padova), "The 'Bellah Affair' at Princeton: Scholarly Reputation, Disciplinary Differentiation, and Controlled Oblivion"

The so-called "Bellah affair at Princeton" began in March 1973 when a harsh but nonetheless ordinary academic fight over the appointment of Robert N. Bellah as a permanent member of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton found its way within the wider public sphere. In a violation of academic etiquette, the newspapers had direct access to confidential evaluations of Bellah's work and his public and scientific reputation appeared to be in jeopardy. Using published and unpublished evidence, the paper shows how two different interpretations of "academic freedom" were put forward by Bellah's supporters and opponents, and how the sociological profession understood the whole episode as a disciplinary attack on the part of the "hard" sciences and historical disciplines. The paper shows how the emerging symbolic constellation led all the relevant actors to develop a shared interest in the rapid oblivion of the episode: the Bellah affair became a lose-lose game which all the players had an interest in ending as rapidly as possible. This outcome was not pre-determined; rather, it was the product of a reputational struggle played within and without the media. The particular differentiation of the American scientific field in the 1970s, unexpected coalitions between relevant actors, the changing tone of the articles published by the mass media, and some contingent events are all factors which help in explaining the "controlled oblivion" of the Bellah affair.

David Paul Haney (University of Texas-Austin), "Out of Dystopia: American Mass Society and the Study of Suburbanization in the 1950s"

The 1950s represented a critical watershed in the sociological study of community life in the United States by virtue of perception of an emergent "new middle class" and by the mass migration of formerly rural and urban populations to suburbs. The tone for studies of this transition was set, however, not by sociologists but by journalists and public intellectuals, whose assessments have solidified into durable stereotypes about suburban social structure and culture. This paper seeks to enlarge the debate over the history of the study of suburbia during the fifties by acknowledging the fifties scholarship produced by sociologists, much of which not only cited the popular works but also sought to correct their distortions and myth-making.

Sessions

Continued

Jennifer Platt (University of Sussex), "What do ISA presidential addresses represent?"

Presidential addresses have sometimes been treated as appropriate data to represent the sociology of the constituencies of the associations addressed. The representative status of ISA presidential addresses is considered, relating them to the ideological background, historical development and organisational structures of the ISA, and discussing the extent to which they can be seen as social rather than individual intellectual products.

Reception

6:30 pm to 8:10 pm

Parc 55 Hotel

The Section's reception, hosted jointly with the Section on Comparative and Historical Sociology and the Section on Political Sociology.

Tuesday, August 11

Sociological Theory II (Roundtable)

8:30 am to 10:10 am

Hilton San Francisco

President: Darrell James Bennetts (School of Social Sciences)

Hirofumi Utsumi (Outemon Gakuin University), "The Predicament of Society?: Sociological Imagination in the Age of Globalization"

The concept "society" has become the subject of critical debates. Sociologists who proclaim the predicament of "society" argue that sociology had identified the concept "society" with "nation-state," and the validity of this identification has expired in the age of "globalization." Has the term of the concept "society" been really expired? This paper asserts that what we need now in the age of "globalization" is not to throw away the concept "society" but to rehabilitate it. For rehabilitating the concept "society," I introduce the distinction between "society as a whole" and "society in a narrow sense." I analyze the transformation of "society" and the development of sociology from the late 19th century to the present based on this distinction. Through the historical analysis, I point out two characters of the "society" in the age of globalization: invisibilization and individualization of "society". The conclusion is that, if we

can dismantle the sociological imagination of the 20th century and rebuild our approach into "society in a narrow sense" based on a re-imagined "society as a whole", the age of globalization will promote the re-birth of sociology.

Gwoon Jung (Yonsei University), "The Understanding of Subjectivity in the Colonial Period of Korea from Michel Foucault's Frame"

Michel Foucault's claim of Subjectivity which is the result of secret power relations and training by the modern system is commonly received. However, is this truth also applicable to the eastern society's modernization in the colonized period? As the answer of this question, the different view from the Michel Foucault's subjectivity is debated in this paper with the example of Korea. The modernization process typified as the Kyung-Sung Empire University did not bring about the perfect formation of subjectivity which we can discover from Michel Foucault's modern frame. The case of modernization in Korea does not fit with his idea because the colonial power in the modern educational system appeared so explicit in their intention that intellectuals could recognize the decisive aspect of modern power well. The educated people at the moment realized that they are just the subordinate of the colonial power and not the subject by themselves even though the Japanese colonial power pursued to formulate the specific form of subjectivity which is beautifully tamed by Japan through the education system. This paper investigates the colonial period of Korea by Japan and especially focuses on the establishment of one public university, Kyung-Sung Empire University. With a detailed research of the historical fact, it employs the full sets of Michel Foucault's sociological ideas such as power, knowledge, and subjectivity. It hopes to test the existing Michel Foucault's idea of subjectivity and discover the uniqueness of it which can be discovered in the special social situation.

Darrell James Bennetts (School of Social Sciences), "William Pember Reeves, New Zealand's first Sociologist"

New Zealand's first sociologist borrowed and adapted ideas. William Pember Reeves did not operate inside the boundaries of distinct academic disciplines, as we do today. In the 1890s he institutionalized a novel new civic contract: compulsory arbitration of industrial disputes. This legislative experiment accepted that disputes occurred within communities, and they should be resolved there. The purpose was to preserve extant social harmony in a small, exports-driven society. The experiment worked, meaning the small statement is true: Reeves solved the labor problem. International

Sessions

Continued

observers were convinced, including Henry Demarest Lloyd. This paper reviews Reeves's policy experiment. It summarizes the logics of Reeves's particular harmonism.

The roundtable is sponsored by the Section on Comparative and Historical Sociology.

Weber, Charisma, and Capitalism (Roundtable)

10:30 am to 12:10 pm

Hilton San Francisco

President: Kevin L. McElmurry (University of Missouri-Columbia)

Meredith C. Whitnah (University of Notre Dame), "Authority and Anglicanism: A Weberian Perspective on a Contemporary Debate"

A recent controversy in the Episcopal Church (USA) provides a compelling case study for examining legitimization of authority in religiously conservative and liberal strands of the denomination. In the decision of the conservative branch to establish its own separate province within the U.S. and the liberal branch's response, one can observe the interplay of the three ideal types of authority (Weber 1922/1994). The theologically liberal leaders of the Episcopal Church combine an emphasis on human reason and a tradition of openness to promote a charismatic sense of authoritative new revelation. The theologically conservative leaders of the group breaking away from the Episcopal Church argue for a revitalization of tradition. While Weber conceptualizes changes of authority in terms of change within a group, via charismatic means, or change from outside, via legal-rational means, this particular case reveals how change can be based on traditional authority. Tradition is not necessarily "invented" (Hobsbawm 1992), but rather revitalized, in both the conservative and liberal factions.

Cristobal Young (Princeton University), "Christianity, Judaism, and the Spirit of Capitalism: The Weber-Sombart Debates"

This short essay discusses the Weber-Sombart debate over the paternity of capitalism. In late 19th century Germany, a popular critical view held that capitalism was a product of Jewish culture, a fact that reflected poorly both on Jews and capitalism. Anti-Semitism and anti-capitalism were intertwined. With *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, Max Weber set out to defend the market system by insisting on its Christian religious

origins. This sparked a rather unsavory debate with his illustrious colleague Werner Sombart. In defending his position, Weber ultimately partitioned modern capitalism into a usurious, opportunistic element (derived from Judaism) and a productive, efficiency-driven element (derived from Christianity). What was directly at stake here was politics rather than social theory. The competing claims of Weber and Sombart were more about the legitimacy of capitalism than the socio-economic significance of religion.

Paul Jooos (University of Alberta), "Max Weber and the Social Construction of Charismatic Power"

In 1983, Meredith McGuire addressed the Association of the Sociology of Religion with the "hunch that, if we could watch would-be charismatic leaders in the developing states of interaction with their would-be followers, we could see a complete process of power-building" (1983: 6). In a similar vein, Anthony Blasi maintained that charisma is a fundamentally collective, dialectical phenomenon, "a moment in our societal conversation" (1991: 4). This paper seeks to demonstrate Max Weber's accord with such propositions by showing that implicit within his writings on charisma are tools that can enable a processual understanding of charismatic formation through symbolic interaction. A corollary of this point is that Weber's writings represent an historically crucial turning point in the progression from a Carlylian idea of leaders as inherently powerful to a more 'social constructionist' perspective, and that Weber's inspiration for this progression is best understood not through reference to his 19th century forbearers in the social sciences, but rather in his contrast with the very few theological writers (namely Rudolph Sohm and the writers of the New Testament) who had actually employed charisma as a term prior to Weber's famous appropriation of it. A reinterpretation of Weber's writings on charisma that gives priority to the social constructionist elements in his thought can provide tools for navigating through many of the interpretational controversies that have plagued charisma research.

The roundtable is sponsored by the Section on the Sociology of Religion.

The History of Sociology as a Bi-Focal Project (Part 2)

Continued from page 1

race, gender, science, economic institutions, political organizations, social psychology, and so on. To be sure, this particular listing reflects the interests of sociologists in our own time and place, and the listing would obviously differ if we looked beyond the U.S. or to earlier periods in the discipline's history. Even so, concern with specific substantive topics has been a salient feature of sociology from its earliest beginnings; and while generalist thinkers—sociologists-at-large—have come forward at various points to shape the discipline in significant ways, they have always been comparatively rare beasts. To study sociology's subfields, then, is to incorporate into the history of sociology the work of the great majority of the men and women who have pursued sociology and to encompass, too, the specific contexts in which these women and men developed their ideas and their methods.

Second, research on the development of subfields would confront historians of sociology with more distinctively sociological questions. The study of subfields would immediately raise the problem, for example, as to why subfield A emerged when (and where) it did, whereas subfield C did not emerge until, say, three decades later, while subfield B vanished altogether during the same period. Likewise, questions would inevitably arise as to why subfields D and E veered in these particular intellectual and institutional directions, while subfields F and G turned in those directions; or why subfields H and I were marked by strong internal consensus, where subfields J and K were polarized; or why scholars in subfields D and K were so focused on methodological issues, while those in subfields A and J were so indifferent to them. By no means is this a complete enumeration, and many additional questions suggest themselves as well, including the issue of whether the processes of subfield formation and division vary over time and across national contexts, and the issue of how these processes, as they have operated in sociology, resemble or differ from analogous processes in other disciplines. Plainly, these are all fundamentally

sociological questions, many of which could only be adequately addressed through a comparative-historical analysis of the social and intellectual organization of the relevant subfields (perhaps along the lines pioneered in Richard Whitley's *The Intellectual and Social Organization of the Sciences* and other work in the sociology of science). Although this is not the form of analysis that is most typical in the current literature of the history of sociology, its presence would serve to inject a salutary sociological dimension into scholarship in the area.

Third, the study of subfields would open lines of communication between historians of sociology and scholars elsewhere in the discipline. Among sociologists who are not historians of sociology, interest in the existing scholarship on the history of sociology is—as members of this section often complain—noticeably limited. My sense is that this is true, to some extent at least, because the scholarship on the general development of sociology-at-large appears to have little immediate bearing on the everyday work of most practicing sociologists. This is not to say, however, that sociologists outside of HoS lack intellectual-historical curiosity, for they are often highly interested in the history of their own specialty areas (or at least certain aspects of this history), among other reasons because the standard way by which sociological researchers motivate and frame their work in the present is by reference to narratives about their subfields at earlier points in time. Often, however, specialists' knowledge of the history of their subfields is (as they admit) scanty, a dubious mix of haphazard collective memories and whiggish myths. This is where research by historians of sociology on subfields could speak directly, and with obvious pertinence, to members of these subfields, cutting through the haze of memory and myth and offering—as a basis for present sociological practice—genuinely historical accounts of changes over time in these areas of the discipline. (Insofar as research on subfield development engaged the kinds of sociological questions listed under point #2 above, historians of sociology would

have additional grounds for greater dialogue with sociologists in other areas.)

Fourth, attention to the history of subfields would enrich understanding of the history of sociology-at-large itself. To view the object of research on the history of sociology in bi-focal terms is not to disconnect the two foci, but to make it possible for each to inform the other. Presently, very little is known about the relationship between, on the one hand, the major thinkers, theories, and methods on which historians of sociology have tended to concentrate and, on the other hand, the history of sociology's subfields. Are the major thinkers, theories, and methods representative of developments that first originated within specialty areas (and, if so, were these established and mainstream areas, long-marginalized areas, or newly-founded areas?); or are they forces which had other origins but which subsequently imparted unity to a wide range of subfields; or has the intellectual life of subfields—some subfields, at any rate—been removed (intentionally or unintentionally) from the development of sociology-at-large? When has one of these patterns prevailed over the others? Over the course of the history of sociology, when and under what conditions has sociology-at-large been greater than or merely the equivalent of the sum of the discipline's parts (specialty areas)? In my view, answers to questions of this sort are essential for understanding the history of sociology-at-large, but at the same time they are answers that we will only find by means of systematic research on the history of the specialty areas.

As I have said, the two sessions that I am chairing at the ASA meeting this August have been organized with these purposes in mind, and my hope is that their inclusion in the program will encourage more attention hereafter to the historical development of the many subfields of sociology. On behalf of the HoS Program Committee (myself included), I invite you to attend these sessions, and for myself I invite you to consider taking part in the bi-focal project I have described. ■

Awards

Section prizes, 2009

Congratulations to this year's winners! Thanks to all those who served on the three award selection subcommittees, with special thanks to Craig Calhoun for coordinating the award process.

Distinguished Scholarly Achievement Award

Edward Tiryakian, Department of Sociology, Duke University

Distinguished Scholarly Publication Award

co-winners

Mary Jo Deegan, Department of Sociology, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, for: *Self, War, and Society: George Herbert Mead's Macrosociology* (Transaction Publishers, 2008)

Chad Alan Goldberg, Department of Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison, for: "Introduction to Emile Durkheim's 'Anti-Semitism and Social Crisis,'" *Sociological Theory*, December 2008 (vol. 26, pp. 299-323)

Graduate Student Paper Award

Cristobal Young, Department of Sociology, Princeton, "The Emergence of Sociology from Political Economy in the United States: 1890-1940"

Election Results

Section elections for 2009-2010

Congratulations to those elected, and thanks to all those who showed their commitment to the Section by their preparedness to stand.

Chair-Elect

Gary Alan Fine, Northwestern University

Secretary-Treasurer

Anne Eisenberg, SUNY-Geneseo

Council Members

Kevin Anderson, Purdue University

Matteo Bortolini, University of Padua

Student Representative

Kristin Haltinner, University of Minnesota

Section Officers 2008-2009

Chair

Charles Camic,
Northwestern

Chair Elect

Craig Calhoun,
SSRC

Past Chair

Jennifer Platt,
University of Sussex

Secretary-Treasurer

Mikaila Mariel Lemonik
Arthur, Hamilton College

Council

Silvia Pedraza, University of Michigan
(2006-2009)

Marcel Fournier, Université de
Montréal (2007-2010)

Anthony J. Blasi, Tennessee State
(2008-2011)

Alford A. Young Jr., University of
Michigan (2006-2009)

Richard Swedberg, Cornell University
(2007-2010)

Kay Richards Broschart, Hollins
(2008-2011)

Student Representatives

Michelle Christian, Duke University
(2008-2010)

Zandria F. Robinson, Northwestern
University (2008-2009)

Section Committees 2008-2009

Program Committee

Charles Camic, Northwestern (Chair)

Craig Calhoun, SSRC

Michael Hill, Nebraska

Neil McLaughlin, McMaster

Distinguished Scholarly Publication Selection Committee

Margaret Somers, Michigan (Chair)

Tony Blasi, Tennessee

Kay R. Broschart, Hollins College

Membership Committee

Richard Swedberg, Cornell (Chair)

Larry Nichols, West Virginia

Distinguished Achievement Selection Committee

Craig Calhoun, SSRC (Chair)

Gary Alan Fine, Northwestern

George Steinmetz, New School

Nominations Committee

Jennifer Platt, Sussex (Chair)

Matthieu Deflem, South Carolina

Neil Gross, British Columbia

Graduate Student Prize Selection Committee

Zandria Robinson, Northwestern (Chair)

Michelle Christian, Duke

Owen Whooley, NYU