

SASKIA SASSEN

Professor of urban planning at Columbia University in New York City where she also serves on the faculty of the School of International and Public Affairs. Among her recent books are *The Mobility of Labor and Capital* (1988); *The Global City: New York London Tokyo* (1991); *Cities in a World Economy* (1994); and *Losing Control? Sovereignty in an Age of Globalization* (1996). She is currently writing a book on immigration policy in a world economy.

DOROTHY E. SMITH

Department of Sociology & Equity Studies, OISE/UT, Canada. She is the author of *The Everyday World as Problematic: A Feminist Sociology* (1987); *The Conceptual Practices of Power: A Feminist Sociology of Knowledge* (1990); *Texts, Facts, and Femininity: Exploring the Relations of Ruling* (1990). Her forthcoming book (1998) is entitled *Writing the Social*.

GIDEON SJOBERG

Professor of sociology at the University of Texas at Austin. His long distinguished career is bracketed by his classic *The Preindustrial City* (1960) and his most recent book (with Roger Nett), *A Methodology for Social Research: With a New Introductory Essay* (1997). His current interests focus on bureaucratic capitalism, human rights, and democracy.

BARRY WELLMAN

Professor of sociology at the University of Toronto and conducts his research at the Centre for Urban and Community Studies. Wellman founded the International Network for Social Network Analysis in 1976 and headed it for a dozen years. He is currently chair of the ASA Section on Community and Urban Sociology. He has edited *Social Structures: A Network Approach* (rev. 1997) and *Networks in the Global Village* (forth. 1998), as well as published a very large number of articles based on his Toronto research.

INTRODUCTION

THE HERITAGE AND FUTURE OF SOCIOLOGY IN NORTH AMERICA*

Janet L. Abu-Lughod

New School for Social Research

The European Roots of Theory, Orientations and Practices

Just about one hundred years ago, North America was experiencing its third or possibly fourth wave of settlers and intellectual ideas -- drawn across the currents of the Atlantic and deposited on a shore which, while rapidly Europeanizing in cultural roots, was ripe to generate a different synthesis -- one born out of a different soil, a different history, and a different mix of peoples and institutional arrangements.

And just about one hundred years ago, the first departments of sociology were established on the North American continent, drawing upon the legacy of nineteenth-century western European (chiefly German and French) social thinkers (1). This implanting of sociology in the New World was intensified by highly selective "reverse migrations," as American scholars made pilgrimages abroad, seeking out more advanced training, especially in Germany.

The transmission of social thought from Europe, however, went through a highly selective screening in early American sociology. For example, Karl Marx's detailed analysis of the objective workings of the capitalist system was conspicuously absent during the early days when sociology was being "codified" in the United States. In the over 1000 pages of *Introduction to the Science of Sociology* (known as "The Green Bible" (2)), the first American textbook in sociology jointly assembled by Robert Park and Ernest Burgess in the second decade of the twentieth century, there were only a few oblique references to the work of Marx, merely bibliographic or dismissive (3). It was only after World War II that Marxist analysis began to infuse the subfield of political economy, adding a structural appreciation of the operation of capitalism to the insights of historically-minded and globally-oriented thinkers.

From the beginning, regardless of the varied sources of its legacy, North American sociology began with the assumption that the purpose of theoretical understanding was to guide social reformation and to achieve "the good [humane] society" (4). Gradually, this "mission" came to be lost in a forest of empirical research, although it was to be emphasized again by Robert Lynd and C. Wright Mills. This controversy still persists and was linked to a second unresolved dilemma over the issue of "generalizations." From its European

beginnings, sociology's object of study was contested: Was its focus to be on common forms of sociation or on the composition, structure, and transformation of "society" — understood as specific social formations differing and changing in time and space? To put it baldly, was sociology's mandate to search for universals of human social behavior, or was it to provide contextual diagnoses of the time- and place-specific manifestations? This issue has still not been resolved.

North American Transformations of the European Legacy

Today, the field of sociology, as it is conventionally taught in American universities, still bears the heavy imprint of its early European heritage, although more so in a subfield called "theory" (5) than in many other areas of method and practice. Max Weber, Emile Durkheim, Georg Simmel and, to a lesser, later, and more variable extent, Karl Marx, now have their canonical (iconic) place in all graduate programs in sociology. However, their works are usually taught in the form of "explication de texte," rather than as "tools" and "exemplars." (6) The hidden (and not so hidden) subject of their inquiries, from which they drew their trenchant conclusions, was the transformation of a specifically European society from its relatively unique feudal agrarian origins into an industrializing society occupying a hegemonic (colonial) position in the world. There is a tendency, however, to suppress this historical specificity when their still-important concepts are applied, often uncritically, to the societies of the New World, and there has been insufficient attention to later "real world" developments which their theories could hardly be expected to predict (7).

And yet more indigenous forms were also germinating in the new soil. From the British social reformers had come the quantitative social survey, along with more ethnographic (anthropological) observational studies of poverty and "deviance." But in the new American context, these studies were at first linked almost exclusively to the enormous waves of immigration with which they were too often conflated (8). And from the Pragmatists (9), New World philosophers who were creating perhaps the only truly indigenous American addition to human thought, came a deep questioning of traditionalism, truth, and ways of knowing, as well as an emphasis on language. These philosophers/social scientists were the precursors to what the modern literary critics would naively "rediscover," drawing chiefly upon contemporary French theorists and calling it "post-modernity", which suggests that European ideas continue to influence American sociology.

Not only theories but methods as well were reshaped after their Atlantic ocean passage. Although Max Weber had cautioned the need for *verstehen* to comprehend the *meaning to the participant* of his/her social acts, and Georg Simmel had laid out the basic metaphorical formula for investigating the embeddedness of social actors within a defining context of social networks,

both insights were slow in becoming integrated into North American sociology. From the beginning, sociology distinguished between *objective* qualitative categories/processual events, and the *meanings* of such categories and occurrences to participants. While lip-service was paid to the question of meaning, and methods of observation and interpretation in the social construction of "reality" were not ignored, few methodological breakthroughs and refinements have been achieved. Ethnomethodology, the logical outcome of the former, would not be developed as an explicit method until the post-second World War period, despite W. I. Thomas' early acknowledgment that social actors' "definitions of the situation," whether "true" or not, were very real in their consequences.

Despite advances in so-called qualitative methods, none of them has been on the order of magnitude of those achieved in quantitative analysis. American sociology built strongly on the quantitative methods of analysis initially developed in Europe, chiefly in France and Britain, and this subfield is perhaps the most commonly-acknowledged contribution of North America to sociology. Today, the existence of a wide variety of computer programs and of powerful computing facilities at universities, coupled with data from large-scale surveys, some of them repeated on the same "panel" periodically, as well as the availability of detailed census information (both for small areas and for individuals) have made it easier and easier to manipulate data in a quantitative way. While some of these studies have been critiqued as mindless or at least atheoretical, many have yielded valuable descriptive precision and/or have carefully tested specific alternative hypothetical propositions (10).

A century of methodological progress has yielded ever-more-reliable quantitative indicators to these nominal variables and has refined ever-more-robust (primarily statistical) techniques for exploring relationships among them and processes of change. Network analysis, as a methodologically-sophisticated statistical technique paying systematic attention to social embeddedness, would have to wait even longer.

Most of the "findings" of early "objective" sociology were based upon extremely fragmentary data sources and upon primitive methods of analysis. There is, perhaps, a supreme irony that we now have access to an almost unlimited amount of data available for analysis and to powerful associated techniques for manipulating such data. But this inflation of data comes just at the moment when we are losing confidence in our ability to *select* "scientifically" the most appropriate measures to answer specific questions, and when our belief that these categories and measures have stable and transparent meaning is being undermined by legitimate deconstructionist critiques.

The earlier gap between participant observation and ethnographic research, on the one hand, and quantitative/numerical studies, has widened, yielding what Joel Levine, borrowing terminology from Snow, referred to as "the two

cultures." (11) The recent critiques of sociology's basic epistemology, now coming relentlessly from the arenas of philosophy and cultural studies/ literary criticism [under the rubric of post-modernism] are not new. They have been with sociology almost from the start of the discipline. However, the proposed substitute methodologies: hermeneutics, deconstruction of texts of *all* types [the world itself as "only" a text], the so-called "science" of semiotics, etc., have few, if any, rigorous methodologies that can be defended as attaining the validity level that has been claimed for positivist manipulations (12). Our conference asked what are new promising directions for binding the micro and macro levels?

The essays by Dorothy Smith and Barry Wellman included in this book explore some of the newest ways in which linkages between persons and institutions can be studied, and in which linkages within and between social groups can be mapped into social space.

A second area in which something was "lost in translation" from Europe to the United States was the specificity of history. The nineteenth-century German debate of "scientism," between nomothetic and ideographic approaches, which Max Weber had used to distinguish the social sciences from history, coming down squarely on the side of the former (13), was more or less accepted in American sociology, perhaps because of the extreme "presentism" of short-term American preoccupations. This set back recognition of the historical contexts for the generation both of theories (the sociology of knowledge) and institutions. It was left to European-origin thinkers, such as Vienna-born Karl Polanyi and Russian-born Pitirim Sorokin, *inter alia*, to keep alive this fertile and essential approach, an approach which would eventually infuse the work of comparativists (14) and eventually world-system scholars (15), albeit in different ways.

The Present State of Sociology in the North American Region

There are currently some 13,000 dues-paying members of the American Sociological Association. The annual meetings of the Association attract some four to five thousand registrants who identify themselves as sociologists. At least thirty-eight "Sections" exist within the larger association, bringing together sociologists who share specialized substantive and ideological interests as diverse as: Crime, Law and Deviance; Organization, Occupations and Work; Race, Gender, and Class; Community and Urban Sociology; Collective Behavior and Social Movements; Sociology of Mental Health; Science, Knowledge, and Technology; Social Psychology; Theory; Methodology; Political Economy of the World System; International Migration; Comparative & Historical Sociology; Medical Sociology; Sociology of Sex and Gender; Sociology of Culture; and even Peace and War, Marxist Sociology and Sociological Practice.

This list, however, even if it were complete, would not be exhaustive of the diversity of specializations that now fall within the larger rubric of the profession. There is, for example, no explicit section on "policy," although sociologists frequently take positions, individually or collectively, on issues of political and/or social relevance. And many sociologically-trained individuals do not teach in universities but are employed by governmental agencies or private corporations in what is termed "applied sociology," which might be anything from quantitative analysis for the Bureau of the Census, political polling organizations, or marketing firms, or, through more qualitative methods, advising on the management and evaluation concerns of educational, business or service institutions. In short, to describe all the ways that North American sociologists operate today would be to become lost in a myriad of details (16).

The North American Regional Conference

It is evident that no single essay assessing the present state of sociology in the North American region, much less its future concerns, could possibly be written, and I shall not try to do so. Nor, in convening a closed working conference in Toronto on August 7-8, 1997 (at the request of ISA President Immanuel Wallerstein with the collaboration of the American Sociological Association and with the financial assistance of the Russell Sage Foundation), did I try to invite a random selection of even the "best" sociologists now working in these diverse areas of specialization.

Rather, I selected five problematics. Two of them are of perennial and basic significance in the field: namely, disjunctions within the realm of theory, and the often-cited antinomies in methods of inquiry and analysis referred in short-hand as quantitative and qualitative. Five of the papers presented at the conference addressed these issues. The first section of my essay was addressed to the origins and changes in these two problematics. The remaining three foci were selected because they represented what I consider to be issues of increasing future centrality to the societies (and the field of sociology) in North America (17), namely:

-1) changes in conceptualizing racial and ethnic definitions and relationships in response to the heightened and diversified immigration that has been taking place in the United States and Canada in recent decades;

-2) the increasingly-entailed "global system" in which North America plays a (quasi?) hegemonic role; and

-3) the possibilities for intimate social relations and effective social movements in an "age of information", in which spatial proximity, in the physical sense, is supplemented if not totally displaced by developments in cyberspace that affect not only economic-financial integration but social relations and the capacities for democratic politics.

These problematics are not necessarily those most central to sociological concerns throughout the rest of the world (or even North America in general). But I assumed that our conference was intended to capture the preoccupations of globally- and future-minded sociologists as *seen from the North American perspective*, and that the purpose of other regional conferences was to engage in a similar task but from their perspectives. Hence, what the North American regional conference sacrificed in terms of range, it gained in terms of focus.

The advantage of following this latter strategy was that the two-day working conference enjoyed a certain coherence and animated depth. The contributed essays, all but two of which were distributed in advance and read by participants, were intellectually linked and could be grouped for sequential presentation, which permitted lively communication during the ensuing discussions. Furthermore, there were unexpected linkages among the essays that had been prepared independently for the "separate" sessions, suggesting a certain confluence of diagnoses, if not resolutions of differing positions.

Fourteen papers were presented at the two-day conference, all of remarkably high quality. Given the space restrictions for the International Sociological Association books, these could not all be reproduced here. A fuller book, including all papers and discussants' remarks, is planned for future publication. A complete table of contents for that book is as follows:

Table of Contents for the Forthcoming Book

- Janet L. Abu-Lughod, New School for Social Research, New York.
"The Legacy, Disjunctures, and Future of Sociology in the North American Region."

Part I: Theory

- Randall Collins, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.
"The European Sociological Tradition and 21st Century World Sociology."
- Gideon Sjoberg, University of Texas, Austin, Texas.
"Observations on Bureaucratic Capitalism: Knowledge About What and Why."

Part II: Methods

- Dorothy E. Smith, OISE, University of Toronto, Canada.
"Consciousness, Meaning, and Ruling Relations: From Women's Standpoint."
- Joel Levine, Dartmouth College, Hanover, New Hampshire.
"We Can Count, But What do the Numbers Mean?"

- Loic Wacquant, University of California at Berkeley, California.
"Reincarnating Society: Theory and Ethnography for a Carnal Sociology."

Part III: Race, Ethnicity, Identity

- Joe Feagin, University of Florida.
"The Future of U.S. Society in an Era of Racism, Group Segregation, and Demographic Revolution."
- Roger Waldinger and Joel Perlmann, University of California at Los Angeles.
"Second Generations: Past, Present, Future."
- Jules Duchastel and Gilles Bourque, Université du Québec à Montréal.
"Erosion of the Nation-State and Transformation of National Identities."
- Tomas Almaguer, University of Michigan at Ann Arbor.
"The Enduring Ambiguities of Race."

Part IV: Globalization

- Giovanni Arrighi, State University of New York at Binghamton.
"Globalization and Historical Macrosociology."
- Saskia Sassen, Columbia University, New York.
"Cracked Casings: Notes Towards an Analytics for Studying Transnational Processes."
- Harriet Friedmann, University of Toronto.
"From Closed Politics and Open Economies (A Problem), to Open Politics and Bioregional Economies (A Solution)."

Part V: Social Life and Social Movements

- Barry Wellman, Centre for Urban and Community Studies, University of Toronto.
"The Privatization of Community: From Public Groups to Unbounded Networks."
- Henri Lustiger-Thaler, Pierre Hamel and Louis Maheu, University of Montreal.
"From Stability to Non-Correspondence within Late-Modernity: Institutions and the Ambivalence of Collective Action."

For the current book, I selected essays to "represent" each of the five types of issues our conference explored. Inclusion of these specific papers in the current book is in no way intended to draw an invidious distinction among the papers presented.

Three Substantive Problematics for the Future of Sociology in North America

In the space left at my disposal in this book, I shall try to explore some of the implications for the future of sociology of the issues raised in Parts 3-5 above.

The Growing Ethnic and Racial Diversity in North America

The preoccupation with what is uniquely North American has been deeply undermined in the current era, as the United States and Canada are again the recipients of large numbers of immigrants, especially from non-cognate cultures. The legacy of assimilation theories or even race relations cycles presumed the coherence of a core that would modify but not break apart. Separatist movements, radical and unyielding de facto spatial fragmentation, bilingualism, and identity politics are parts of the changing reality for which earlier models give poor guidance. How have settlement patterns and segregation by race, class and ethnicity been affected by shifts in the world system? What new investigations and theories show promise of illuminating these changes? Are there any guides for policy?

One reason, perhaps, that pragmatism and early "postmodern" theories suited the American context was the inherent "multiculturalism" of the United States, which in the nineteenth century had perhaps shaken the foundations of the "taken for granted," as the society faced a pressing need to integrate diverse populations. Race was one of the concepts used in coming to terms with the multicultural community (18), but this essentialist biological concept was in direct contradiction to the optimism of the pragmatists and their faith in the socialization effects of language, the malleability of human beings, and the overriding importance of environment -- in short, amalgamation. In the United States, slavery had compounded (and contradicted) the simple ideology of assimilation, by leaving a deep residue that can only be called racism (19).

Reconceptualizations of race and ethnicity are sorely needed. Nineteenth century continental theories and early twentieth century North American theories left North American sociologists poorly prepared to understand recent changes in the increasingly complex composition of the population and the dynamics of differential growth rates in contemporary North America. Long overdue is a rejection of stereotypes associated with older social categories. Sociology is increasingly concerned with "rethinking" new forms of identity, and the interactions among such *a priori* categories as race, class, gender, age, immigration status. These variables have generated more and more overlapping and unclear unbounded "units," dependent upon socially-generated and/or internalized meanings, and have required sub-analyses in place of the master and privileged general categories of race and ethnicity.

Also wide open is the question of possible future assimilation into a multicultural society (20).

One of the symptoms of this in the United States is the recent debate over what categories the decennial census should employ to capture intersections of race and ethnicity that increasingly defy the earlier simplistic "sorts" into white and non-white, later modified to a four-fold division of biological "race," even later subdivided by Hispanic and non-Hispanic language or origin. The census bureau also faces some decisions (which must be made before the next one, to be held in the year 2000, is conducted) on how to deal with persons of multiple racial and ethnic ancestry.

In Canada, in contrast to the United States, "multiculturalism" was formerly closer to forming a neater tripartite division: the indigenous people [now called First Nations], French Catholic immigrants whose first arrival predated the French Revolution, and British Protestants whose political hegemony followed from imperial rule. Slavery, which had played so formative a role in regionalism and racism within the United States and which has left so deep an imprint on an otherwise much transformed post-Civil War society, had been absent from a Canada whose climate was unsuited to a plantation economy. Today, however, Canada has become the home of a large immigrant population of highly diverse origins (including "racial" minorities), and is struggling to devise a new institutional *modus vivendi* to cope with the potential fragmentation (21).

Globalization and North America's Place in the World

The insularity of New World settlements from internationally-generated capital and labor flows was always overstated in sociology, although perhaps less so in Canada than in the United States. Despite the continental origin of most "theory," the actual practice in the field has tended to focus on "America," with little recognition of the embeddedness of its history within a changing world-system. Isolationism and a confidence in the New World's special privilege and hegemony seemed to make it possible to ignore the rest of the world, except insofar as it created inconveniences (wars) or immigrants. This insularity can no longer be defended intellectually.

It is now a truism that the economic network of powerful transnational corporations has reduced the power of national political entities to control their behavior and ensure their accountability. The relationship between the United States and Canada and the rest of the world-system has been changing rapidly. The wider integration of the world (so-called globalization and transnationalization) has significantly altered the older assumed relationships between states, firms, markets and citizens.

Western economies, including those of North America, have been undergoing basic restructuring. Never before has "self-determination" been so obvious a chimera. Especially with the development of a vigorously-competitive

Asian block, the reentry into the world-system of a formerly-isolated China, and the moves within Europe toward greater unification, what happens in the United States and Canada is increasingly dependent upon the rest of the world. How is sociology making sense of these changes? (22)

Political efficacy had been one of the pillar assumptions of North American studies of society. However, there is a growing disjuncture between the scales at which political action can take place and the scales at which economic and social determinants operate. The world of local politics -- "civil societies" and voluntary associations (now called social movements), idealized by de Tocqueville and internalized in the complimentary self-images of North Americans -- has been deeply undermined by the transnational footlooseness of gigantic firms, of the free flow of finance capital, and thus of the growing inequality between capital and labor, between "home" and "abroad." Included in this book is the paper by Saskia Sassen that directly addresses this issue (23).

Cyberspace, Social Networks, and the Possibilities for Democratic Social Movements

The changing spatial and social patterns within human settlements under conditions of urban saturation and domination have eroded the presumed relationship between forms of settlements and social relations. There has been a decline in the diversity of regionally- and locally-specific cultural characteristics and increasing disjunctures of scale between personal and communicative interactions. Our conference asked how these changes will affect mechanisms and possibilities for a supportive social life and the vigor of social movements?

One of the cardinal concepts in early North American sociology, to some extent inherited from post-feudal western European theories, was the distinction between urban and rural spaces and the congruence presumed to characterize the relationship between such physical arrangements and types of social interactions. This congruence has become increasingly irrelevant as both physical and socio-economic spaces have become fungible to a degree that earlier theories could not predict. Can anything be salvaged from earlier attempts? What changes are required by changing realities?

Some analysts have suggested that we are now entering a post-industrial epoch in which the communications "revolution" has recast the nature of human life and has delinked residence, work and social interactions from the frictions of space. Clearly, this is too extreme a characterization, since "life worlds" persist, albeit in revised form. What are the new configurations of spatial agglomerations in North America and their interconnections? What are the differential impacts of these changes on relative access by classes

and racial/ethnic groupings? Does increasingly fungible physical space yield more or less inequality?

While undoubtedly unintentional, prior frictions of space constituted significant barriers to complete social and political segregation, creating enforced but, of course, not conflict-free, arenas of interaction and struggle. Given the enhanced capacity of more powerful groups to disassociate themselves from the common arenas of local politics within which such struggles were carried out, what will be the fate of the excluded and powerless? The final two papers in our conference begin to grapple with these questions, although only the essay by Barry Wellman could be reproduced here.

The Future Promise of Sociology in North America

We have tried to identify some of the cutting-edge questions that creative sociologists in North America are now beginning to address. Many of these questions hark back to those raised when the field of sociology was in its infant stage a century ago. But the old answers no longer suffice. To take from the past what is usable may be important, but it is also absolutely essential that past conceptualizations do not blind us to new realities.

Notes

(*) I apologize in advance for this unavoidable "colonization" of Canada, since there is no way that I can, from my ignorance of Canadian developments, avoid concentrating on developments within the United States, to the detriment of a fair and full treatment of both French-speaking and English-speaking Canadian sociology. I suspect, however, that this deficiency also permeated most regional conferences convened under the auspices of the International Sociological Association this year. Rather than speak from ignorance, let me merely say that one of the outcomes of the North American Regional Conference was a deep recognition of how societies so close, and yet so different in many ways, as the United States and Canada come, quite naturally, to somewhat different preoccupations. Nowhere was this so evident as in our discussions of race and ethnicity. I believe that such recognitions were "part of the plot" when President Immanuel Wallerstein decided to stimulate our regional meetings.

(1) Nor was the "New World" the only soil to which such ideas diffused; the influence of Durkheimian thought on Turkey, for example, or of political "constitutionalism" on the North African region suggests multiple paths through which European "thought" entered other societies and was adapted.

(2) So named for its green cover, this collection of "readings" became, for the period that followed, a truly canonical text.

(3) See Robert E. Park and Ernest W. Burgess, *Introduction to the Science of Sociology* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1921 for the first edition). Of the seven times Marx is mentioned by name, most are dismissive, as the following complete quotations illustrate: i.e., p. 77: "Upon this point at least a Marxian simplification is nearer the truth than that of Jung;" p. 343: "The orthodox socialist appeals in unquestioning faith to the ponderous tomes of Marx;" pp. 566 and 568: bibliographic entries for the "Manifesto of the Communist Party" and Chapter XV of *Capital*; p. 912: a passing reference to the fact that "A surprisingly large number [of the I.W.W., i.e., the Wobblies] can quote extensively from Buckle's *History of Civilization* and from the writings of Marx;" and p. 1008: where Marx's name appears in the subtitle of a bibliographic entry to Moritz Kaufmann's *Utopias, or Schemes of Social Improvement: From Sir Thomas More to Karl Marx* (London, 1879).

(4) At stake from the start were basic conceptualizations about order and change, inexorability vs agency. Contrast the blind evolution of Darwin with the social engineering of Comte.

(5) I thoroughly disagree, personally, with this distinction between theory as abstraction, and "theory in use" which informs, either explicitly or implicitly, all but the most mechanical and mindless work in the field.

(6) A strong defense of the contemporary relevance of these basic theorists to issues such as the nature of capitalism, bureaucracy, social movements and state power was set forth by Randall Collins in his presentation to the conference, entitled "The European Sociological Tradition and 21st Century World Sociology."

(7) The essay by Gideon Sjoberg, "Observations on Bureaucratic Capitalism: Knowledge About What and Why," included in this book, builds upon but goes well beyond the concepts of the classical theorists to explore contemporary society under late-modernity.

(8) Notably, Jane Addams, founder of Hull House, other women and men in the Settlement House Movement, and Sophonisba P. Breckinridge and the women of the segregated University of Chicago School of Philanthropy, inter alia.

(9) Among them, William James, Charles Peirce, John Dewey, and eventually George Herbert Mead. The interconnections of these thinkers, both among themselves and with the persons mentioned in the "social reform" group, were decisive in shaping this truly indigenous contribution to sociology.

(10) An examination of any issue of the *American Sociological Review*, the official journal of the American Sociological Association, will reveal the strong preoccupation with secondary analysis of large data sets and the preference for regression analysis as a means of hypothesis testing.

(11) See Joel Levine, "We Can Count, But What do the Numbers Mean?" He presented a strong defense of quantitative methods at the North American regional conference, and in the discussion advanced a number of suggestions to more historically-grounded colleagues, showing how newer methods of numeric analysis, including network

analysis, could help illuminate and illustrate their findings. His essay will appear in the forthcoming larger book of papers.

(12) If meanings are unstable and far from transparent, the need for more and better detailed ethnographic studies, depth interviewing, participant observation, and textual analysis of signs and symbols is heightened. However, American sociology has never resolved the issue of how micro analyses can be cumulated to more generalized conclusions. Ideally, the methods should complement one another, but there remains a major disjuncture that must be bridged.

(13) While nevertheless violating his own position by using historical specificity to "extract" his concepts.

(14) For example, Barrington Moore, Charles Tilly, Theda Skocpol, and the "bridge generation" to world-systems analysis consisting of critics of colonialism and imperialism

(15) Whose originator is generally accepted as Immanuel Wallerstein, although by now there are significant variations among those who define themselves within this paradigm. The contrast between "Comparative-Historical" and "World-System" approaches is explored by Giovanni Arrighi in the paper he presented at the North American regional meeting, "Globalization and Historical Macrosociology."

(16) I have been unable to obtain equally detailed information on membership and subdivisions of Canadian bilingual sociological organizations. But while their memberships may be smaller, commensurate with population differences, their activities are equally diverse.

(17) Gender and feminist inquiries, which now constitute a central preoccupation within the discipline, were intentionally not singled out as a "problematic," since I firmly believe that such concerns must permeate all sociological investigations. Dramatic shifts in gender roles, the nature of the family, and the composition of the labor force are among the most significant changes occurring in North American society. From the 1960s on, a fertile development has occurred in sociology that reconceptualizes many of the formerly misogynist assumptions in the field. These are addressed and fully integrated with the subject matter, especially in the contributions by Harriet Friedmann and Dorothy Smith.

(18) Although "race" currently refers, albeit ambiguously, to only three groups (Caucasians, Negroes, and Orientals), it should be recalled that, inter alia, Italians and Jews were initially called "races."

(19) The paper by Joe Feagin, included in this book, is especially relevant here, as is the attempt by Tomas Almaguer, in his essay on the ambiguities of race, to trace the roots of changing racial distinctions in U.S. law.

(20) This question was taken up, with reference to Hispanics, in the paper presented by Roger Waldinger and Joel Perlmann.

(21) A lively discussion on the differences between the U.S. and Canadian approaches to race and ethnicity ensued in this session. To highlight the contrasts, we include in this book both the paper by Feagin and the one presented by Duchastel and Bourque.

(22) The paper given by Giovanni Arrighi in our conference explores how the world-systems approach, as contrasted with an approach he refers to as "comparative-historical," is better situated to grasp both the past and the future of globalization.

(23) Harriet Friedmann's contribution has a somewhat different "take" on this subject and the ways in which it should influence both sociology and social movements. Her essay will appear in the full book.

CHAPTER 1 OBSERVATIONS ON BUREAUCRATIC CAPITALISM: KNOWLEDGE ABOUT WHAT AND WHY

Gideon Sjoberg
University of Texas in Austin

My intention is to revisit the issue of "Knowledge for What?" However, I have for some years been persuaded that this query begs two other questions that are equally, and perhaps more, profound. One is: knowledge about what? The other: which standard (or set of standards) should social scientists (and others) employ in evaluating such knowledge?

This brings me to the issue of serious lacunae in sociological analysis. Two compelling shortcomings, in my view, demand consideration. One involves a general failure to understand the role of large-scale organizations in shaping "bureaucratic capitalism"; the second involves concern with how these organizations can be held morally (or socially) accountable for their activities, particularly if one is intent upon advancing democratic ideals of social justice.

When we examine complex organizations, we must do more than focus on the power of the state. We must confront the reality that state control is nowadays intertwined and integrated with corporate power and control. It was not so long ago that one group of sociologists was imploring their colleagues to bring the state back in. We must do the same for corporate organizations, for many of them, multinational in scope, are shaping not only the economic sector of societies but vital aspects of other social spheres as well.

Complex organizations (both corporate and state) are the engine that runs modern bureaucratic capitalism. These organizations have made possible the world-wide development of contemporary capitalism, and they have done so in ways unimagined only a few decades ago. At the same time, these organizations play a central role in fostering inequality, injustice, and other social pathologies in modern life. Yet how many sociologists currently focus on bureaucratic (or organizational) domination?

My conceptual formulation seeks to reorient sociological analysis of large-scale, bureaucratic organizations by melding a neo-Weberian framework regarding organizations with the pragmatist theorizing of Mead and Dewey. Such a perspective seems essential not only for comprehending how these organizations shape the economy, the polity, and other social spheres (including family arrangements), but also for recognizing how human agents