

Perspectives

VOLUME:
NUMBER: 9
ISSUE: 2
Fall

SECTION OFFICERS

Chair:

Jonathan Turner

Incoming Chair:

Ruth Wallace

Secretary:

George Ritzer

Council Members:

Joseph Berger
Craig Calhoun
Miriam Johnson
Stephen Turner
R. Stephen Warner
Deena Weinstein

Theory Prize Chair:

Charles Lemert

Nominating Comm Chair:

Edward Tiryakian

Perspectives Editor:

Charles Powers

Chair's Message

Jonathan Turner
University of California at Riverside

I would like to thank Edward Tiryakian for his efforts over the last year, and to congratulate Ruth Wallace who will succeed me. And, I owe a sincere "thank you" to Charles Powers for assuming the editorship of Perspectives.

My message for this issue is devoted primarily to informing the membership about next year's ASA meetings in Chicago. The theme of the mini-conference will be "Cumulative Theorizing in Sociology." I will define theoretical cumulation very thoroughly to include (1) empirical assessments of abstract theories, (2) syntheses of contemporary theories, and (3) extensions and revisions of early theories by the masters. My goal will be to assemble a distinguished and representative group of theorists working along these three lines. I will not completely close the door on open submissions, but I must confess that I will solicit papers from prominent theorists whom I see as working at theoretical cumulation.

In addition to the mini-conference, Bernard Barber has agreed to organize and moderate a panel on "Parsons's Structure of Social Action: Three Views Fifty Years On." The panel will include Jeffrey Alexander, Harold Garfinkel, and Jonathan Turner. Since this year marks the 50th anniversary of Parsons's first great work, I think it is appropriate to have people of very different theoretical persuasions look back on this

great work by Parsons, offering professional and personal commentary on its impact.

I am very concerned about excluding those who want to participate in sessions, and so, I have decided to make the roundtables completely open to submissions. R. Stephen Warner has agreed to organize the roundtables. Since we could have as many as a dozen tables, this will allow as many section members to participate as would be the case if our three regular section sessions were open. Moreover, the hour format gives presenters ample time to develop their ideas while, at the same time, permitting others to participate more actively and extensively. Priority will be given to papers that are of general interest and should be submitted to Stephen by January 7, since the final program must go to ASA in early February. His address is Department of Sociology, University of Illinois at Chicago Circle, Chicago, Illinois 60680. If a complete paper is not ready, a five page abstract will suffice.

In addition to the open roundtables, there are other theory sessions in the general program. Thus, while the mini-conference format and the special session on Parsons limit my options, I hope that there are sufficient slots (it looks like sixteen to twenty) for open submissions.

This year the theory section reception will be on the same day as all other theory activities (last year they were on different days because our "party" conflicted with the Presidential address). I have decided to hold the section business meeting at 5:00 pm right before the reception (6:00 pm) as an inducement for people to participate and to get the meeting over as quickly as possible. I encourage everyone to attend so that we can chat informally and perhaps break into groups for dinner.

A reminder: Please be aware that we need to secure more library subscriptions for SOCIOLOGICAL THEORY. We have done wonderfully well on individual subscriptions--a clear sign that Randall Collins and Norbert Wiley have produced an interesting journal over the last couple of years. But, we need to secure library orders, since ASA seems upset about the lack of institutional subscriptions (and they will "review" the journal's progress in a couple of years). So, today call or write the subscription librarian.

A final note: The theory section is doing very well. Our membership is up and there is lots of creative activity among the members of the section. But if we could grow a little more, we will have more sessions at ASA meetings and increased options for other section activities. Thus, let us all try to solicit (where?) colleagues and students to join the section.

1986 Theory Prize

Winners of the 1986 Theory Prize are Ann Orloff and Theda Skocpol for their paper "Why Not Equal Protection? Explaining the Politics of Public Social Spending in Britain, 1900-1911, and the United States, 1880s-1920," AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW, December 1984. Orloff and Skocpol were greeted enthusiastically when they summarized their paper for the membership of the Theory Section at the ASA meetings in New York. The paper was praised as an elegant piece of comparative historical research contributing to our understanding of the welfare state.

1987 Theory Prize

** CALL FOR NOMINATIONS **

Charles Lemert, Chair of the section's Theory Prize Committee, announces competition for the coming year. The Committee invites submissions of scholarly works in sociological theory, published or unpublished. The only requirement is that published works have appeared in the last two years and be no more than fifty pages in length. There is no restriction with respect to the definition of theory. On the contrary, the Committee invites submissions from any sociological perspective. Prize winning papers in recent years have ranged from empirical to purely theoretical in nature. Typically, the competition includes essays representing a great variety of theoretical understandings.

In addition to Lemert, members of the Prize Committee are Randall Collins, University of California at Riverside; James Duke, Brigham Young University; Gary A. Kreps, College of William and Mary; and Charles W. Smith, Queens College, New York.

Deadline for submission is March 1, 1987. All entries should be mailed (5 copies) to Charles Lemert, Chair, Theory Prize Committee, Department of Sociology, Wesleyan University, Middletown, CT 06457.

SOCIOLOGICAL THEORY: A Report from the Editor

Norbert Wiley
University of Illinois at Urbana

By and large ST is in a healthy state. The quality of the articles is good and getting better. It takes a while to publicize a new journal, e.g. citations to its articles have a time lag, but theorists around the world are beginning to tell me they will submit something to ST. I think the journal should be internationalized to some extent, and I am sending sample copies to major theorists in other countries.

There is plenty of competition from other journals and book publishers for the best theory papers. Many theorists seem to have gone almost entirely to book writing, and ASR/AJS get first crack at many good theory papers. The search for good manuscripts is something of a bootstrap operation, although I think those boots are somehow rising. It turns out that ASR/AJS reject many good theory papers if they are off-paradigm, i.e. too new and different. This helps.

The routine of reviewing took a while to catch on to. Your pool of reviewers is your personal network, to some extent. Randy Collins couldn't give me his, so I had to find out for myself who was willing to review, what their reviewing style was, etc. But at this point, I am quite impressed by the large percentage of people I ask who come through--over 90%.

One serious problem we still have is getting library subscriptions. There are now fewer than a hundred and there should be several hundred. The ASA has consistently argued that ST should have a strong library base, and they are looking askance at our slowness in building up this base. Some time lag is inevitable, as in the effect citations have on subscriptions. But if everyone in the Theory Section asked their libraries to subscribe (e.g. using the enclosed library order form) this base would rise. If your own request isn't enough, ask a couple of colleagues to request it too, using up a little of your personal clout with them if necessary. It looks like this is the only way to convince the ASA that this is a solid journal.

One of my hopes for this journal is that the notion of theory, and particularly this journal, becomes clearly open to everything. One thing that helps is that we are open to, in fact we are more or less mandated by the ASA to be open to, all points of view. Some of the competing theory journals tend to "tilt," this way or that. It is not easy to get a balanced batch of submissions, and I certainly won't use a quota system, but I will do what I can to encourage all approaches to theory--e.g. by appointing an appropriately diversified board of editors. This means the journal can't be right, left, or center, can't be pro- or anti-positivist (or anti anything else), and can't afford to get itself labelled as sectarian in any way.

I especially hope we can air out the positivist vs. interpretive, quant/qual, two-cultures problem in sociology. When I went to graduate school in the fifties, the Merton formula for the harmony of theory and research, both in hope and in reality, was a powerful unifying statement. Since that time both sides of the binary have become more ingrown and introspective. New ideas from the Continent and the "linguistic turn" have drawn theory more inward. I am not promoting the yahoo position that all theory must translate directly into survey research, but I do think empirical reference -- in the several meanings of the term, empirical -- is the inescapable office of theory. Making matters worse, empirical research, sped up by the computer, has outstripped its own capacity for connecting to theory. Merton's

level of empirical generalization has cut loose from theory, both grand and middle level. In other words both sides have turned away from the other, particularly in their consciousness and program statements.

Perhaps I am overstating this problem. Many papers that come in have a solid empirical base. Still, I hope this all gets aired out in the journal. I don't think this issue can be summarily solved, e.g. by a new Merton, but I do think a serious examination of the present relation between theory and empirical research can only be good for both sides.

I would also hope that branches of theory, such as feminism and Marxism, which have their own journals also get represented in this journal. This hope holds true for any other branches of theory that are now in specialized journals and networks.

The present subsidy arrangement with the ASA requires that we become self-supporting by the end of 1987, although I am trying to negotiate another year. By then -- the fall, 1987 issue -- ST should be at a distinguished level of quality. I am thinking and planning in terms of a permanent journal, solidly rooted in libraries and individual subscriptions, and strong enough for some projections into the future. If this comes to be, there will be the question of who will become the next editor, whether we can begin pushing for more allotted pages, eventually moving up to quarterly status, and so on.

Support Your Journal!

Have your library order SOCIOLOGICAL THEORY. Do it today!

Name: Professor
Department of Sociology

Dear Campus Librarian:

Please subscribe to SOCIOLOGICAL THEORY, the official theory journal of the American Sociological Association. Mail subscription requests to:

Attn: SOCIOLOGICAL THEORY
American Sociological Association
1722 N Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

Subscription Rates:

	U. S.	outside the U.S.
ASA members	\$12.	\$12
non-members	\$18	\$21
institutions	\$20	\$23

But for this to happen, it is absolutely necessary that those library subscriptions roll in, meeting what the ASA regards as the test of our commitment. Randy Collins worked an organizational miracle, getting this journal off to a solid start, although the other half of the job, secure institutionalization, still remains to be complete. The journal SYMBOLIC INTERACTION, one of the half dozen or so competing journals, recently campaigned itself into several hundred libraries, displaying an impressive use of its marketing resources and strengthening its economic status enormously. They proved it can be done, and I am sure we will be able to do it too.

Comments on the State of Theory

THE SOCIAL ORGANIZATION OF SOCIOLOGY FOR CUMULATIVE KNOWLEDGE

Theodore D. Kemper
St. John's University, N. Y.

If sociology has failed thus far to cumulate knowledge in the manner of the mature sciences, is this inherent in our subject matter, or may it be due to the social organization of our pursuit of knowledge? I claim that how we organize our efforts to gather knowledge contributes to whether we cumulate knowledge. In the mature sciences, the social organization of the pursuit of knowledge tends frequently to crystalize around the formulation of a problem and the programmatic pursuit of its solution.

Organizationally, a common form involves a leading scientist who heads a research enterprise staffed with co-investigators, junior scientists, postdoctoral fellows, and graduate students. This enterprise is devoted in the main to solving the problem(s) set by the head of it. Bits and pieces are addressed by different members. The implications of findings by one member can be followed up in the investigations of other members. Questions can be "worried," tickled, squeezed, and milked. Individual researchers, with a need to establish their own intellectual prowess and to differentiate themselves from their mentor or research chief, have incentives to pursue new approaches to the central problem. And this may lead to reorienting the work of the whole program. But, crucially, the central problem remains the same. All effort is devoted to solving it.

An added feature of this approach is that competition between research programs to solve particular problems mobilizes and hones to a sharper edge the faculties and energies of the investigators. In The Double Helix, James D. Watson revealed in beautiful detail the social texture of the scientific pursuit of the structure of DNA. A dominating feature was the knowledge that

while Watson and his collaborators were laboring in Cambridge, England, a California group directed by Nobelist Linus Pauling was also searching for the key to DNA. Both groups knew that the winners of that race would earn a Nobel prize.

The social organization of sociological work differs from that in the mature sciences, and it may seem that we can never become like them. For example, we are not a laboratory science, hence it may seem that we cannot organize according to the research-program model described above. This is wrong. Research programs need not be laboratory based. Discovering the structure of DNA was largely, in the end, a theoretical effort.

Second, it may seem to be much harder to formulate sociologically significant problems. This is also false. What makes a problem significant is the number of connections the specific question has to other questions. If the web of connections is dense enough (whatever enough means), it is a significant problem. But whether it will be revealed to be significant is not inherent in the problem, but is rather a function of the breadth of theoretical understanding of the investigator. And this is not simply a matter of talent or "smarts," but whether sociological metatheory sets proper guidelines for doing sociological work--i.e., formulates for us how we should go about doing that work, especially in respect to elaborating theoretically the web of connections mentioned above, and the importance of doing so.

Third, it may be objected that previous efforts in social science of the kind suggested here have failed. This is true. One of the most resounding failures was in the study of group dynamics, initiated by social psychologist Kurt Lewin in the 1940s. The researchers attached to that program believed they could solve the basic problems of group dynamics in about a decade. What hubris! Of course they did not. So what! They only failed to attain their goal according to a too optimistic timetable set by themselves.

Ironically, failure occurs more often in the mature sciences where great advances are obtained, and seldom in the social sciences where it is difficult to recognize any advance. Indeed, to fail indicates that one has actually attempted something. Since sociologists rarely try, in organized and resolute ways, to answer big questions, we rarely fail.

Yet we do have a great example of important cumulative research in sociology. It will astonish those who say it can't be done, or done without enormous financial resources. And it should make those people ponder who think, like Dilthey, that Geisteswissenschaft and Naturwissenschaft are not commensurate. The example is that of Max Weber. How else can we conceive of his vast historical-cultural project to establish the place of religion, values, and ideas as "switch engines" guiding societies along certain paths rather than others, even within the context of similar economic and technological

structures and opportunities. This was indeed a large question. Weber didn't settle it conclusively, but he demonstrated how to work on it, namely, by working on it.

Today we don't seem to understand that big answers come from organizing social effort to formulating and working on big questions. It will be appropriate to inquire whether or not sociology can be a cumulative science only after we have tried seriously and for sufficient time, both in organizational forms and in individual careers, the practices that have led to cumulation in other sciences.

What Should We Be Doing?

R. Stephen Warner
University of Illinois at Chicago Circle

I thank Chuck Powers for asking me to respond to this question, for I think one of the things we should be doing is talking to each other about theory. The Theory Section has maintained a relatively catholic stance toward various schools within sociology, and it is therefore an excellent forum for discussion. My message is that we each need to develop more substantive wisdom about society. More about that in a moment.

What I think we should do less of is carry on such discussions in general disciplinary forums, lecturing each other and our hapless "non-theoretical" colleagues on the "approaches" and "presuppositions" that should be adopted in research. Whether one is sufficiently attuned to "action," "structure," "intention," and "system" is of concern to us as theorists, but we should not expect the discipline of sociology to listen to us while we argue. So the second thing I think we ought to do is to remember whom we are addressing when we attempt theoretical dialog.

I think we have to remember that a theory, to the extent that it is taken seriously, is a collective commitment, requiring an enormous investment of talent and energy to digest, apply, test, evaluate, effectuate, amend, etc. I think we have to earn the right to have our theories taken seriously. One way to do that is to carry out the implications of our own sermons, as Donald Black did in The Behavior of Law (1976). As a colleague of Black's for six years, I have to say I tired of hearing of the importance of "general, social-level" theory, but when I read his book, I recognized that Black did not leave to others to do what he recommended. In the past ten years, Black's theory has received a great deal of deserved attention. He earned it by thinking hard, writing clearly, and offering sufficient empirical examples that the reader could know what the theory meant.

I do not want to recommend Black's particular style of theory, for it strikes me as sacrificing wisdom to elegance. It is beautiful indeed, but I knew little more about society when I finished it than when I began. No doubt this is a matter of taste, but I am more enlightened by theories less abstract than that of Black's. Partly this preference is a function of the research I have just completed, a social history of a California church that leads into an interpretation of the place of evangelicalism in contemporary American culture. This research began as a short-term case-study project to ground some ideas on consensus and conflict but, because of my initial misunderstanding of the site and later conviction that I had to report my findings, became a ten-year commitment (New Wine, Old Wineskin: The Odyssey of a Small-Town Church in the Sixties and Seventies, forthcoming from the University of California Press). In order to complete my book, I needed information about and interpretations of American religion, not general theory. In the process of searching the literature on American religion, I became fascinated by a question that will be the focus of my next book: why is American religion so uniquely vital among advanced industrial societies? And that sort of question, a relatively idiographic, comparative one, is the sort of thing I wish theoretically inclined sociologists would pay more attention to.

To craft my own statement of my findings, I draw heavily on my theoretical repertoire, particularly on Weber, Parsons, Shils, and Collins, as well as Alberoni's Movement and Institution (1984). Because theories serve a largely mnemonic function for me (see "Teaching Theory in an Empirically Oriented Graduate Program," THE AMERICAN SOCIOLOGIST new series, forthcoming), I suppose I could have drawn on other sources of accumulated social wisdom, though I have to confess that I found other figures in my theoretical background (e.g. Marx, Durkheim, and Peter Berger) of relatively little conscious use. My book is clearly the product of a Weberian sociologist. Writing it has reinforced my conviction that sociologists should learn theory.

But the particular sources from which I developed the ideas that I think give the book its value as sociology were theoretically informed studies of American religion, works by Hadden (The Gathering Storm in the Churches), Hoge and Roozen (Understanding Church Growth and Decline), and their colleagues Reef (Community and Commitment), and Swatos ("Beyond Denominationalism," JOURNAL FOR THE SCIENTIFIC STUDY OF RELIGION, 1981) among others. Late in the writing process I even drew on Weber's essay on United States religion, recently unearthed by Alexander and Loader (SOCIOLOGICAL THEORY, 3:7-13). Above all I draw on Will Herber's Protestant, Catholic, Jew, an astonishingly good book. This is the sort of work that I aspire to accomplish myself: it is informative about society (American society, in particular), oriented to social theory (as well as to theology), and devoted to an explanatory task. I submit that those are the qualities of the works of

Marx, Durkheim, and Weber that have led us to enshrine them as theorists. Weber tells us about the genesis of western European capitalism, Durkheim about its morale in industrialization, and Marx about its likely course. Their books are packed with empirical information, directed to ideas current in their times, and disciplined by explanatory projects. Meanwhile, their data are now largely obsolete if not mistaken, we live in new intellectual contexts, and new questions about society have arisen. We need to keep doing what they did.

Developments in Progress

INTERACTIONISM'S NEXT FIFTY YEARS

Gary Alan Fine
University of Minnesota

Fifty years ago (1937) Herbert Blumer coined the label symbolic interactionism to refer to himself and other sociologists who followed in the pragmatic tradition of G. H. Mead. Although at the time the phrase must have seemed a horrid neologism (especially to those undergraduates who were required to read the text in which the term was embedded), it has had remarkable staying power.

It was not until a decade later when returning veterans and other postwar young men (and some women) spilled across Chicago's Midway that interactionism gained a secure footing in American sociology. Still, until at least the 1970s interactionism was seen by many, if not most, sociologists as being out of step. Quirky micropilgrims in a macroland. The creativity of the best of these graduates of the 1950s--Goffman, Becker, Davis, Turner, Strauss, and others--were respected, but respected as representative of an alien approach.

The last decade has seen a merging of approaches, a new weave of sociology. Whereas Parsons seemed content to ignore interactionism, for Alexander it is an important part of the fabric. Whereas Gouldner dismissed Goffman, Sica assumes his worth. Likewise, the evident interest among continental sociologists (Giddens, Bourdieu, Habermas) in Mead, pragmatism, and interactionism places this perspective in the mainstream. For the more senior interactionists this must be amusing, troubling, comforting, and shocking. For those trained more recently the new warp and woof of sociology wears well.

Despite my title, it would be the height of presumption to sketch an agenda for the next half century. I'll focus my attention on the near, but indefinite future. I see this as a synthetic age, a period in which we incorporate the works of others to our own. Such a perspective can be seen in the increasingly influential writings of Norman Denzin and Patricia

Clough who are building theory using the approaches of French post-structuralism. Their writing remains eminently sociological, but in a way which addresses the reading of selves and situations as texts--which like all texts can be reconfigured and deconstructed.

On a more empirical note, over the past decade there has been a new ethnographic slant. Where once many ethnographers were content to describe a setting (perhaps with a dollop of low-level theorizing), today's ethnographers ground their observations in theory. I think of such works as Kleinman's Equals Before God, Mitchell's Mountain Experience, Swidler's Organization Without Authority, and Hochschild's The Managed Heart. These "theoretical ethnographies" are written by ethnographers who are primarily theorists, and who believe that empirical examples are the best way in which to create new theory. Indeed, such ethnographies are sometimes criticized for not telling the reader very much about the setting.

Some interactionists have attempted to reconfigure psychological issues, especially through the sociology of emotions. Emotions are not alien to sociological thought in their social construction and situational character. The organization of the Emotions Section of the American Sociological Association, although not created only by interactionists, is a part of this ferment. Feelings, thoughts, behaviors, and organized structures are part of the seamless web of human meanings.

Still others have recognized that as Habermas has discovered Mead, the attention can and should be returned. Continental critical theory of the Eighties is concerned with understanding webs of constraint between interaction and structure (the time-space expansion of Giddens). The steps taken by Collins will increasingly be reciprocated by interactionists interested in macro-theory. My own writings on subculture, organizational theory, network, and culture have been attempts to forge such connections. Likewise, Peter Hall's 1986 presidential address at the Midwest Sociological Society titled "Interactionism and the Study of Social Organization" is an attempt to demonstrate how concepts such as collective activity, network, conventions-practices, resources, processuality-temporality, and groundedness provide for an interactionist paradigm of social organization.

Further, we need to go beyond the recognition that interactionists can create theory on macro-topics. That is, we must address the fact that sociological theory has a dual micro and macro foundation. Thus, there is the need for a companion piece to Collins' "The Microfoundations of Macrosociology"--"The Macrofoundations of Microsociology." Collins gives microsociologists an undeserved tribute in that he assumes that microsociology is in some ways more essential than macrosociology. However, this surely involves a social construction. The world is ordered logically in various ways. The writings of Cooley, Mead, and Blumer are ordered by beliefs

about structure. These beliefs are not derivative, but are as much constitutive as behavior itself. Chains of organizational affiliation can be seen to shape interaction, just as ritual chains structure organizations. A lack of ontological primacy is surely congruent with interactionism.

Always, always it is hoped and expected that we will continue to read the classics--our classics, all the classics. Our goal is not to gain the truth but to reconfigure them for our own purposes. The hundreds of interpretations of Mead, Durkheim, Marx, and Weber are a testimony that our discipline is alive. Whether they are right interpretations are less important (and unknowable) than if they are usable interpretations.

One can only know the future by extrapolation of the past. From this perspective there is much that will be done. Sociologists are becoming theoretical bricoleurs, cobbling our analysis from diverse pieces--the sociological equivalent of found art. The danger in this radical eclecticism; of course, is that writers will look for the new and exotic merely because it is new and exotic, rather than because it fits--novelty itself should not become the mark of profundity. Interactionists who hew to Blumer's three premises of symbolic interaction are well-poised to make these connections. Much modern theory-building has chosen what might loosely be called the subjective side of the objectivism/subjectivism debate--the limitations of the scientific model are, today, widely recognized. While pendulums swing, on this portion of the arc symbolic interactionism and pragmatism are stable loadstars on which to ground theoretical and empirical advances.

The library of the past half-century is filled with volumes which attest by their longevity to the vibrancy of interactionism and suggest by their example the likely productivity of the future. The macro-micro link, the sociology of emotions and experiencing, "theoretical ethnography," and the Europeanization of American sociology will likely be much changed by 2037, but they may help us get there.

CURRENT ISSUES IN NETWORK-EXCHANGE THEORY

David Willer
University of Kansas

Recently, the concerns of network-exchange theorists have expanded beyond exchange structures to include issues of equity, justice and legitimacy at the level of the actor and, at the structural level, the issues of coalition formation and negative sanctions. At the same time the most basic problem of the field, the problem of how to theoretically locate power positions in exchange networks, has yet to be generally solved.

The location problem has become increasingly embarrassing for the following reason. Experimental research has shown that exchange structures can reliably produce power differences among subjects and that the production of power differences is very general. The phenomenon is so robust that normally each experimental run is statistically significant and all experiments work. Finding power relations is easy. Theoretically covering the phenomenon in a fully general way has proven to be more difficult than anticipated.

The difficulty does not lie in covering certain simple structures. For simple structures power-dependence theorists' intuitive idea of dependence, introduced by Richard Emerson and developed by Karen Cook, Mary Gillmore and Toshio Yamagishi, is enough. But as an increasing variety of network shapes are considered, more formal procedures like reduction of maximum flow (RMF) and the cost of reduction of maximum flow (CRMF) are needed.

The problem of location is complicated by the issue of network conditions. Power-dependence networks--that is the networks which are normally produced experimentally--are subject to certain conditions. Most experiments and simulations assume that exchanges occur in cycles (negotiation periods) and for each cycle each subject is limited to a single exchange. Exchange consists of the division of profit points. Because profit points can only be divided between adjacent positions, power relations can occur only between adjacent positions. Within these conditions, as shape varies, the distribution of power varies. But these are very special conditions. What if, for a given shape, subjects were allowed to make two or more exchanges? Experiments conducted by Barry Markovsky, Travis Patton and myself have shown that, in at least one network, as the number of exchanges is varied, the location of power shifts. Recent studies by Cook, Gillmore and Yamagishi have shown that the distribution of power in flow networks--networks in which resources can flow through positions to remote parts of the structure--is very different than the distribution of power when exchange is a division of profit points.

Attempts to solve the location problem now take one of two directions. Phillip Bonacich has introduced a family of centrality measures for positively and negatively connected networks. While this approach has very general implications, questions can be raised concerning the relation between its parameters and the conditions of networks to which it could be applied. Markovsky, Patton and I have introduced C1 and CN which are centrality measures for 1- and N-exchange power-dependence networks and hope to develop increasingly general formulations. Here the procedures are explicitly tied to network conditions, but, because of present scope restrictions, questions can be raised concerning future developments.

Thus the question of the location of power positions in any network structure under any possible conditions is now in flux. Since the phenomenon is so robust, all can point to some successes. The future should see an increasing number of critical tests among competing theoretic procedures.

Because power relations can be reliably produced, the experimental paradigm lends itself to the study of actor conditions. Following on the work of Cook and Emerson on equity, John Stolte has investigated legitimation, Linda Molm, knowledge and interaction history and Karen Hegtvedt and Cook, justice. Simulations by Yamagishi and Markovsky emphasize the importance of decision procedures. Both have used fairly simple decision procedures which produce realistic results insofar as rates of exchange are concerned. In the future, the development of increasingly complex actor simulations, may lead to increasingly realistic simulations of interaction processes. Such simulations have a great potential both for research, and teaching.

Given its focus on the social relation of exchange, other types of relations which involve negative sanctions, like conflict and coercion, may become central concerns of network-exchange theorists. (If so, a new name for this sub-field may be needed.) In recent work Molm has suggested that people are more reluctant to transmit negatives than positives. But I have shown that centralized coercive structures are working structures and the phenomenon of coercion can be as reliably produced as exchange.

If the general problem of location can be solved, if negative sanctions can be integrated into our theories, and if actor issues can be resolved, then we will have at least the beginnings of a broad scope theory of social structure. I find that prospect exciting.

News

ASA MJNT-CONFERENCE

Edward Tiryakian
Duke University

A notable aspect of the program of the Theory Section at the New York annual meetings was the two-session mini-conference on the theme "East meets West: A Transpacific Theory Dialogue." The conference was organized by me, as the 1985-86 Theory chairman, in recognition of the need to begin a series of theoretical exchanges between scholars across the Pacific; this would complement the conferences that the section has sponsored in recent years across the Atlantic in cooperation with German scholars.

Coming from across the Pacific were Professors Wang Kang from the People's Republic of China; Takashi Miyajima, Tomihide Kashioka, and Eshun Hamaguchi from Japan; and Man-Gap Lee and Kyong-Dong Kim of Korea. The American sociologists who made presentations were Professors Reinhard Bendix (Berkeley), Murray Milner (Virginia) and Ezra Vogel (Harvard). Professor Hans Haferkamp, chairman of the German Theory Section, was also a participant, and Professors S. N. Eisenstadt of Israel and Hideichiro Nakano of Japan, both unable to come to New York, had their papers available for discussion. I was able, in cooperation with the ASA, to get a conference grant from the Japan Foundation of New York to defray the travel expenses of Japanese participants.

The sessions that comprised this miniconference were held on Sunday, August 31st, and it was very gratifying to see a very large audience turnout for this occasion. Both the quality of the papers and the enthusiasm of the audience are vindication of the premise behind the conference, namely, that the time has come for us who deal with large-scale social change and problems of modernity and development (1) to critically reconsider classical Western images and models of East Asia and "the Orient," and (2) to take into account contemporary transformations of East Asia into a major center of modernity as the basis of renovation and rethinking macro theory, which has implicitly been heretofore ground in Western historical experiences. An important step in this direction is to regularize contacts between East Asian and Western sociologists. Our Theory Section, which has a growing international membership, is well situated to further these dialogues.

Tomihide Kashioka and I have undertaken to be co-editors of a volume stemming from this conference. Details of its publication will be communicated to readers of PERSPECTIVES when arrangements with a publisher become finalized. If a section member would like to be informed of a future "East meets West" theory conference and might be willing to present a paper, she/he should contact either E. A. Tiryakian, Department of Sociology, Duke University, or Tomihide Kashioka, Kansai University of Foreign Studies, 333 Ogura, Hirakata City, Osaka, Japan 573

GERMAN-AMERICAN THEORY CONFERENCE

Neil Smelser
University of California at Berkeley

By way of background I should indicate that in 1981 a number of representatives from the theory section of the German Sociological Association approached the offices of the Theory Section of the American Sociological Association with the idea that some kind of joint conference on theory might be held. The latter were receptive, and after a period of planning a conference was scheduled for the summer of 1984 at the University

of Giessen. The theme of this first conference was "The Macro-Micro Link," and dealt with the theoretical relations between interaction patterns among individuals on the one hand and larger social structures on the other. The conference was regarded as a successful one, and in its aftermath four participants--Jeffrey Alexander, Bernard Giesen, Richard Munch, and Neil Smelser--agreed to undertake editorial responsibility for the papers. They were submitted to the University of California Press and at the present time a book with the title The Macro-Micro Link is in production and should appear in the first half on 1987. The first conference was funded by the Volkswagen Foundation.

In the aftermath of the initial conference the organizers agreed that it would be worthwhile intellectually to plan for a second meeting, this one in the United States. The theme adopted was "social change and modernity." The format was much the same, with seven or eight German and American theorists presenting, along with several non-German Europeans, with several discussants from Germany and the United States. The second conference was sponsored by the National Science Foundation, and was held at the Institute of International Studies at Berkeley on August 26-18, 1986.

Among the dominant themes that emerged in the conference were the following:

1. A reevaluation and revision of evolutionary ideas. The main papers in this area were Niklas Luhmann, University of Bielefeld, "The direction of Evolution"; Norbert Wiley, University of Illinois, Urbana, "The Human Self: From Primates to Present"; and Klaus Eder, University of Dusseldorf, "Contradictions and Social Evolution."

2. The relations between social change in world society and social change in national societies. Papers addressing this issue were Karl-Otto Hondrich, J W. Goethe University, "World Society Versus Niche Societies: Paradoxes of Unidirectional Evolution"; Roland Robertson, University of Pittsburgh, "Sociological Theory and Images of World Order"; and Neil J. Smelser, University of California, Berkeley, "External and Internal Factors in Development."

3. Distinctive kinds of social movements associated with modernity. Papers in this area were by Ron Eyerman, Lund University, "Modernity and Social Movements"; Edward Tiryakian, Duke University, "Dialectics of Modernity: Reenchantment and Dedifferentiation as Counter Processes"; and Alain Touraine, "Two Interpretations of Contemporary Social Change,"

4. Patterns of inequality in development. Papers on this topic were John Goldthorpe, Oxford University, "Employment, Class and Mobility: A Critique of Liberal and Marxist Theories of Long-Term Change"; Hans Maferkamp, University of Bremen, "Modernity and Ascription"; and Richard Munch, University of Dusseldorf, "Social Change and Modernity in America: The System of Equality

and Inequality."

5. Distinctive patterns of social change associated with modernization. Papers on this topic were Jeffrey Alexander, University of California, Los Angeles, "Durkheim's Problem and Differentiation Theory Today"; Craig Calhoun, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, "New Information Technology, the Changing Scale of Social Integration, and the Idea of a Post-Industrial Society"; S. N. Eisenstadt, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, "A Reappraisal of Theories of Social Change and Modernization"; Robert Wuthnow, Princeton University, "Cultural Change in Sociological Theory" and Johannes Berger, University of Bielefeld, "The Future of Capitalism."

The keynote of the conference was one of intellectual synthesis, and there was very little wrangling over the value of comparative approaches to the study of social change and modernity. That keynote seems to reflect the dominant intellectual trends in both the United States and Germany at the present time where theoretical work seems to be converging toward some new kind of synthesis. There was general agreement on the part of the participants in the conference that the papers enjoyed a sufficient theoretical coherence and were of sufficient quality that an effort should be made to try to have the contributions, appropriately revised, published in book form. On a tentative basis, Hans Haferkamp and I have agreed to undertake the preliminary editorial work.

GERMAN THEORY GROUP, 1986 IN REVIEW

Hans Haferkamp
University of Bremen
Chair, German Theory Section

In 1986 we had two section sessions. Listed below are titles of the papers presented at the Symposium on "Niklas Luhmann: Soziale Systeme." This session was organized around a discussion of Luhmann's new book on general sociological theory, Soziale Systeme: Grundriß einer allgemeinen Theorie, Frankfurt 1984. The session was held on February 7th and 8th 1986 in Augsburg and was organized by Hans Haferkamp, Bremen, and Michael Schmid, Augsburg. (Titles are translated into English for the convenience of non-German speaking readers.)

Michael Schmid, Augsburg, "Autopoiesis and Social Structure: A Position Finding"
Johannes Berger, Bielefeld, "Autopoiesis: How 'Systemic' is the Theory of Social Systems?"
Hans-Joachim Giegel, Marburg, "Interpenetration and Reflexive Determination of the Relationship between Psychic and Social System"

- Georg Lohmann, Berlin, "Autopoiesis and the Impossibility of Loss of Sense: A Marginal Access to Niklas Luhmann's Theory 'Social Systems'"
- Helmut Willke, Bielefeld, "Differentiation and Integration in Luhmann's Theory of Social Systems"
- Erwin K. Scheuch, Cologne, "The Conception of 'Loose Social Systems' as Corrective to System Theory"
- Constans Seyfarth, Tübingen, "'Social Systems': Some Aspects of Reading from the Viewpoint of Max Weber's Sociology of 'Verstehen'"
- Max Miller, Freiburg, "Self-Reference and Experience of Difference: Some Reflections on Luhmann's Theory of Social Systems"
- Alois Hahn, Trier, "Sense and Senselessness"
- Gunther Teubner, Bremen and Florence, "Hypercycle in Law and Organization: On the Relation between Self-Observation, Self-Constitution and Autopoiesis"
- Niklas Luhmann, Bielefeld, "Autopoiesis as Sociological Conception"

These papers will be published in the collective volume Sinn, Kommunikation und Differenzierung: Beiträge zu Luhmann's Theorie sozialer Systeme in the Suhrkamp Verlag, Frankfurt, 1987. edited by Hans Haferkamp, Bremen, and Michael Schmid, Augsburg. Two further articles are included in this book: Hans Haferkamp, Bremen, "Autopoietic Social System or Constructive Social Action? On the Arrival of Action Theory and on the Rejection of Empirical Research in Niklas Luhmann's System Theory"; and Karl-Otto Hondrich, Frankfurt, "The other Side of Social Differentiation: Critique and Affiliation with Niklas Luhmann's Thesis of the Primacy of Functional Differentiation."

The second symposium in 1986 was the "Max Weber Conference," held June 19th to 21st in Kassel. It was organized by Richard Munch, Dusseldorf and Johannes Weiss, Kassel. Presentations included:

- Johannes Weiss, Kassel, "Max Weber: An Endless Discussion?"
- Dirk Kasler, Hamburg, "The Varnished Classic: On the Current State of Research of Max Weber's Biography"
- Constans Seyfarth, Tübingen, "Sociology as 'Wirklichkeitswissenschaft': Max Weber's Sociology of Profession"
- Richard Munch, Dusseldorf, "Differentiation, Rationalization, Interpenetration: Max Weber and the Development of Modernity"
- Hans Haferkamp, Bremen, "Individualization and Uniforming: On a Paradox in Weber's Theory of Societal Development"
- Rainer Dobert, Berlin, "The Complex of Rationality and Max Weber's Theory of Legitimation"
- Helmut F. Spinner, Mannheim, "The Whole Rationalism of a 'World of Opposites': the Principle Rationality of the Occident and the Occasional Rationality of Modernity"
- Pietro Rossi, Turin, "The Reception of Weber's Work in Italy after 1945: Max Weber as Alternative to Idealism and Marxism?"
- Zdzislaw Krasnodebski, Warsaw, "The Weber-Reception in Poland"

Guenther Roth, Seattle, "Attempts at Application of Weber's Sociology of Domination to the Soviet Union, People's Republic of China and the United States"

M. Rainer Lepsius, Heidelberg, "'Charisma': Application of a 'Idealtype' to Hitler's Domination"

Nikolai Genov, Sofia, "What's the Reason for Max Weber's Topicality in the Sociology of Socialism?"

Takeji Iberaki, Tokyo, "Problems of Reception of Max Weber's Sociology in Japan"

Wilhelm Hennis, Freiburg, "Max Weber's Political Views"

Wolfgang Mommsen, Dusseldorf, "Politics and Political Theory with Max Weber"

Clausjohannes Lindner, Nurenberg, "Max Weber as Action Theorist"

Friedrich H. Tenbruck, Tübingen, "The Development of Sociology of 'Verstehen' out of the Question about the Sense of Science"

Wolfgang Schluchter, Heidelberg, "Max Weber's First Breakthrough: From the Abstract Theory of Economy to the Realistic Theory of Culture"

Manfred Rehbinder, Zurich, "Max Weber and Jurisprudence"

Stephen Kalberg, Boston, "Max Weber's Sociology of Ethical Action"

Lawrence A. Scaff, Tucson, "Max Weber's Theory of Culture"

Martin Albrow, Cardiff, "The British Reception of Max Weber"

These papers will be published in the Suhrkamp Verlag, Frankfurt. The volume will be edited by Johannes Weiss.

The third theory section meeting in 1986 was held in conjunction with our American colleagues at the 2nd German-American Theory Conference in Berkeley, California. Proceedings of that meeting are reported on by Professor Smelser in this issue of PERSPECTIVES.

At the 23rd Annual Meeting of the German Association for Sociology in Hamburg, September 29th to October 2nd, the theory section arranged two events. The first was a session with the title: "Microsociological Revolution? Did it take place?" organized by Klaus Eder, Munich/Dusseldorf. The second was a session held in cooperation with the Methodology Section under the theme "Modelling Sociological Subjects." This session was organized by Michael Schmid of Augsburg and Hartmut Esser of Mannheim.

Papers presented in the session on Microsociological Revolution were Klaus Eder, Munich/Dusseldorf, "How Can Societies Learn?"; Hartmut Esser, Mannheim, "On some Good Reasons for a (Certain) Microsociological Revolution in Sociology"; Jürgen Markowitz, Dortmund/Bielefeld, "System contra Lifeworld? On the Self-Description of Communicative Processes"; Karin Knorr-Cetina, Bielefeld, "On the Double Production of Social Reality: The Constructivist Approach and Its Consequences"; and Ulrich Oevermann, Frankfurt, "On Some Principles of the Hermeneutic-Reconstructive Structure Analysis in the Social Sciences."

Papers presented in the session on Modelling Sociological Subjects were Werner Raub, Erlangen/Nurenberg, "Group Size and

Cooperation: A Model for the 'Dilemma of Large Numbers'; W. Muller and D. Liepmann, Berlin, "Welfare Behavior: Experimentally Testing Theoretical Models of Group Decisions"; Georg Erdmann, Zurich, "Modelling the Emergence and Change of Structures of Order"; and Reinhard Zintl, Munich, "Sociology of Elections and Individualistic Theory: On the Theoretical Accomplishment of Empirical Research."

In 1987 three symposia will be held:

1. Session, held on February 12th to 14th in Dusseldorf, organized by Klaus Eder, Munich/Dusseldorf, and Richard Munch, Dusseldorf: "Social Classes and Culture".
2. First European Theory Conference in cooperation with the theory group of the British Sociological Association and other European sociological associations, held on June 18th to 20th in Bremen, organized by Hans Haferkamp, Bremen: "Social Structure and Culture".
3. Session, held on December 10th to 12th in Augsburg, organized by Michael Schmid, Augsburg, and Johannes Weiss, Kassel.

Members of the ASA are urged to contact the authors for copies of papers. Those, who wish to participate in symposia of the German theory section, or who have others questions, please write to the chair of the theory section:

Prof. Dr. Hans Haferkamp
Universitat Bremen
FB 8/Fach Soziologie
Postfach 33 04 40
D-2800 Bremen/ West-Germany

INTERNATIONAL SOCIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION
RESEARCH COMMITTEE ON THE HISTORY OF SOCIOLOGY

Stephen Turner
University of South Florida

The Research Committee on the History of Sociology (RCHS) is one of the oldest and largest of the "Research Committees" that make up the International Sociological Association, with 167 members in 26 countries, and includes many Third World and Eastern Bloc scholars. The committee meets with the World Congress of Sociology every four years, and once in the period between Congresses. Past interim meetings have been held at Oxford, Paris, and Munich; the 1988 meeting is tentatively planned for Amsterdam. The meetings serve as a major point of international contact for scholars from several disciplines (but primarily from sociology) working on the history of sociology. Participants range from the grand old men of the field to new

Ph.D. students, and always include active scholars working on major historical research projects. Important work in this area often is presented to the committee in its formative stages. The conferences are small, egalitarian, and European-style, with ample opportunities for meeting scholars with similar interests, and sharing information. A given conference will usually have one or more themes, such as "National Sociological Traditions" or "The Institutionalization of Sociology." In the recent New Delhi meetings there were sessions on Orientalism, Sociologists in Public Life, Sociologists and Fascism, and Peace, War, and Nationalism in the History of Sociology. The aim of the committee is to treat the history of sociology in a serious historical way, and the kind of work done for the committee has gradually evolved, through many methodological discussions and exemplary studies, away from expositions of the masters to concrete historical research, although more broadly interpretive work still plays a role. Membership is open to interested persons, newcomers are very welcome, and dues are nominal. The committee has a Newsletter which is a source of information on conferences, new publications in the area, and of course RCHS and ISA conferences. For more information, write:

Prof. Dr. Dirk Kaesler
Geschäftsführender Direktor
Institut fuer Soziologie
Allende-Platz 1
D-2000 Hamburg 13
Federal Republic of Germany

THEORY SECTION BUSINESS MEETING HIGHLIGHTS

Section membership grew from 369 in July of 1984 to 471 in August of 1986. This is a very positive development, in part because program time at the annual ASA convention is allocated on the basis of section size.

Items of business:

1. Election results were reported. Ruth Wallace will be the Theory Section Chair for 1987-1988. Stephen Turner and Deena Weinstein have been elected to the Council.
2. Dues were raised from \$5 to \$7. This was viewed as necessary in order to provide the section with a budget. The minimum dues of \$5 go directly to the ASA rather than to the section.
3. A new committee on nominations was elected. The committee will consist of Randall Collins, Stephen Kalberg, Dennis Wrong, and Edith Kurzweil, and will be headed by the outgoing chair of the Theory Section, Edward Tiryakian. Charles Powers was elected to the editorship of PERSPECTIVES. New members of the Theory Prize selection committee are James Duke, Gary Krebs, and Charles Smith.

Call for Papers

TEACHING SOCIOLOGY

TEACHING SOCIOLOGY will publish a special issue on teaching theory next year. The editor is interested in articles of all types, including long analytical papers, empirical studies, short papers on teaching techniques, book reviews, film reviews, commentaries, and interviews. The deadline for submission is February 1, 1987. Authors should submit 4 copies plus a \$10 processing fee to:

Theodore C. Wagenaar, TS Editor
Department of Sociology
Miami University
Oxford, Ohio 45056

RACE, CLASS, AND GENDER
ASA TEACHING RESOURCES CENTER

Patricia Hall Collins Department of Afro-American Studies University of Cincinnati Cincinnati, Ohio 45221	Margaret Anderson Department of Sociology University of Delaware Newark, Delaware 19716
--	--

We are requesting materials that assist instructors in presenting material that integrates race, class, and gender throughout the sociology curriculum. These are to be published in a volume, "An Inclusive Curriculum: Race, Class, and Gender in Sociological Instruction," co-sponsored by the Teaching Resources Center, the section on race and ethnicity, and the section on sex and gender of the American Sociological Association. We would especially like to receive syllabi for core courses (such as theory, methodology, and substantive areas other than race and ethnic relations and sex and gender) that are inclusive of race, class and gender.

In addition to course syllabi, we are looking for contributions that illustrate or discuss class projects, discussion guidelines, film reviews, and other pedagogical techniques and resources that instructors have successfully used to bring race, class, and gender to the center of student's thinking on sociological issues.

While we would like to see some finished projects, we also encourage people to send "think pieces" in the form of brief essays that discuss the new questions brought to courses when building an inclusive curriculum. What, for example, would a

course in sociological theory look like were it to be inclusive of race, class, and gender throughout? What transformations are made in Introduction to Sociology when race, class, and gender are brought to the center of the course? The deadline is March 1987.

Editorial Policy

COMMUNICATION AND INTELLECTUAL FERMENT

Charles Powers
Santa Clara University
Santa Clara, California 95050

The theory section has gained real intellectual vitality in the last few years. It is clear to me that PERSPECTIVES, under the stewardship of Jonathan Turner, has contributed significantly to the improved climate and sense of intellectual charge. PERSPECTIVES is the only open, broad based forum we have for learning about the work in progress of persons outside of our own small networks of colleagues. Being informed about what is going on improves prospects for making innovative theoretical breakthroughs and meaningful disciplinary progress. Being informed also makes our jobs more rewarding and gives people a sense of being plugged in. For these reasons I will continue to make PERSPECTIVES a vehicle for (1) advertising conference and other events of theoretical interest, (2) stimulating discussion on the state of theory and direction of our discipline, (3) circulating ideas more rapidly than one can expect the journals to do, and (4) keeping theorists abreast of new developments. But I will be unable to accomplish these ends without your help. PERSPECTIVES can only serve as a clearinghouse for the information that you send in. If you know of local activities, interesting theoretical work in progress, or important issues that need to be aired, please write to me. Unsolicited comments are also wanted, as are responses to any comments appearing in the newsletter. The more broad the spectrum of ideas transmitted through PERSPECTIVES the better. Help me make our newsletter an effective conduit linking theorists together into a community of scholars.

This issue of PERSPECTIVES appears in reduced print size in order to take maximum advantage of our space allotment. Whether we continue to publish in reduced size will depend entirely on the quality of the product and reader reaction.

Beginning in 1987, my plan is to move from a semi-annual to a quarterly format. If we are successful in this regard, the next issue should reach you in March. So if you have items to share with the readership, please send them in as soon as possible.

DON'T FORGET: Have your library order a subscription to our journal, SOCIOLOGICAL THEORY!

Name: Professor
Department of Sociology

Dear Campus Librarian:

Please subscribe to SOCIOLOGICAL THEORY, the official theory journal of the American Sociological Association. Mail subscription requests to:

Attn: SOCIOLOGICAL THEORY
American Sociological Association
1722 N Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

Subscription Rates:

	U. S.	outside the U. S.
ASA members	\$12.	\$12.
non-members	\$18.	\$21.
institutions	\$20.	\$23.
