

# SOCIOLOGY AT THE END OF HISTORY: PROFESSION, VOCATION AND CRITICAL PRACTICE

Daniel M. Harrison

## ABSTRACT

*As the social scientists of modern society, sociologists find themselves in a peculiar situation. Human civilization appears on the brink of collapse; the ravages of global capitalism are turning natural and social orders upside down. Some theorists are declaring the “end of history,” while others wonder if humans will soon become extinct. People find themselves increasingly shouldering burdens on their own, strangers to themselves and others. Struggles for recognition and identity are forged in harsh landscapes of social dislocation and inequality. The relationship of the individual to the state atrophies as governmental power becomes at once more remote and absolutely terrifying. How are we as sociologists expected to theorize under such circumstances? What implications result for the mission of sociology as a discipline and area of study? What political initiatives, if any, can counter these trends?*

*This chapter provides an immanent critique of sociology as a profession, vocation, and critical practice. Sociology today (in the US and around the globe) faces fierce social, economic, and political headwinds. The discipline continues to be a perilous choice as a vocation for independent researchers as much as the shrinking professoriate. Yet while the traditional functions of sociology are thrown into doubt, there has been an increase in critical practices on the part of some sociologists. As institutional norms, values, and traditions continue to be challenged, there will be passionate debates about the production of social worlds and the validity claims involved in such creation. Sociologists must play an active role in such discourse. Sociology is needed today as a mode of intervention as much as occupational status system or method of inquiry.*

**Keywords:** End times; profession; vocation; praxis; sociology; critical theory

---

The Challenge of Progress: Theory Between Critique and Ideology

Current Perspectives in Social Theory, Volume 36, 133–155

Copyright © 2020 Emerald Publishing Limited

All rights of reproduction in any form reserved

ISSN: 0278-1204/doi:10.1108/S0278-120420190000036018

## INTRODUCTION

Whither the labor of sociology in the world, here now at the “end of history”? To think that, less than a generation ago as we prepared for the new millennium, the world was celebrating globalization, international capitalist development, and all wonders technology had to offer. Today that vision of the future has all but disappeared. First came the attacks of September 11, 2001, and then the “War on Terror” followed, which continues to this day. For individuals, organizations, and societies, these are often frightening and dangerous times. Much of the world now is embracing anti-globalization, experiencing widespread inequality and warfare, and questioning the merits of the administrative/technological society. The election of the 45th President of the United States saw the emergence of social and political forces shaping contemporary US society that we are only just beginning to understand. In the sociology of knowledge, the ideology of these forces might be described as a virulent form of neo-barbarism, an authoritarian, hegemonically-masculine worldview wrapped up in white ethno-nationalism, false populism, and jingoistic conservatism. This movement and worldview, with more or less openly racist and sexist rhetoric, unadulterated chauvinism, and paranoid conspiratorial thinking, now infects a small but sizeable portion of the US population. The current President of the United States is disliked by more than half of the American electorate,<sup>1</sup> yet he expects 100% submission from his subjects (see [Robinson, 2017](#)). This creates significant problems for democratic governance.<sup>2</sup>

Just how should social theorists and sociologists try to understand this peculiar state of affairs, which impacts people not just in the United States, but all across the planet? At the macro level, there is a widespread sense of people living on the edge. Human societies appear to be spinning out of control, as they try to come to terms with complex and intractable social, economic, and cultural problems. Our worlds are increasingly catastrophic. Natural disasters (fires, tornadoes, and hurricanes) are no longer the rare events they appeared to be a few years ago, but are now regular features of the landscape. Mass shootings occur at places once considered safe, for example, in churches, hotels, and schools.<sup>3</sup> Risks in society are multiplying. People are dying younger and in more tragic ways (through drug overdoses, suicides, and car accidents) ([Boddy, 2017](#)). Meanwhile, the political class evades responsibility for fixing these problems and is focused much more on simply running for office (and then getting reelected) than actually governing. Economically, the stock market (at the time of writing, at least) is still flying high, but the national debt continues to accelerate and is now over US\$21 trillion, up from \$9 trillion just ten years ago.<sup>4</sup> The US social contract, once the envy of the world, lies in tatters. An authoritarian billionaire TV personality is the most powerful man on the planet. Culture has become a carnival hall of mirrors.<sup>5</sup>

Sociology is supposed to be the science of civilization. But how does one practice sociology when its object of study becomes more uncivilized by the day? How do we explain this turn of events to ourselves, our students, each other? “All that is solid melts to air,” [Marx and Engels \(1978\[1848\], p. 476\)](#) once

quipped about the revolutionary character of capitalist society. This quotation seems particularly apropos to our current situation. The sand is shifting beneath our feet. Our social institutions are wobbling, some on the verge of collapse. As the discipline that has as a central mission trying to understand the changing nature of society, just how should sociology respond to the predicament in which we find ourselves? Just what, if anything, should sociologists do?

The “Culture Wars” that Pat Buchanan and Ralf Reed championed in the 1980s have become a basic aspect of social life in the United States. Race, class and gender inequalities are increasing. Ideologues like Stephen Bannon<sup>6</sup> try to spin a narrative that Trump and his associates are champions for the US working class, but such a claim is laughable in light of the specifics of their agenda. Trump & Co. talk a good game when it comes to blue-collar politics,<sup>7</sup> but in reality, implement policies that do very little to help their constituents. The old “bait-and-switch” routine is found as often among the politicians as among the common. Take, for example, tax reform, Trump’s signature victory during his first two years in office (Tankersley, Kaplan, & Rappeport, 2017). In their analysis of the legislation, the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office (CBO) showed that wealthy Americans had the most to gain from the GOP tax plan (BBC News, 2017). While many families would see a small tax decrease (about US\$1,300 or so) in the short run, these middle-class families would, in fact, pay more in over time. Yet tax decreases for corporations and wealthy Americans are permanent. This discrepancy does not bother advocates of the legislation who simply ignore this information (not to mention the \$1.4 trillion dollars that are expected to be added to the deficit) and argue that the CBO hasn’t appreciated the wonders of the trickle-down economic theory. Advocates of Trump’s tax plan suggest that the average worker will be soon receiving a US\$4,000 annual raise, but like the proverbial carrot on a string in front of the horse, this remains a fantasy (Lovell, 2018). The President of the United States can claim with a straight face that the legislation will “cost me a fortune” (Tankersley, 2017), and in the same way that his followers blindly accepted his promises and assertions on the campaign trail, they continue to believe him now (see Aslan, 2017). The penchant for the Trump administration to twist the truth, constantly change the narrative, and rely on fragmentary and false information has worrying consequences across society. However, it is especially problematic for sociology since it is the discipline which is supposed to know what is really going on. How can one objectively speak of, let alone study, the social world under such bizarre social conditions?

We are stuck, or so it seems, in a Baudrillardian kind of nightmare, a *Black Mirror* episode that never ends. Perhaps it is time to dig out all those postmodernism books of the early 1980s. Even Stephen Bannon uses postmodern nomenclature as he champions the “deconstruction of the administrative state” (Rucker & Costa, 2017). Yet the absurdity and spectacular singularity of the current moment should not blind us to the pain, suffering, and social isolation affecting many in society, all of which are likely to get worse in the years ahead. The social destruction at the end of history has hit the vulnerable and disadvantaged the hardest. From the dismantling of the social safety net to the impacts

of climate change, it is the poorest and the most disadvantaged, especially members of minority populations, who are always the worse off. Just who today speaks for the downtrodden and the oppressed?

According to the philosopher Slavoj Žižek, “the global capitalist system is approaching its apocalyptic zero point.” Žižek claims that this apocalypse is being driven by four main factors:

the ecological crisis, the consequences of the biogenetic revolution, imbalances within the system itself (problems with intellectual property; forthcoming struggles over raw materials, food and water), and the explosive growth of social divisions and exclusions. (Žižek, 2011, p. x)

Žižek is, of course, not the only theorist, philosopher, or writer to address these sorts of issues. Readers of Ulrich Beck (1986) might see parallels to his concept of “risk society.” We could also mention Jared Diamond’s (2005) work on civilizational collapse, Noam Chomsky’s (2006) writing on “failed states,” and George Packer’s (2013) *Unwinding of America*. All of these works speak to and seek to understand the very real threats that are currently facing humanity.

Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri remind us in *Empire* (2001) how the modernist era assumed a functionality in social institutions which postmodernism calls into question. In modern societies, it was assumed that institutions such as the economy, schools, and governments, for example, could actually succeed in their attempts to solve the problems facing them. In postmodern societies, on the other hand, there is no such expectation of confidence. More often than not, it is assumed that institutions simply do not or will not work; they cannot be reformed. They are viewed as inherently dysfunctional and riddled with crisis.<sup>8</sup> One sees such postmodern dysfunctionality all around us today, in the media, in education, the criminal justice system, and in the government. The state as an ethical body has failed the populace. The government has been sold to the highest bidder (Associated Press, 2017). No one is minding the store.

The neo-conservative/ethno-nationalist movement of the current epoch is markedly different from the austerity conservatism of the 1970s and 1980s. Whereas Margaret Thatcher and Ronald Reagan pushed for a “starve the beast” approach when it came to the government, Trump & Co. want to kill off the beast entirely. Once this agenda is understood, many of the rather apparently murky decisions of the current administration suddenly make a lot more sense. The intention is to unmake or eliminate key state institutions that have, until very recently, been considered essential to the public good.<sup>9</sup> Examples can be seen in administrative changes to policies at the US State Department, the US Department of Education, the US Department of the Interior (see Siegler, 2017), the Environmental Protection Agency, and NOAA. These agencies are all undergoing massive restructuring and are facing huge budget cuts. Because of such reactionary efforts, the government as protector and guarantor of the social contract recedes further from the concrete life of people in society. The individual is left more or less to his or her own devices.<sup>10</sup>

However, while the Trump administration is deconstructing the administrative state, it is at the same time reconstructing or fortifying the US military state, which requires constant financial support from the taxpayer. The military and

police are essentially the only governmental institutions tolerated by neo-conservative, ethno-national ideology.<sup>11</sup> Otherwise, the state is viewed as a bumbling, meddling entity that just gets in the way of business and should be destroyed (see *Sebestyen, 2017*). The current disinvestment and *de facto* privatization of the US government and society will likely accelerate in the years ahead. The impact of these social changes on what is left of the welfare state, civil society, the environment, public universities and colleges, and the sciences – including the social sciences and, more specifically, sociology – are chilling and consequential. In a recent interview, Francis Fukuyama (author of the *End of History and the Last Man* 2006[1992], a book once held up as an exemplar of the triumph of global neo-liberal capitalism) admitted, “Twenty-five years ago, I didn’t have a sense or a theory about how democracies can go backward.” Today, he says, “I think they clearly can” (*Tharoor, 2017*).

Given such social and political conditions facing US society, just how do we practice sociology today? These issues go to the very heart of the discipline. Indeed, as Dr Eduardo Bonilla-Silva, past president of the American Sociological Association, stated on a panel discussion at the ASA’s 2017 conference: “God supposedly created the world in six days, Trump in six months has come close to destroying it” (*Flaherty, 2017*). Bonilla-Silva is not simply stating his personal opinion here, but is rather offering a sociological account of what the policies of the newly elected President are doing to US society. His remarks provide sociologists with an opportunity for self-reflection and social inquiry. How do we engage as sociologists when civilization itself seems at risk of being annihilated? How is it possible to teach and conduct research, let alone understand or affect change in society? How should sociologists respond, professionally, personally, and collectively to the new world we are living in? In what follows, I develop provisional answers to these questions by considering the state of sociology today in terms of profession, vocation, and critical practice. Embedded in my remarks is a heuristic, research program for doing sociology during the “end times.”

## SOCIOLOGY AS A PROFESSION

To use the language of the accrediting institutions, just what is our assessment of sociology as an academic profession in contemporary society? It has been a century since the death of Emile Durkheim (*Lukes, 1985*), a figure arguably most responsible for the intellectual enterprise known to most of us today as “sociology.”<sup>12</sup> Just what remains of Durkheim’s legacy and his conceptualization of the discipline? How fares the science of “social facts”? To borrow a quote from *Bentz and Shapiro (1998, p. 1)*, I think it is safe to say that it is still the “best of times” and the “worst of times” for sociology as an academic discipline, as it is for much of the social sciences. On the one hand, it seems that never before has sociology had it so well. The information revolution, while not without negative unintended consequences (such as the health costs of being tethered to a computer all day), has allowed for increased efficiency and heightened productivity on the part of knowledge workers. For example, no longer do we have

to trudge over to the library to find and then photocopy the journal article we are looking for — it is available in an instant. We are capable of accessing all sorts of facts, figures, and information in a similar fashion. The craft of sociology (Alford, 1998) is changing. Word processing and presentation software make it easier to write and share research. There is a vibrant methodological pluralism within sociology today, as well as openness to interdisciplinary collaboration outside the discipline. No longer must sociologists be forced to choose between rigid qualitative and quantitative research camps. For example, hermeneutics, content analysis, network analysis, visual sociology, action research, and many more methods are now rightly considered legitimate tools for studying society. Reserves of “big data” as well as the rich details found in historical archives (of say, diaries, photographs, and sound recordings) allow sociologists to probe deeply into the social landscape in ways that once seemed impossible. Conferences, webinars and academic websites allow for scholarly relationships and opportunities to grow through collaboration across the globe. In this regard, sociology seems to be doing quite well.

On the other hand, these are also dark days for sociology. The number of sociological adherents, like church attendees, is shrinking. Certainly, the percentage of tenured and tenure track teaching positions in the US academic sociology is getting smaller (McKenna, 2016). Most students who are exposed to sociology do so now in general education classes where they receive instruction from adjuncts or graduate students (Edmonds, 2015). Tenure-track lines in sociology are being cut, and then not filled or replaced with part time or nontenure track positions (Ennis, 2011). Such decisions make sense for budget-conscious institutions seeking flexibility in a tight labor market, but the consequences of replacing professorial lines with part-time contract workers are deleterious to the quality of teaching and learning, the production of research, and service commitments within and outside the academy.

As might be expected, this decline of the sociological professoriate has led to a corresponding drop-off in student interest in sociology.<sup>13</sup> In the 1960s and 1970s, students flocked to sociology as a major to help change the world. Students had an activist interest in reforming society and tackling persistent inequalities. Though that concern still exists, students more often today are self-interested, careerist, and apolitical. They are also paying considerable amounts of money to attend college or university. Some schools have experienced a very sharp decline in sociology majors as students enroll in what they see as more lucrative degree programs. Sociology programs are used to fighting with other disciplines on campus to keep up their enrollments. Today this competition has expanded to out-of-state schools and online institutions. It is a very competitive market for college students these days, a situation exacerbated by demographic changes (the so-called baby-bust) which have created fewer 18–22-year-olds who want to go on to pursue a college degree.<sup>14</sup> At the same time, degrees offered in more seemingly topical fields such as critical media studies, gender and ethnic studies, and sports management, poach students away from sociology. Sociology is also seen (wrongly, I would argue) as antithetical for students majoring in business<sup>15</sup> or nursing, so we lose more potential students there.

Moreover, sociology still faces its perennial problem of being viewed as an “easy” major<sup>16</sup> by faculty and staff on campus, as well by as parents of prospective students, and by many in society as a whole. Partially because of such factors, many sociology students come to the discipline relatively late in their educational careers and only after trying a number of other majors first.

There is of course a productive core of high-status professional sociologists who work at elite institutions, publish their research in top journals and serve in leadership roles throughout the profession. The whole carousel (see Dahms, 1998) of academic production is thereby kept in motion, but the notion of sociology as publically relevant enterprise is disappearing.<sup>17</sup> Certainly, sociology has its share of stars or superheroes, such as Alice Goffman (with her 2014 book *On the Run*), Sudhir Venkatesh (especially his 2008 *Gang Leader for a Day*) or Annette Lareau (*Unequal Childhoods*, 2003). There is obviously high-level sociological work being published in places like *American Sociological Review*, *American Journal of Sociology*, *Social Forces*, and *Social Problems* (not to mention in the pages of this very journal!) Looking beyond the top tier publications, there is also a large (and growing) population of less selective journals where sociologists can also publish their work. Yet it is a bit like having 500 cable channels on television and still finding nothing worth watching. Even with all the published material at our disposal, and in spite of all the books that continue to go to press, there remains a gnawing sense that so very little of such output speaks to the core of what sociology is or could be. Not only is so much of the work published in sociology journals incomprehensible to a general reader, but the rest is also too often mediocre, uninspired, or consists simply of bad writing. The situation brings to mind one of the most biting lines in *Souls of Black Folk* where W.E.B. Du Bois writes that “while sociologists gleefully count his bastards and his prostitutes, the very soul of the toiling, sweating black man is darkened by the shadow of a vast despair” (Du Bois, 1897). Just what are sociologists (collectively and individually) doing about such despair (not just as it pertains to African-Americans, but to all people)? How is the discipline improving the human condition?

In face of all the information publically and privately accessible in the knowledge economy – on television and radio, in newspapers, journals, books, articles and reports, for example, not to mention all the blogs, tweets, and other posts on social media, the voice of the sociologist has become muted. It is likely to become even more so in the years ahead. The National Rifle Association recently declared war on academic, political and media “elites.”<sup>18</sup> Neo-conservative ethno-nationalists have little regard for any science, let alone a social science like sociology, long considered by the right as a base for liberal (if not socialist or communist) propaganda. In many societies (such as Scandinavia and Europe) the research and perspectives of sociology are appreciated and often taken into consideration in the formulation of social and political policy. The perspective of social science is valued. Not so in the United States, where politicians cherry-pick the social science data that best supports their position and ignore the rest. “The elites don’t need us,” goes the unspoken adage in sociology, and it is true. Witness the brouhaha after Justice John

Roberts used the term “sociological gobbledygook” during a Supreme Court hearing (Bonilla-Silva, 2017). In today’s society, there is widespread questioning of the value of academic research. As religious fundamentalism recolonizes more of US culture, the view for many is there is “nothing new under the sun”<sup>19</sup> to be found in the academy. In a peculiar reversal of status signifiers, many now consider ignorance a virtue, a view that is also embraced by the so-called leader of the Free World.<sup>20</sup> Colleges and universities will continue to play an important social role as agents of socialization and offer important rites-of-passage for students, but the knowledge gained in such spaces will continue to be diminished relative to the world outside them, as well as on the Internet.<sup>21</sup>

Going forward, it is possible that elites will become even more openly hostile to academics and the role of colleges and universities in society today (except of course, when they are speaking of their own alma mater). Forget the “fake news.” What about “fake sociology,” or “fake professors”? It is disturbing to think of a world where sociologists are considered “enemies of the people,”<sup>22</sup> but in many respects we are already there. Once the authorities declare war on journalists, the attacks on college professors will not be far behind. Indeed, this very story can be found in rightwing literature like Andrew McDonald’s *Turner Diaries*, 1999<sup>23</sup> a work that at times looks frighteningly prophetic when we consider events like the “Unite the Right” march in Charlottesville, VA, in August 2017.

Even without such political obstacles confronting us, the situation would be quite difficult for sociology as a profession today. A profession normally tries to monopolize its skillset. Yet today, largely due to the Internet, sociological content has escaped the confines of the Ivory Tower and has become a part of the collective conscience of society. Who needs people to teach sociology when it is all freely available online, anyway? And just as the sociological content goes on the Internet, online content (e.g. blogs, tweets) becomes part of sociology. And why not? Of course, sociologists should be discussing Instagram photos or Facebook memes in their Social Inequality or Feminist Theory classes. Or share and discuss them with the folks at the next conference. Fifty years ago, sociologists were anxiously debating the “blurred genres” (Hazelrigg, 1989a, p. 33) of interdisciplinary boundaries. Today the lines between these genres are often effaced entirely. In some cases, there is outright poaching of sociological content. Professors of business, for example, often spend considerable time talking about power relationships and the importance of culture. They speak as if they are the rightful experts in these areas without acknowledging their intellectual debts to the social scientists, particularly anthropologists and sociologists (see Thompson, 2014).

The increasing cost of college tuition is also making things difficult for sociology as a profession. As state governments have withdrawn financial support for colleges and universities, the cost of tuition has been rising tremendously (Jamrisko & Kolet, 2014). It is likely that this is making students more instrumental in their course selection, decisions which are often ultimately made by anxious, check-writing parents. Given the current political climate, one might predict a continuing turning away from majors that do not seem to allow a fast route to a lucrative career. Sociology would seem to be included in that group

(Strauss, 2017). With declining enrollments, many departments will increasingly have difficulty recruiting new students, which could then lead them into a kind of death spiral. With this lost revenue from tuition, departments would also be hard-pressed to find resources for faculty grants, conference travel and sabbaticals, thus decreasing the faculty's quality of life. The perquisites once associated with working as a professional sociologist now exist only for a small subset of the professoriate. For the rest, a sort of proletarianization of labor has become the norm.<sup>24</sup>

Overall, 100 years after his death, the luster of Durkheim's vision for sociology has faded. Durkheim was adamant that a legitimate science must have its own subject matter. In the case of sociology, Durkheim declared our subject matter to be social facts — external constraints on human action. He believed it was the sociologist's job to investigate and analyze such facts and in so doing would develop universal laws of the human condition. Yet over time, this proposed empirical study of social constraints (and the history of them) has largely devolved into a discipline that teaches assessable skills of reading comprehension, writing, critical thinking, statistics, and research. While all of this is somewhat understandable (after all such skills are much easier to measure than "sociology" writ large), there is nothing particularly sociological about them. Indeed, they are found in many different disciplines within colleges and universities, not to mention in state agencies, the private sector, and so on. Meanwhile the rich analysis of the social facts (constraints) that should be the focus of sociological inquiry in the first place is often forgotten after the fact. More often than not, genuine sociologies of the social landscape are more promised than delivered.

Ironically, while academic sociology departments might suffer from identity crises and institutional neglect, the need for sociology "on the ground" so to speak, is today more important than ever (Irwin, 2017; Smith, 2016). Even if sociology does not get completely squeezed out of academia, this will of course not mean that social facts will cease to exist or that sociological work won't be required. It will simply be practiced by nonacademics in think tanks, at non-profits, in private institutes, and so on. At some level, professional sociology will clearly survive. Nevertheless, it will likely play a less institutionally relevant role in society than it has done in previous years. One can see glimpses of such a future in the decline of the sociologist as a public figure. For example, with the exception of luminaries such as William Julius Wilson, there are few contemporary sociologists who today serve as public intellectuals in US society. It is hard to find the American equivalent of say, an Anthony Giddens or a Pierre Bourdieu, in contemporary US society. Sociology as a discipline seems to be fading away, like philosophy, and Greek and Latin before it. While the death of sociology has been heralded before (see Gouldner, 1970), it seems we are closer now to actually putting the body in the ground. There has been a dramatic shift in the episteme undergirding academic knowledge which is beyond the control of any institutional actor or group of actors. Certainly as long as humans exist they will forever be trying to understand the social forces around them. But how much longer will people use sociology (at least as we understand it today) to do so?

## SOCIOLOGY AS VOCATION

Having addressed some macro-level concerns surrounding issues of sociology as a profession in contemporary society, we now turn to more micro-level questions of sociology as a vocation. A vocation, that is, a calling to or an affinity for a career or a way of life can be seen as the interior face of a profession; these two aspects rise and fall together. How one manages to practice a vocation in the context of a profession, such as sociology, which is undergoing dramatic and rapid change, is a difficult dilemma indeed. How do individual teachers, scholars, and citizens who identify themselves as sociologists think about the direction the discipline is taking? How is the vocation of the sociologist changing?

Notwithstanding the religious connotations of the term, it seems it would be well worth investigating the presence or absence of a “calling”<sup>25</sup> among self-identified sociologists. Have we sociologists – you or me, for example – been *called* to do what we do? It would be an interesting empirical study to inquire into how professional sociologists first encountered the discipline. Anecdotally at least, it seems many sociologists often take a circuitous route getting there. They did not start out in sociology initially but were drawn to the discipline over time. You can see this pattern in the case of Talcott Parsons, for example, who studied biology as an undergraduate (see [Dillon, 2014](#)) or in the case of Earl Babbie (author of the best-selling research methods books), who refers to his sociological career an “accident” ([Schaar, 2015](#)). Yet when inquiring souls do eventually stumble upon sociology, they quickly know they have found their place. This is at the heart of C. Wright Mills’ often cited yet little understood concept of the “sociological imagination” – that “Aha” moment of epiphany which convinces us all of a sudden that not only is the sociological perspective a powerful one, but it is one is also that right for “us.” Once people discover sociology and the rewards of the sociological perspective, they quickly understand its value. They become one of the converted.<sup>26</sup>

Yet the duration of such sociological epiphanies remains an open question. Just what happens to the calling in the longer run? Certainly one would need to consider variations in the social-psychological makeup of individual sociologists, for example, in terms of motivation, perseverance, productive ability, creative thought, and so on, not to mention the good luck of avoiding contingencies of illness and bad health that can get in the way. But in the main, the concept of a calling, for Martin Luther as much as ourselves, is only useful in so much as it is practiced. On this issue, we can turn to sociological elder Max [Weber \(1958 \[1922\]\)](#) who says that in sociology you must work as if your very life depended on it. As Weber writes in “Science as a Vocation”:

And whoever lacks the capacity to put on blinders, so to speak, and to come up to the idea that the fate of his soul depends on whether or not he makes the correct conjecture at this passage of this manuscript as well may stay away from science.

Weber called this the “personal experience” of science, which he described as a “passion,” a “strange intoxication,” “ridiculed by every outsider.” Weber claims that, without such passion, “you have no calling for science and should do

something else. For nothing is worthy of man as man unless he can pursue it with passionate devotion” (Weber, 1958[1922], p. 135). It would be an interesting project to survey say, professional sociologists around the world and ask them about their “passionate devotion” to the field today. Can such passion still be found among the ranks of contemporary sociologists, or is it missing in action? The mark of a true intellectual (sociologist or not) is one who reads, writes, and thinks – off-the-clock. Everyone else is just phoning it in to get a paycheck. The real scholars are the ones who were doing the work well before the paychecks began and will continue doing so long after the paychecks stop coming. And while it is certainly true that in contemporary sociology (and surely this is the case of much of the academia) that there are plenty of intelligent and creative minds doing excellent work, there are also many who spend their time gaming the system, doing the bare minimum to scrape by, counting down the seconds to the end of the workday, and so on. Moreover, persistent attacks on the profession of sociology lead to a diminution in sociology as a vocation. Rather than being perceived as an area of study that provides valuable insight into the nature of society and the body politic, sociology and the rest of the social sciences have become, for many at least, an irrelevant annoyance to be avoided.

This state of the discipline makes career prospects quite daunting for the young sociologist. Job searches with two hundred applicants are now the norm at many institutions. Even if individuals are lucky to find a full-time position, the faculty is often overworked and undercompensated. In some locales, adjunct instructors scrape together a living while spending their time driving between different institutions, or increasingly teach online. Overwork can lead to depression, burnout, and exhaustion. It is likely that such trends will continue in the age of Trump as the man and his supporters evince no value for a liberal arts education in general or for social science in particular. Sociologists must also successfully manage to work in a near perpetual state of distraction in which so many people live their lives today, and which makes it so difficult to think deeply (in a philosophical or theoretical sense), about the world around us. From Facebook, the latest tweets from the President, Words with Friends or Candy Crush (take your pick), and so on, at the level of “everyday life”<sup>27</sup> – thanks to the ubiquity of smartphones and other omnipresent gadgetry – we are constantly faced with the temptation of doing anything *other* than sociology. It is so much easier just to pick up a device than it is to engage a qualitatively different sort of object, let alone actually interact with other human beings (especially in real time). In such a manner, all sorts of “screen time” are making the idea of sociology as a vocation, highly problematic. One is pulled today in so many different directions (social, temporal, virtual, etc.) at once. The rewards of careful scholarship are increasingly illusory when measured against the pleasure and spectacle of the (social) media apparatus.

Of course, the identity of the sociologist today is not simply tied to the office or the classroom. It is possible that the “passionate devotion” to one’s vocation described by Weber is now, for many people today, spread out over a number of distinct realms of social life. The sociologist becomes “called” to different

research interests, activities, and specializations, inside and outside the classroom, and these may vary over the course of a career. While not all sociologists are political in orientation, some are “called” to practice a fusion of politics and sociology. For such individuals, the vocation of the sociologist is to be at once an activist and a scholar.<sup>28</sup> These intellectuals believe that the sociologist should not only understand, but also actively intervene in and, in so doing, change the world. This brings us to the topic of sociology as a form of critical practice.

## SOCIOLOGY AS CRITICAL PRACTICE

This essay is a reflection on the practice of doing sociology in the “end times.” So far, we have discussed sociology as a profession and as a vocation. I have suggested that sociology as a profession is atrophying. Because of this, the vocation of the sociologist has become more tenuous. These are perilous times for knowledge workers across the social sciences. However, as we will see, things may not be as bleak as they may first appear. In part because of the challenges faced by sociology as a profession and as a vocation, there are increased opportunities for using sociology to change the world for the better. Such opportunities allow us to conclude this work on a slightly more positive note.

Thanks to the work of one of our disciplinary founders, Karl Marx, sociology has never simply been just about the knowledge created about society, but it has been equally concerned about changing the material conditions in society for the better. Since Marx developed his own immanent critique of society (which evaluates the validity claims of actors and institutions by comparing them with empirical realities on the ground), sociology has contributed to critical forms of practice – interventions in society to close the gap between “what is” and “what ought to be” (see Hazelrigg, 1989b, p. 283). As sociologists, we have the “expectation of living in a humane world based on mutual respect and solidarity” (Müller-Doohm, 2014, p. 31). Making this world a reality involves engaging in democratic action. Sociologists have a moral responsibility to describe other, more humane and just ways of living, counterpoised to the current order. Sociologists are among the ones who must hold society up to a higher standard. While such standards have been under attack and may continue to be so in the years ahead, the story of the 45th President’s first two years in office is (at the time of this writing) as much about the resistance to his rule than his accomplishments. After the 2016 election, with control of the presidency, the House of Representatives and the Senate, Republicans were bold in their political agenda. Yet to date, the President has had only one major legislative achievement (this on taxes, right at the end of his first year). Much, if not most, of the Trump agenda has so far been blocked by the courts,<sup>29</sup> by Democrats or by members of Trump’s own party. The discipline of sociology has also shared in this resistance.

For example, sociologist Barbara Risman (2016), a former president of the Southern Sociological Society and a leading voice in the discipline wrote an

interesting blog shortly after Trump's victory entitled "How to Do Sociology in the Trump Era." She wrote:

I see two questions that we need to address as sociologists. First, how do we move forward to inspire students to be civically engaged when they feel afraid and helpless? Second, how do we do public sociology in a "post-truth" age? (Risman, 2016)

To tackle the first question, Risman says sociologists must stress the importance of the social constructionist approach. As she says:

The understanding that society is what we make it is empowering, and we must leave our students, in every course, with the understanding that they are not only products of their society but producers of the future. (Risman, 2016)

In response to the question about public sociology in a post-truth age, Risman (2016) counsels that:

What we should do is focus on the culture, how do we get our ideas, research, and evidence out there [...] Here is our challenge, how to get beyond the echo chamber of urban college-educated America, and talk to those citizens who feel left behind [...] Our challenge is to help change culture and to do that we must find a way to break the glass barriers between college-educated elites (that's us) and those who voted for Trump. (Risman, 2016)

Risman has been one of a number of sociologists to give advice on how to deal with the Trump Administration. The American Sociological Association (ASA), which has never been known to be a particular political organization, also weighed in early in opposition to the President. In arguing against the proposed changes to US immigration policy, the ASA wrote in January 2017 that the organization would also combat "threats to data sharing, data collection, funding for scientific scholarship, academic freedom, and peer review, as well as policies that inhibit the exchange of ideas domestically or internationally." It said they would "defend the conditions for the exercise of our professional responsibilities, which include free speech, democracy, the rule of law, and the values of diversity and meritocracy." The organization also stated they would "take positions on public policy issues for which there is clear sociological evidence" (ASA, 2017).

In a separate statement, then ASA President Michele Lamont tried to explain the current political climate sociologically in terms of lack of social recognition and the boundaries that exist between different groups in society (Lamont, 2016). She argued:

Social scientists should explicitly tackle this recognition gap. Just as we have provided citizens the language needed to describe realities such as "unemployment rate" and "stereotypes," it is time to mount a campaign to help people think about how to weaken group boundaries. As shapers of cultural frameworks, we need to help people understand that scarcity and group competition makes group boundaries more rigid, that group contact does not necessarily result in less stereotyping, but that inclusion benefits collective well-being for all. We also need to systematically compare the recognition gaps wherever they exist.

Lamont also offered a possible way of working through our contemporary social, cultural and political dilemmas through scholarship<sup>30</sup> and described recent works — by authors such as Thomas Piketty, Catherine Panter-Bricks,

Arlie Hochschild, and Ofer Sharone – which in her view demonstrate how sociology can be useful in capturing the trends of social life.

Such statements remind us that sociology is more than an academic profession and more than just a personal calling, but most importantly it is an intervention into society. As sociologists, it is our responsibility to never lose sight of gap between the “is” and the “ought,” and to strive to make societies as democratic, just and equitable as possible. This requires intervention. Yet as we intervene, we must acknowledge difference. We would do well to listen the advice of Michael Walzer, who reminds us that: “There is nothing like the classic ‘working class’, neglected by Democratic politicians, waiting to be mobilized.” He goes on:

The people we need to reach are a radically mixed group. They are economically mixed: they include unemployed men and women, old people without adequate pensions, part-time workers, rust belt workers with new jobs that pay much less than they once earned, workers without union protection and with few benefits, and the rural poor—all of them frighteningly vulnerable, watching anxiously for the next downturn. And they are mixed in their identities: black and white, Hispanic and Asian, men and women, gay and straight. These people could form what Charles Mills [...] called “a transracial coalition of the disadvantaged.” But first they must come to see that their difficulties are not theirs alone. Think of them as a class in formation—or, in the old language, a class in itself but not yet for itself. How can we advance the formation? That is the question we should be debating.<sup>31</sup>

More recently, Eduardo Bonilla-Silva, 2018 President of ASA, offered his own critique of society under the Trump administration. While he says it is easy to be preoccupied with President Trump on a daily level, Bonilla-Silva says it is better to take a longer view. Bonilla-Silva argues the focus of sociology should be “on the class, race and gender fronts.” He suggests that the current “administration has not changed the fundamentals of American policy – although on the race and gender fronts, he’s advancing morals that represent a step back” (Flaherty, 2017).

At the time of writing (September 2019), it seems that sociologists have become more accustomed to the world of Trump. Trump’s bark has always been worse than his bite. Immediately after the election, individuals, groups and organizations in society were waiting to see the impact of his bite. It will be up to the social historians of the future to know with certainty just how much damage to US society and the world will ultimately be done by Trumpian politics. Much of what is happening in the US now is a rolling back of Obama policies, which were a response to Bush-era policies (which were in response to Clinton policies responding to Reagan, and him to Carter, etc.) And so it goes. In the final analysis, a neoliberal, socially conservative, militaristic government is again in control of the White House. Trump likes to believe that he is a different sort of Republican, but in fact he is exploding deficits and handing out tax breaks to the wealthy just like his predecessors. Sociologists and other social scientists have amassed considerable evidence over the last decades demonstrating that these policies do not create an equitable or sustainable society. Today, the biggest fault lines in contemporary society can be seen in the breakdown of civil society, the assault on the public sector, and in the absence of a new social contract. The President’s megalomaniac tendencies, his embrace of know-nothingism and his devil-may-care attitude is appealing to his most fervent

supporters, particularly those who feel aggrieved by challenges to their status and authority. There is an obvious danger in such attitudes (particularly in relation to women and minorities) becoming more widespread and normalized in the culture as a whole. However, what works for celebrity millionaires is unlikely to work for the average American lacking the President's social, economic and cultural resources. Even his most enthusiastic supporters and spokespeople disregard, play down, or otherwise ignore, much of what the President says. While darkness and chaos often loom large on the national scene, at the local level people throughout the United States are reinvigorating communities across ideological lines by solving problems together (see [Fallows & Fallows, 2018](#)).

In Weberian terms, the main sociological problem posed by Trump may well be his charismatic style of leadership ([Weber 1978\[1922\]](#)). Many US presidential candidates (e.g. John F. Kennedy, Barack Obama) have been charismatic leaders, but once they become president, they usually abide by the norms of rational-legal authority. Trump has not done so. He seems to realize that if he were to become a rational-legal figure, he would lose his charisma and, by extension, the support of his followers. However, charismatic authority is often very difficult to execute in a rational-legal framework.

One might argue that what we are seeing today in the "culture wars" surrounding this president is largely a result of conflict between these two different styles of leadership. Trump's supporters adore the power of his charisma, to the point of even comparing him to the Messiah, a characterization the President himself has embraced. As such, they likely believe that it is right for Trump to have complete freedom in his actions and demand total subservience from his subjects. After all, who can question the Messiah? Any attempt to limit Trump's power is seen as blasphemous, petty, and disgraceful.

Trump's detractors, on the other hand, are very worried about his charismatic side, and would much prefer that he become a legal-rational actor and adhere to all the appropriate rules and regulations. When observers complain that Trump has subverted so many norms of the US Presidency, this is essentially what they are talking about. Trump champions spectacular irrationality over bureaucratic rationality. He insists he is perfect in everything he says and does. Like Louis XIV, Trump essentially asserts, "*L'état, c'est moi.*" This is why he refuses to admit he is ever wrong, even in the face of obvious and overwhelming evidence to the contrary. As the very personification of the state, Trump knows he has a monopoly on power and can define reality any way he chooses. Witness, for example, his bizarre responses to different embarrassing incidents during his first term in office (e.g. his "cofeve" tweet, the Tim Cook "Apple" flub, "Sharpie-gate").

Such micro-events in contemporary politics might simply be viewed as hilarious were it not for the fact that such absolutist sentiments often cross into more serious terrain. Then it becomes impossible to know if Trump is being serious or not. We see this dynamic (to use just a few examples) in his suggestion that he might stay in office beyond just two terms, his attempt to muzzle the press and quash those who dare to speak out against him, his lavish affection for ruthless

dictators, and (most recently) his intimation that whistleblowers be executed. Trump appears to think criticism should only be leveled at those beneath him in the social hierarchy. He is at the top of the pecking order and should therefore be free of all criticism. Since Trump believes he can do no wrong, any criticism is interpreted as a form of harassment, persecution, or perhaps even, crucifixion.

Ultimately, the main political problem for sociology may not be so much with Trump, but with his extreme supporters who really do view the man as a Supreme Being. These are the true believers in Trump's infallibility who adopt his rhetoric and worldview as their own. They have internalized the right-wing narrative that the entire world is rigged against him and that the "deep state" will stop at nothing to destroy him. As Weber pointed out almost a century ago (Weber 1978[1922]), it is extremely difficult for a charismatic social movement to survive after the demise of its leader. Whether Trumpism will outlast Trump will remain a fascinating question in the years ahead.

## CONCLUSION

So where does that leave us? Perhaps, with the understanding that, while we might indeed be at the "end of history," we may also be at the beginning of a newer, open-ended historical period. The uncertainty of the present moment is palpable, not just for sociology, not just for US society, but for the entire planet. Yet despite this uncertainty, somehow we must still act, even and until the real "end of history" (Hazelrigg, 1989b).<sup>32</sup>

The social world is increasingly complicated and more often than not misunderstood. It needs to be properly deciphered. However, as Harrison White notes in *Identity and Control* (1992), social theory continues to be in the "doldrums" (1992, p. 3). The necessity of a new theory of society has never been greater. Many of the "theorists" discussed and taught today in contemporary social theory classes came of age fifty years ago, when society was qualitatively different. Just when will be the next paradigm shift (see Kuhn, 1962) in theory occur? Will there be productive "return to theory" in the years ahead to help us come to terms with our predicament?

On December 6, 2016, sociologist Randall Collins (one of the most senior and respected theorists in the field) published an article on the weblog of the American Sociological Association. He titled his entry: "The Real Structural Problem: The Self-destruction of Capitalism." In this piece, Collins makes the rather chilling argument that capitalism will soon collapse because of automation – the increasing number of robots out there who will soon be taking our jobs. Collins raises some salient points. After all, how can society continue to exist if people have no ability to support themselves? As he says, "Capitalism depends ultimately on having an income-earning population who can buy its products. Displacement of workers by machinery is the formula for the self-destruction of capitalism." Collins claims that "computerization and the electronic media are eliminating the middle class" (Collins, 2016). He then goes on to predict that the "collapse of capitalism will happen in the 2040s or 2050s,"

about 50 years prior to what he says will be the beginning of a widespread ecological collapse. Yet for all his pessimism, Collins nonetheless argues that, around the middle of the twenty-first century, even after the collapse of global capitalism, “there will be time for a regime that is people-oriented rather than profit-oriented to solve global warming.” Let us hope he is right.

Collins’ appeal for a “people-oriented regime” mirrors the call in this chapter for a reinvigoration of public sociology. This will obviously be a protracted, collective struggle, which will continue until the real “end of history” (should such a day ever arrive). Such a social movement will require concerted efforts on the part of sociologists as scholars *and* citizens to act to protect truth, justice, democracy, science, and perhaps even civilization itself. Sociology is urgently needed to properly understand the dominant social, economic and political orders in society today (see Smith, 2016). Given the paucity of sociology in the public sphere, there is presently a void in conversations about society that could be exploited by sociologists, particularly as they concern the articulation of race, class, and gender inequalities. Sociologists have an opportunity to prove their mettle. More than ever we need once again Marx’s “ruthless criticism of everything existing” (1978 [1843], p. 12; see also Frasier, 1985). So, much in society today demands be understood, analyzed, critiqued, and changed. Let us get to work.<sup>33</sup>

## NOTES

1. See <https://news.gallup.com/poll/203207/trump-job-approval-weekly.aspx>
2. See Mounk (2017). In July 2018, former Secretary of State Madeleine Albright declared Trump to be “the most undemocratic president in modern American history” (Ehrlich, 2018).
3. For a good sociological explanation of the phenomena of rampage shootings, see Newman (2005).
4. See [https://www.treasurydirect.gov/govt/reports/pd/histdebt/histdebt\\_histo5.htm](https://www.treasurydirect.gov/govt/reports/pd/histdebt/histdebt_histo5.htm)
5. For an overview of our current condition and where we may go from here, see Hazelrigg (1989a).
6. Bannon is an enigmatic character. His anti-establishment style, weather-beaten appearance, and browbeating demeanor have been embraced by the far right (despite his falling out with the President). Bannon is a keen theoretician and tactician of the contemporary conservative movement. Ultimately, his position is untenable as he wants to have it both ways. On the one hand, he ingratiates himself to the media (Peters, 2017) and in so doing, attempts to convince the public that both he and Trump are not in fact far-right ideologues but rather political centrists. “Dude, he’s Archie Bunker,” Bannon claims (Peters & Haberman, 2017). The “Access Hollywood” tape (the veracity of which, incidentally, Trump questioned over a year after he apologized for it) is in Bannon’s view simply “locker room talk” (Alemany & Watson, 2017). Bannon asserts that Trump supports all Americans with his economic nationalist program. Yet in reality, Bannon is still wedded to symbolic politics. One saw this, for example, in his advice to the President in terms of the “Muslim Ban,” canceling televised White House press briefings, waiting to comment on Charlottesville, rolling back transgendered troops in the military, remilitarizing police forces across the country, and so on. Bannon also campaigned with right-wing zealots such as Judge Roy Moore, who is fiercely Christian, anti-Muslim and anti-gay rights. Moore is apparently what Bannon (and Trump) thought of as the future of the country. It is also interesting to point out some ways in which Bannon and Trump disagree. For example, on the issue of tax reform, Trump did not support initiatives

(proposed by Bannon) to increase taxes on America's top earners. As Lynch and Paletta (2017) report, Bannon believed that "raising the top rate paid by the wealthiest Americans was a way to follow through on the populist principles Trump invoked in his campaign." Trump was happy to renege this campaign pledge. The extent of all the other broken promises the 45th President has made to America will be revealed in due course.

7. At a speech in St. Louis, MO, in late November, President Trump claimed solidarity with the US working class. As he said: "But really, the people that like me best are those people, the workers. They're the people I understand the best. Those are the people I grew up with. Those are the people I worked on construction sites with" (Tankersley, 2017).

8. As Baudrillard once said, the apocalypse "has already happened [...] All that remains to be done is to play with the pieces" (Gane, 1993, pp. 43, 95).

9. For a more systematic view on these issues, see Wright and Rogers (2015).

10. For an in-depth examination of such processes, see Daniel M. Harrison, *Making Sense of Marshall Ledbetter* (2014).

11. See Isaac and Harrison (2006). In late November 2017, it was reported that the Trump administration was considering a proposal to privatize some of the functions of the CIA (Roston, 2017).

12. For a foundational critique of Durkheimian sociology (especially its neo-Kantian) roots, with glimpses at an alternate style of inquiry, see Rose (1981).

13. According to the ASA, in 1970, sociology had a "4 percent share of bachelor degree recipients." By 2015, this had "declined to less than a 2 percent share." See <http://www.asa-net.org/your-sociology-program-thriving-consider-changing-popularity-your-major>

14. See Cook (2014). But there continues to be huge variation in terms of race, ethnicity and gender. At my current institution, approximately 65% of the student body is female. It seems that men (particularly white men) are increasingly less likely to attend college, while rates are increasing for members of other groups (e.g. African-American women). My sense also is that sociology is an increasingly attractive major among African-American students in general and African-American female students in particular. Properly understanding such trends goes beyond the purpose of this chapter. However, the interest could partially be explained by more African-American students attending college and university in general, the explicit attention that sociology as a discipline gives to the issues of race and ethnicity (in both teaching and research), and the fact that towering figures in the African-American community (for instance, Martin Luther King Jr. and Michelle Obama) were sociology majors.

15. As Harrison White says, "I have been doing my best for some years now to get sociologists – students as well as faculty – into the business schools [...] Business schools are natural places for sociologists to be, and sociology is the natural intellectual base in social science for business schools" (in Swedborg, 1991, p. 90).

16. Popular culture does not always help the case for sociology. As an example, consider this scene from *Dirty Harry*: "Sociology? Oh, you'll go far - that's if you live [...] Just don't let your college degree get you killed 'cause I'm liable to get killed along with ya." See: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RitnM9n0jTY>. The idea of sociology as an "easy" major usually vanishes after the individual in question takes a class in it (particularly if it is a theory and or a methods course). Monty Python gets a dig in at sociology in their "Hell's Grannies" Skit: "Reporter: The whole problem of these senile delinquents lies in their complete rejection of the values of contemporary society. They've seen their children grow up and become accountants, stockbrokers and even sociologists, and they begin to wonder if it is all really [...] (*disappears downwards rapidly*) arggh!" See <http://www.montypython.net/scripts/hellgran.php>

17. It would be interesting to address whether this apparent decline in sociology in the United States is universal, or if and to what extent sociology is facing happier futures elsewhere in the world.

18. <https://www.c-span.org/video/?c4667607/nras-lapierre-greatest-domestic-threats-academic-political-media-elites>. See also <https://www.apnews.com/c8cfcc9f96de439ca0d7d7c338f97949>

19. Ecclesiastes 1:9.

20. “I love the poorly educated,” exclaimed Donald Trump in February 2016 after winning the Nevada Primary (Hafner, 2016). See also Graham (2017).

21. As Hazelrigg (1989a, p. 30) put it almost three decades ago, “we have witnessed the death of the disciplines of social science in all aspects but the occupational.”

22. For a very disturbing harbinger of things to come, see <http://professorwatchlist.org>. See also <http://www.campusreform.org> for right-wing efforts to root out liberals on the Faculty.

23. This book was found in the possession of Timothy McVeigh after he blew up the Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma in 1995.

24. “The lower strata of the middle class — the small tradespeople, shopkeepers, and retired tradesmen generally, the handicraftsmen and peasants — all these sink gradually into the proletariat, partly because their diminutive capital does not suffice for the scale on which Modern Industry is carried on, and is swamped in the competition with the large capitalists, partly because their specialised skill is rendered worthless by new methods of production. Thus the proletariat is recruited from all classes of the population” (Marx & Engels, 1978[1848], pp. 479–480).

25. For the classic sociological statement on the calling, see Weber (2001[1904]).

26. Of course, there are also social processes through which people lose their affection for sociology, become de-converted, and eventually stop being sociologists altogether. But that is the subject for another chapter.

27. See Smith (1989).

28. Cornel West is a figure who perhaps best exemplifies such an intellectual position.

29. Trump earned another victory recently with the Supreme Court ruling 5:4 in his favor regarding his ban on people traveling to the US from certain predominantly Muslim countries (Reuters, 2018). However, it should be noted that the court only ruled on the constitutionality of the President’s action. As Chief Justice John Roberts stated, “We express no view on the soundness of the policy” (Reuters, 2018).

30. There might be a greater likelihood of this happening if the political class actually read and consulted sociological work when making decisions, but this unfortunately does not seem to happen much in the United States. Whereas the elected officials might rely on sociologists in other societies, in the United States the practice is that legislators use their own analysts and legislative aides when researching social issues. As sociologist Herbert Gans notes, “When no one asks us for advice, there’s no incentive to become a policy field” (in Irwin, 2017). Because of such non-communication, the perception that sociology has nothing to offer the conversation continues.

31. Walzer (2017). See also recent remarks by Chantel Mouffe where she argues “Movements cannot be left just to the streets.” She continues:

I am very critical of the idea of politics as fomenting a moment of total rupture with the existing status quo. This is not how revolutions work. At some point, mobilizations will lose steam. You cannot change things only on the horizontal level of social movements. You have to develop what Podemos calls “an electoral war machine.” You need to try to come to real power in the institutions and government. (in Shahid, 2016)

32. As Hazelrigg (1989b, p. 265) puts it, “If we are committed to act (and short of the end of history we *will* act), we are always committed to act where we stand.”

33. For additional leads, see Burrowoy (2004).

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank the helpful comments of Harry Dahms, Lawrence Hazelrigg, Daniel Kavish, and attendees at the “Sociology between a Profession and Vocation” session of the annual Southern Sociological Society in Greenville, SC (March 30–April 1, 2017), where an earlier draft of this chapter was presented.

## REFERENCES

- Alemany, J., & Watson, K. (2017). Bannon compares Moore report to access Hollywood tape. *CBS News*. November 9. Retrieved from <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/steve-bannon-speaks-in-new-hampshire/>
- Alford, R. R. (1998). *The craft of inquiry*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- American Sociological Association. (2017). Statement of the American Sociological Association concerning the new administration's recent and future activities. January 30. Retrieved from <http://www.asanet.org/news-events/asa-news-statement-american-sociological-association-concerning-new-administrations-recent-and-future>
- Aslan, R. (2017). The dangerous cult of Donald Trump. *Los Angeles Times*. November 6. Retrieved from <http://www.latimes.com/opinion/op-ed/la-oe-aslan-trump-cultists-20171106-story.html>
- Associated Press (AP). (2017). Sanders in Pennsylvania warns the US is approaching 'oligarchy.' *The Inquirer*. Retrieved from [http://www.philly.com/philly/news/politics/presidential/20171203\\_ap\\_44fd9a0152fe47b1aaece48147644806.html](http://www.philly.com/philly/news/politics/presidential/20171203_ap_44fd9a0152fe47b1aaece48147644806.html)
- BBC News. (2017). Tax bill: Trump victory as Senate backs tax overhaul. *BBC News*. December 2. Retrieved from <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-42205181>
- Beck, U. (1986). *Risk society*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bentz, M., & Shapiro, J. (1998). *Mindful inquiry in social research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Boddy, J. (2017). The forces driving middle-aged white people's 'death of despair.' *National Public Radio*. March 23. Retrieved from <https://www.npr.org/sections/health-shots/2017/03/23/521083335/the-forces-driving-middle-aged-white-peoples-deaths-of-despair>
- Bonilla-Silva, E. (2017). ASA President Eduardo Bonilla-Silva responds to Chief Justice John Roberts. October 10. Retrieved from <http://www.asanet.org/news-events/asa-news/asa-president-eduardo-bonilla-silva-responds-chief-justice-john-roberts>
- Burroway, M. (2004). Presidential address: For public sociology. Retrieved from <http://burawoy.berkeley.edu/PS/ASA%20Presidential%20Address.pdf>
- Chomsky, N. (2006). *Failed states*. New York, NY: Henry Holt.
- Collins, R. (2016). The real structural problem: the self-destruction of capitalism. December 17. Retrieved from <http://speak4sociology.org/2016/12/07/the-real-structural-problem-the-self-destruction-of-capitalism/>
- Cook, L. (2014). Is the college admissions bubble about to burst? *US News & World Report*. September 22. <https://www.usnews.com/news/blogs/data-mine/2014/09/22/is-the-college-admissions-bubble-about-to-burst>
- Dahms, H. (1998). Beyond the carousel of reification: Critical social theory after Luckács, Adorno and Habermas. *Current Perspectives in Social Theory*, 18, 3–62.
- Diamond, J. (2005). *Collapse: How societies choose to fail or succeed*. New York, NY: Penguin.
- Dillon, M. (2014). *Introduction to sociological theory*. New York, NY: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Du Bois, W. E. B. (1897). The veil of self-consciousness. *The Atlantic*. August. Retrieved from <https://www.theatlantic.com/ideastour/civil-rights/dubois-full.html>
- Edmonds, D. (2015). More than half of college faculty are adjuncts: Should you care? *Forbes*. May 28. Retrieved from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/noodleeducation/2015/05/28/more-than-half-of-college-faculty-are-adjuncts-should-you-care/#7fda08381600>
- Ehrlich, J. (2018). Madeleine Albright calls Trump 'most undemocratic president in modern American history.' *CNN*. July 2. Retrieved from <https://www.cnn.com/2018/07/02/politics/madeleine-albright-donald-trump-undemocratic-president/index.html>
- Ennis, D. J. (2011). The last of the tenure track. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. July 1. Retrieved from <https://www.chronicle.com/article/The-Last-of-the-Tenure-Track/128076>
- Fallows, J., & Fallows, D. (2018). *Our towns: A 100,000 mile journey into the heart of America*. New York, NY: Pantheon.
- Flaherty, C. (2017). Teaching sociology in 2017. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2017/08/15/sociologists-talk-about-teaching-political-now-emphasis-charlottesville>
- Frasier, N. (1985). What's critical about critical theory? *New German Critique*, Spring/Summer, 97–131.

- Fukuyama, F. (2006[1992]). *The end of history and the last man*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Gane, M. (1993). *Baudrillard live*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Goffman, A. (2014). *On the run: American life in a fugitive city*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Gouldner, A. (1970). *The coming crisis of western sociology*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Graham, D. A. (2017). Why do Republicans suddenly hate college so much? *The Atlantic*. July 13. Retrieved from <https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2017/07/why-do-republicans-suddenly-hate-colleges-so-much/533130/>
- Hafner, J. (2016). Donald Trump loves the 'poorly educated' – And they love him. *USA Today*. February 24. Retrieved from <https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/onpolitics/2016/02/24/donald-trump-nevada-poorly-educated/80860078/>
- Hardt, M., & Negri, A. (2001). *Empire*. New York, NY: Harvard University Press.
- Harrison, D. (2014). *Making sense of Marshall Ledbetter: The dark side of political protest*. Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida.
- Hazelrigg, L. (1989a). *A wilderness of mirrors: On practices of theory in a gray age*. Tallahassee, FL: The Florida State University Press.
- Hazelrigg, L. (1989b). *Claims of knowledge: On the labor of making found worlds*. Tallahassee, FL: The Florida State University Press.
- Irwin, N. (2017). What if sociologists had as much influence as economists? *New York Times*. March 17. Retrieved from <https://mobile.nytimes.com/comments/2017/03/17/upshot/what-if-sociologists-had-as-much-influence-as-economists.html>
- Isaac, L., & Harrison, D. (2006). Corporate warriors: The state and changing forms of private armed force in America. *Current Perspectives in Social Theory*, 24, 153–188.
- Jamrisko, M., & Kolet, I. (2014). College tuition costs soar. *Bloomberg*. August 18. Retrieved from <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2014-08-18/college-tuition-costs-soar-chart-of-the-day>
- Kuhn, T. (1962). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Lamont, M. (2016). Trump's triumph and social science adrift...What is to be done? Retrieved from <http://www.asanet.org/trumps-triumph-and-social-science-adrift-what-be-done>
- Lareau, A. (2003). *Unequal childhoods: Class, race and family life*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Lovelace, B., Jr. (2018). Tax overhaul means a \$4,000-a-year pay raise for the average family, Trump advisor says. *CNBC*. January 29. Retrieved from <https://www.cnbc.com/2018/01/29/tax-overhaul-means-4000-a-year-pay-hike-for-average-family-hassett.html>
- Lukes, S. (1985). *Emile Durkheim: His life and work*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Lynch, D. J., & Paletta, D. (2017). Hours after GOP passes tax bill, Trump says he'll consider raising tax rate. *The Washington Post*. December 2. Retrieved from [https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/business/wp/2017/12/02/trump-waffles-on-corporate-tax-rate-demand-central-plank-of-gop-tax-plan/?utm\\_term=.a75094e2f5d7](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/business/wp/2017/12/02/trump-waffles-on-corporate-tax-rate-demand-central-plank-of-gop-tax-plan/?utm_term=.a75094e2f5d7)
- Marx, K. (1978[1843]). For a ruthless criticism of everything existing. In R. Tucker (Ed). *The Marx-Engels reader*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton.
- Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1978[1848]). The communist manifesto. In R. Tucker (Ed). *The Marx-Engels reader*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton.
- McDonald, A. (1999). *The Turner diaries*. (2nd ed.). Charlottesville, VA: National Vanguard Press.
- McKenna, K. (2016). The ever-tightening job market for Ph.Ds. *The Atlantic*. April 21. Retrieved from <https://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2016/04/bad-job-market-phds/479205/>
- Mounk, Y. (2017). The past week proves that Trump is destroying our democracy. *The New York Times*. August 1. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/08/01/opinion/trump-democracy-institutions-destroyed.html>
- Müller-Doohm, S. (2014). *Adorno: A biography*. New York, NY: Polity.
- Newman, K. S. (2005). *Rampage: The social roots of school shootings*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Packer, G. (2013). *The unwinding*. New York, NY: Farrar, Strauss, & Giroux.
- Peters, J. W. (2017). Key takeaways from Steve Bannon's interview with the Times. *New York Times*. November 10. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/11/10/us/politics/steve-bannon.html>

- Peters, J. W., & Haberman, M. (2017). Bannon was set for a graceful exit. Then came Charlottesville. *New York Times*. August 20. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/08/20/us/politics/steve-bannon-fired-trump-departure.html>
- Reuters. (2018). U.S. top court upholds Trump travel ban targeting Muslim-majority nations. *New York Times*. June 26. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/reuters/2018/06/26/world/26reuters-usa-court-immigration.html>
- Risman, B. 2016. How to do sociology in the Trump era. *American Sociological Association*. December 12. Retrieved from <http://www.asanet.org/news-events/speak-sociology/how-do-sociology-trump-era>
- Robinson, E. (2017). Loyalty to Trump isn't enough. *The Washington Post*. October 5. Retrieved from [https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/loyalty-to-trump-isnt-enough/2017/10/05/297a9d30-a9fb-11e7-850e-2bdd1236be5d\\_story.html?utm\\_term=.3a93d3a6d309](https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/loyalty-to-trump-isnt-enough/2017/10/05/297a9d30-a9fb-11e7-850e-2bdd1236be5d_story.html?utm_term=.3a93d3a6d309)
- Rose, G. (1981). *Hegel contra sociology*. New York, NY: Verso.
- Roston, A. (2017). The Trump administration is mulling a pitch for a private 'rendition' and spy network. *Buzzfeed News*. November 30. Retrieved from [https://www.buzzfeed.com/aramroston/trump-administration-mulls-private-rendition?bftwnews&utm\\_term=.nork66X17#.rjzMVV2N3](https://www.buzzfeed.com/aramroston/trump-administration-mulls-private-rendition?bftwnews&utm_term=.nork66X17#.rjzMVV2N3)
- Rucker, P., & Costa, R. 2017. Bannon vows a daily fight for the 'deconstruction of the administrative state.' *Washington Post*. February 23. Retrieved from [https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/top-wh-strategist-vows-a-daily-fight-for-deconstruction-of-the-administrative-state/2017/02/23/03f6b8da-f9ea-11e6-bf01-d47f8cf9b643\\_story.html?utm\\_term=.568008bee529](https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/top-wh-strategist-vows-a-daily-fight-for-deconstruction-of-the-administrative-state/2017/02/23/03f6b8da-f9ea-11e6-bf01-d47f8cf9b643_story.html?utm_term=.568008bee529)
- Schaar, C. (2015). Emeritus profile: Earl Babbie. *ASA Footnotes*, November. 43(7), 1, 4.
- Sebestyen, V. (2017). Bannon says he's a Leninist: that could explain the White House's new tactics. *The Guardian*. February 6. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2017/feb/06/lenin-white-house-steve-bannon>
- Shahid, W. (2016). America in populist times: An interview with Chantal Mouffe. December 15. Retrieved from <https://www.thenation.com/article/america-in-populist-times-an-interview-with-chantal-mouffe/>
- Siegler, K. (2017). Trump to take aim at Utah's national monuments, reversing predecessors' legacies. *National Public Radio*. December 4. Retrieved from <https://www.npr.org/sections/thetwo-way/2017/12/04/567803476/trump-to-take-aim-at-utahs-national-monuments-reversing-predecessors-legacies>
- Smith, D. (1989). *The everyday world as problematic*. Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press.
- Smith, N. (2016). Calling all sociologists: America needs you. *Bloomberg View*. August 31. Retrieved from <https://www.bloomberg.com/view/articles/2016-08-31/calling-all-sociologists-america-needs-you>
- Strauss, K. (2017). College degrees with the highest (and lowest) starting salaries in 2017. *Forbes*. June 28. Retrieved from <https://www.forbes.com/sites/karstenstrauss/2017/06/28/college-degrees-with-the-highest-and-lowest-starting-salaries-in-2017/#7f1bf4a82343>
- Swedborg, R. (1991). *Economics and sociology*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Tankersley, J. (2017). A 'main street' tax speech becomes a riff on the rich. *New York Times*. November 29. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/11/29/us/politics/a-main-street-tax-speech-becomes-a-trump-riff-on-the-rich.html>
- Tankersley, J., Kaplan, T., & Rappoport, A. (2017). Senate Republicans pass sweeping tax bill. *New York Times*. December 1. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/12/01/us/politics/senate-tax-bill.html>
- Tharoor, I. (2017). The man who declared the 'end of history' fears for democracy's future. *Washington Post*. February 9. Retrieved from [https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/world-views/wp/2017/02/09/the-man-who-declared-the-end-of-history-fears-for-democracys-future/?utm\\_term=.5898359b4085](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/world-views/wp/2017/02/09/the-man-who-declared-the-end-of-history-fears-for-democracys-future/?utm_term=.5898359b4085)
- Thompson, D. (2014). Turning customers into cultists: Why many companies now take their cues from religious sects. *The Atlantic*. December. Retrieved from <https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2014/12/turning-customers-into-cultists/382248/>
- Venkatesh, S. (2008). *Gang leader for a day*. New York, NY: Penguin.
- Walzer, M. (2017). The historical task of the left in the current period. *Dissent*. January 2. Retrieved from [https://www.dissentmagazine.org/online\\_articles/historical-task-of-left-present-period-trump](https://www.dissentmagazine.org/online_articles/historical-task-of-left-present-period-trump)

- Weber, M. (1958[1922]). Science as a vocation. In H. Gerth & C. W. Mills (Eds.). *From Max Weber*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Weber, M. (1978[1922]). *Economy and society*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Weber, M. (2001[1904]). *The Protestant ethic & the spirit of capitalism*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- White, H. C. (1992). *Identity and control: A structural theory of social action*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Wright, E. O., & Rogers, J. (2015). *American society: How it really works*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton.
- Žižek, S. (2011). *Living in the end times*. New York, NY: Verso.