

Diverse Histories of American Sociology

International Studies
in
Religion and Society

VOLUME 2

Diverse Histories of American Sociology

edited by

Anthony J. Blasi



BRILL
LEIDEN • BOSTON
2005



Sponsored by the
History of Sociology Section of the
American Sociological Association

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication data

Diverse histories of American sociology / edited by Anthony J. Blasi.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 90-04-14363-7 (pbk.: alk. paper)

1. Sociology—United States—History. I. Blasi, Anthony J.

HM477.U6D58 2005

301'.0973—dc22

2005042082

ISBN 90 04 14363 7

© **Copyright 2005 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.**
Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill Academic
Publisher, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers and VSP.

Cover design by Jeannet Leendertse

Photographs of Lester F. Ward, Albion Small, Edward Alsworth Ross,
Pitirim A. Sorokin, and William Graham Sumner provided courtesy of
the American Sociological Association ©.

Photograph of Jane Addams. Water, Ed. D., copyright claimant.
“[Jane Addams, head-and-shoulders portrait, facing left]” Copyright 1907.
Prints and Photographs Division, Library of Congress.

Photograph of William E.B. Du Bois, Half-Lenght Portrait, Facing Left. Between
1920 and 1930. Visual Materials from the National Association for the
Advancement of Colored People Records, Prints and Photographs Division,
Library of Congress. Photograph provided courtesy of the National Association
for the Advancement of Colored People ©.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated,
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means,
electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior
written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted
by Brill provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to
The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910,
Danvers, MA 01923, USA.
Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

Dedicated to
Helena Znaniecka Lopata
1925–2003

CONTENTS

| | |
|--|------|
| List of Tables | xi |
| Foreword | xiii |
| Acknowledgements | xv |
| Introduction by Anthony J. Blasi | xvii |

I. SOCIOLOGY FOR SOCIAL REFORM

| | |
|---|----|
| 1. The Settlement as a Factor in the Labor Movement | 3 |
| JANE ADDAMS | |
| 2. A Private Trouble behind the Gendered Division of Labor in Sociology: The Curious Marriage of Robert E. Park and Clara Cahill Park | 18 |
| MARY JO DEEGAN | |
| 3. The Scholar Practitioners; The Development of Clinical Sociology in the United States | 40 |
| JAN FRITZ | |

II. ALTERNATIVE SOCIOLOGICAL VOICES

| | |
|--|-----|
| 4. The Neglected Contributions of Female Sociologists in the American South | 59 |
| KAY RICHARDS BROSBART | |
| 5. The Early Sociological Legacy of W.E.B. Du Bois | 74 |
| ROBERT A. WORTHAM | |
| 6. The Legacy of Julian Samora: Development of Theory for the Study of Undocumented Immigration | 96 |
| VICTOR RIOS, JR. | |
| 7. The Sociology of William J. Kerby of Catholic University | 111 |
| ANTHONY J. BLASI | |

III. THE SOCIAL HISTORY OF AMERICAN ORGANIZED SOCIOLOGY

8. Jesse Lawson and the National Sociological Society
of 1903 127
MICHAEL R. HILL
9. Resisting Sociology's Seductive Name:
Frederick J. Teggart and Sociology at Berkeley 141
JONATHAN VANANTWERPEN
10. Women, African Americans, and the ASA,
1905–2005 178
MARY JO DEEGAN
11. "Blooming in the Noise of the Whirlwind": From
Caucus of Black Sociologists to the Association
of Black Sociologists 207
BETTE J. DICKERSON
12. Intellectual Wasteland or Garden of Eden?
Sociology in the American South before 1950 229
KAY RICHARDS BROSBART
13. Sociology at Women's and Black Colleges,
1880s–1940s 260
VICKY M. MACLEAN AND JOYCE E. WILLIAMS
14. Sociology in American Higher Education 317
ANTHONY J. BLASI
15. Chicago in 1930: Maurice Halbwachs' Outsider
View of the City and its Sociologists 323
SUZANNE VROMEN

IV. NEGLECTED ISSUES AND TRAJECTORIES

16. Veblen, Innis, and the Classic Tradition: North
American Economic Sociology 339
ROSS MITCHELL
17. Sociology in Hawai'i: Beginnings 360
JEFFREY L. CRANE

| | |
|--|-----|
| 18. Community Studies as Trajectories in the Development of Sociology | 370 |
| JOYCE E. WILLIAMS AND VICKY M. MACLEAN | |
| References | 405 |
| About the Contributors | 441 |
| Index | 445 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | |
|--|-----|
| Table 4.1: Social Characteristics of Southern Foremothers of Sociology | 71 |
| Table 4.2: Social Characteristics of Early Twentieth-Century Southern Female Sociologists | 72 |
| Table 4.3: Major Contributors of Early Southern Women in Sociology | 73 |
| Table 5.1: Atlanta University Conference Publications Edited or Co-Edited by Du Bois | 94 |
| Table 5.2: Perception of African American Crime Trend by Race of Respondent | 94 |
| Table 5.3: Known Graduates of Black Medical Schools, 1906 | 95 |
| Table 10.1: ASA President and Eminent Spouse | 206 |
| Table 10.2: Names and Years of Office of White Female Presidents of the ASA | 206 |
| Table 10.3: The Names and Years of Office of African American Male Presidents of the ASA | 206 |
| Table 12.1: Social Background Characteristics and Major Publications of Two Early Southern Arm-Chair Social Analysts | 250 |
| Table 12.2A: Social Background Characteristics and Major Publications of Southern Sociological Pioneers | 250 |
| Table 12.2B: Chronological Listing of Publications of William Edward Burghardt DuBois Prior to 1950 | 252 |
| Table 12.3: Major Professional Contributions of Early Southern Sociological Pioneers | 253 |
| Table 12.4: Social Background Characteristics of Early Twentieth Century Southern Sociologists | 254 |
| Table 12.5: Major Publications of Early Twentieth Century Southern Sociologists | 256 |
| Table 12.6: Major Professional Contributions of Early Twentieth Century Southern Sociologists | 258 |
| Table 12.7: Location and Duration of Early Southern Sociologists' University Appointments by Race | 259 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Table 13.1: Growth of Sociology in the United States, 1909—Early Forties | 306 |
| Table 13.2: Early American Sociology at Atlanta University | 307 |
| Table 13.3: Early American Sociology at Hampton University | 308 |
| Table 13.4: Early American Sociology at Howard University | 309 |
| Table 13.5: Early American Sociology at Fisk University | 310 |
| Table 13.6: Early American Sociology at Radcliffe College | 311 |
| Table 13.7: Early American Sociology at Wellesley College | 312 |
| Table 13.8: Early American Sociology at Smith College | 313 |
| Table 13.9: Early American Sociology at Mount Holyoke College | 315 |
| Table 13.10: Early American Sociology at Simmons College | 316 |
| Table 14.1: Percentage Distribution of Different Graduate and Professional Degrees, by Decades | 322 |

FOREWORD

Not until 1999 was a History of Sociology Section formed within the American Sociological Association. Largely as a result of the initiative and efforts over several years of Patricia Madoo Lengermann and Jill Niebrugge-Brantley, the Section on the History of Sociology in the American Sociological Association obtained formal status in 2000 with a membership of 316, its own by-laws, a slate of officers, and a newsletter entitled "Timelines." The first elected section chair was Helena Znaniecki Lopata.

At its business session during the 2003 meetings in Atlanta of the American Sociological Association's Section on the History of Sociology, 2003 Section President Michael Keen of Indiana University, South Bend, proposed the publication of a volume that would bring together essays highlighting the multiple and diverse histories of American sociology. The idea was to have the publication of the volume coincide with the Centenary of the A.S.A. in 2005. During the following year, at the suggestion of 2004 Section President Patricia Madoo Lengermann of George Washington University, the Publications Committee of the A.S.A. approved sponsorship of the project by the Section.

As early as 1924 sociologist Albion Small recognized not only the importance of recording and understanding the history of sociology, but also of giving attention to the contributions of those "who were outside the ranks of the sociologists" who were, nevertheless, significant in the emergence and development of the discipline. As an early founder, Small made a strong case for the centrality of the history of sociology and for recognition of the impact of such factors as politics, nationality, and ethnicity in the shaping of the sociological enterprise. One of the most important recent transformations in sociology in the United States is the revived and growing appreciation of the significance of the history of the discipline for our self-understanding as practitioners and students of society. As a community of social scientists we have come to recognize the assets of historical understanding and the liabilities of choosing to discredit or ignore that history.

Interest in the history of sociology as a discipline and in the context in which individuals shaped the practices of sociology in the United States in its many facets was slow in becoming “institutionalized.” This was true in spite of the work of Harry Elmer Barnes, Edward Shils, Neil Smelser, Peter Burke, Seymour Lipset, Charles Tilly, Jennifer Platt, Donald Levine and others. American sociologists have had mixed reactions to the idea that the history of the discipline is a specific area of research and teaching, and even more to the point, that it is essential to an understanding of sociology as it exists today. Some consider the subject best left to historians or irrelevant for current sociological work. Others, including many sociologists from the classical period, have valorized a sociology that is not only scientific but also historically grounded and understood within the context of its emergence and continuing historical development. The historical approach reveals connections, subtle influences, changes and conflicts, actions and reactions, perhaps previously not apparent, that have had impact on contemporary sociology. Therefore, a volume such as this, the first collaborative volume by members of the History of Sociology Section of the American Sociological Association, reflects that recognition of the importance of a discipline’s history and, most significantly, of the variety of perspectives, of diversities, which historical understanding reveals.

Some of the chapters in this volume provide something other than a favorable view of various facets of the history of American sociology. The purpose of the volume is to highlight minority experiences in that history. Thus the volume can be seen as something of an alternative to a celebration of the mainstream. The argument is not that the mainstream should not be celebrated but that, as scientists, sociologists seek a full array of information for purposes of balance and objectivity. This volume of “diverse histories” is intended in that spirit to complement other volumes and thereby to add to the available data.

Anthony Blasi, Editor, *Diverse Histories of American Sociology* and Susan Hoecker-Drysdale, Chair, 2004–2005, The Section on the History of Sociology, American Sociological Association.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Chapter 17, “Sociology in Hawai‘i: Beginnings,” by the late Jeffrey L. Crane, is reprinted from pages 1–10 of *Sociology of Hawaii: Facts and Commentary*, by Jeffrey L. Crane, Alton M. Okinaka, Jan H. Mejer, and Anthony J. Blasi (New York: HarperCollins, 1992), by arrangement with Pearson Education, Inc. Alton M. Okinaka of the University of Hawaii, Hilo, helped facilitate the arrangement.

INTRODUCTION

In the past the history of sociology was written as if it were a system of ideas, a philosophy, as it were. The tendency was to take classic theories that had influenced subsequent studies as the content of the field in the past. Of course, it is true that classic theories are an important part of the field's content in the past. It is also true that some "theory" or "history of sociological thought" texts used a sociology of knowledge approach to help explain how the classical theories came about; that was particularly the case with *Masters of Sociological Thought* by Lewis Coser. But of course much would be left out. A history of sociology could also be written in terms of developments in the technologies of keeping records, arraying data, and performing statistical analyses. A history could also be written in terms of mentor-disciple relationships, schools of thought, and empirical research traditions.

Rather than privilege theory, research technique, research tradition, or some other dimension, it is worthwhile taking a sociological approach to sociology itself. Sociologies of sociology have been written before. A historical sociology might differ insofar as it leads to a depiction of the field as a social movement. In the United States, sociology would be seen as emerging out of the nineteenth-century Social Science Movement, which was an extraordinarily amorphous development that included academic planning, empirical research, social philosophy, and communal settlement plans. The bearers of an identifiable sociology *qua* sociology in the 1890s included college and university professors, minority-group intellectuals, clergy, social reformers, and people whom we would today identify as social workers. What they had in common was a desire to obtain accurate and impartial information about the life circumstances of ordinary people. They were interested in social research.

Social theory did not disappear after its initial European formulations. American theoretical developments were typically tied to considerations of the research situation. Theories about such topics as assimilation and prejudice—focused theories that would later be termed "middle range"—would be comprised of considerations generated by

research into particular American phenomena. Other theories, particularly in the “symbolic interactionist” trajectory, would focus on the emergence of localized and personal meaning systems that researchers might investigate. Rather than a grand scheme that would offer an integrated set of answers to any question (that would come later with functionalism), theories were more likely to consist of basic concepts. One would have a framework of sensitizing concepts rather than a concatenate scheme of propositions. The desire for research, for usable information, would remain in the forefront. The phenomenon of the regnant theory, functionalism, in the mid-twentieth century seemed bound up more with textbook writing than research.

This is to suggest that American sociology has had a dual career of research and education. In the first career, practitioners improved their work by drawing insights from home-grown American theory. Often these were critical insights first formulated by such people as Jane Addams, W.E.B. DuBois, and Thorstein Veblen. At other times they were analytical insights into the nearby first formulated by such people as W.I. Thomas, George Herbert Mead, and Charles Horton Cooley. In the second career, that of sociological education, practitioners sought to link sociology as an intellectual endeavor with the wider realm of learnedness. There was the relationship of sociology to natural science, a discussion developed by Auguste Comte and Herbert Spencer in Europe. There was the relationship of sociologists as role performers to partisan participants in the political process, a discussion begun among historians, continued by Max Weber, and yet to be concluded. There was the issue of the uniquely sociological, which was taken up by Weber and Wilhelm Dilthey. European sociological theory was of interest in this second sociological career, so much so that with the work of Talcott Parsons an American theory developed along European lines quite detached from the research enterprise.

In shifting the focus from the history of sociological theory to the history of sociological practice, we need to look for what sociologists were looking for. What did they deem to be lacking? Such matters as the plight of the working classes and racial discrimination required relevant information and modes of analysis. Then, when and how did the early sociologists get together and see themselves as engaging in a common enterprise? When did they establish formal organizations in and out of the academy? Why did they distinguish them-

selves from others? What dilemmas of organization and formalization did they experience?

The essays in this volume seek to address issues related to these latter kinds of question. The three chapters in Section I examine sociology pursued for purposes of social reform in America. The four chapters in Section II highlight the perspectives of identifiable American minorities in the practice of sociology. The eight chapters of Section III narrate some organizational histories. Finally, the three chapters of Section IV point to some neglected issues and trajectories.

AJB

Nashville

August 2004

PART ONE

SOCIOLOGY FOR SOCIAL REFORM

American sociology emerged as a distinct scholarly discipline out of the social science movement of the nineteenth century. That movement entailed more than university-based research and teaching; it was more than an academic curriculum. It included philanthropic works, communes, settlement houses, and social activism. When the American Sociological Society organized itself from a caucus in the American Economic Association in 1905 and 1906, it included these various facets of the social science movement. As the American sociologists came to identify themselves with a separate science, albeit in the service of social betterment, and eventually simply as a science of society, the question of how much of a relationship with “value laden” and “applied” endeavors should be maintained emerged as a matter of controversy. There were surely advantages to be won in the academy from assuming the mores of the natural sciences, but at what cost?

The first three essays in this volume highlight the tensions between the pure and applied tendencies in early American sociology. The first is a reprint of the 1895 essay by Jane Addams, “The Settlement as a Factor in the Labor Movement.” Once one begins to follow the flow of the author’s thought, embodied in an almost poetic prose that is rich in concrete detail and high principle, one realizes that she was no mere partisan but a circumspect analyst. The fact that she was a cause for alarm for the Chicago industrialists as well as being associated with the suffragette and peace movements drove the University of Chicago academics—apart from Thomas, Dewey, and Mead—to dissociate themselves from her. But would one really doubt the scientific stature of Thomas, Dewey, and Mead? W.E.B. DuBois found it worth his while during the academic phase of his career to visit Hull-House; we invite the reader to do so also.

In Chapter 2 Mary Jo Deegan gives us a micro-depiction of the tension between sociology as a quasi-natural science and the discipline as a moral science. It turns out that Robert E. Park not only maintained an ambivalence over the issue in his professional life,

despite professing adherence to the natural science model and impatience toward women club “do goodism,” but his personal life was marked by an absenteeism and irresponsibility toward his own family, even while his wife Clara Cahill Park was a nationally-recognized reformer. Deegan, who has done much to revive interest in the applied female sociologists in early American sociology, here presents us with a fascinating narrative that calls the naturalistic self-image of much of sociology into question; for it raises the possibility that the image was not based on a need or quest for pure science but on the personal idiosyncrasy and problems of one man.

In Chapter 3, Jan Fritz give us an account of later applied sociology—“clinical sociology.” She shows that it was pursued by some of the major figures in the history of American sociology early on and in more recent years has become a permanent part of the disciplinary scene.

CHAPTER ONE

THE SETTLEMENT AS A FACTOR IN THE LABOR MOVEMENT¹

JANE ADDAMS

One man or group of men sometimes reveal to their contemporaries a higher conscience by simply incorporating into the deed what has been before but a philosophic proposition. By this deed the common code of ethics is stretched to a higher point.

Such an act of moral significance, for instance, was John Burns's loyalty to the dockers' strike of East London. "The injury to one" did at last actually "become the concern of all;" and henceforth the man who does not share that concern drops below the standard ethics of his day. The proposition which workingmen had long quoted was at last incarnated by a mechanic, who took his position so intelligently that he carried with him the best men in England, and set the public conscience. Other men became ashamed of a wrong to which before they had been easily indifferent.

When the social conscience, if one may use the expression, has been thus strikingly formulated, it is not so hard for others to follow. They do it weakly and stumblingly perhaps; but they yet see a glimmer of light of which the first man could not be sure, and they have a code of ethics upon which the first man was vague. They are also conscious of the backing of a large share of the community who before this expression knew not the compunction of their own hearts. A settlement accepts the ethics of its contemporaries that the sharing of the life of the poor is essential to the understanding and bettering of that life; but by its very existence it adopts this modern code somewhat formally. The social injury of the meanest man not only becomes its concern, but by virtue of its very locality it has put

¹ From Residents of Hull-House, *Hull-House Maps and Papers. A Presentation of Nationalities and Wages in a Congested District of Chicago, together with Comments and Essays on Problems Growing Out of the Social Conditions*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell & Co., 1895.

itself into a position to see, as no one but a neighbor can see, the stress and need of those who bear the brunt of the social injury. A settlement has not only taken a pledge towards those thus injured, but it is placed where the motive-power for the fulfilment of such a pledge is constantly renewed. Propinquity is an unceasing factor in its existence.

A review of the sewing-trades, as seen from a settlement, will be sufficient to illustrate this position.

Hull-House is situated in the midst of the sweaters' district of Chicago. The residents came to the district with the general belief that organization for working-people was a necessity. They would doubtless have said that the discovery of the power to combine was the distinguishing discovery of our time; that we are using this force somewhat awkwardly, as men use that which is newly discovered. In social and political affairs the power to combine often works harm; but it is already operating to such an extent in commercial affairs, that the manufacturer who does not combine with others of his branch is in constant danger of failure; that a railroad cannot be successfully projected unless the interests of parallel roads are consulted; and that working-people likewise cannot be successful until they too, learn, skilfully to avail themselves of this power.

This was to the residents, as to many people, an accepted proposition, but not a working formula. It had not the driving force of a conviction. The residents have lived for five years in a neighborhood largely given over to the sewing-trades, which is an industry totally disorganized. Having observed the workers in this trade as compared to those in organized trades, they have gradually discovered that lack of organization in a trade tends to the industrial helplessness of the workers in that trade. If in all departments of social, political, and commercial life, isolation is a blunder, and results in dreariness and apathy, then in industrial affairs isolation is a social crime; for it there tends to extermination.

This process of extermination entails starvation and suffering, and the desperate moral disintegration which inevitably follows in their train, until the need of organization in industry gradually assumes a moral aspect. The conviction arrived at entails a social obligation.

No trades are so overcrowded as the sewing-trades; for the needle has ever been the refuge of the unskilled woman. The wages paid throughout the manufacture of clothing are less than those in any other trade. In order to meet the requirements of the workers,

lack of skill and absence of orderly life, the work has been so subdivided that almost no skill is required after the garment leaves the cutter. It is given practically to the one who is at hand when it is ready, and who does it for the least money. This subdivision and low wage have gone so far, that the woman who does home finishing alone cannot possibly gain by it a living wage. The residents of Hull-House have carefully investigated many cases, and are ready to assert that the Italian widow who finishes the cheapest goods, although she sews from six in the morning until eleven at night, can only get enough to keep her children clothed and fed; while for her rent and fuel she must always depend upon charity or the hospitality of her countrymen. If the American sewing-woman, supporting herself alone, lives on bread and butter and tea, she finds a Bohemian woman next door whose diet of black bread and coffee enables her to undercut. She competes with a wife who is eager to have home finishing that she may add something to the family comfort; or with a daughter who takes it that she may buy a wedding outfit.

The Hebrew tailor, the man with a family to support, who, but for this competition of unskilled women and girls, might earn a wage upon which a family could subsist, is obliged, in order to support them at all, to put his little children at work as soon as they can sew on buttons.

It does not help his industrial situation that the woman and girl who have brought it about have accepted the lower wages in order to buy comforts for an invalid child, or to add to the earnings of an aged father. The mother who sews on a gross of buttons for seven cents, in order to buy a blue ribbon with which to tie up her little daughter's hair, or the mother who finishes a dozen vests for five cents, with which to buy her children a loaf of bread, commits unwittingly a crime against her fellow-workers, although our hearts may thrill with admiration for her heroism, and ache with pity over her misery.

The maternal instinct and family affection is woman's most holy attribute; but if she enters industrial life, that is not enough. She must supplement her family conscience by a social and an industrial conscience. She must widen her family affection to embrace the children of the community. She is working havoc in the sewing-trades, because with the meagre equipment sufficient for family life she has entered industrial life.

Have we any right to place before untrained women the alternative

of seeing their little children suffer, or of complicating the industrial condition until all the children of the community are suffering? We know of course what their decision would be. But the residents of a settlement are not put to this hard choice, although it is often difficult to urge organization when they are flying to the immediate relief of the underfed children in the neighborhood.

If the settlement, then, is convinced that in industrial affairs lack of organization tends to the helplessness of the isolated worker, and is a menace to the entire community, then it is bound to pledge itself to industrial organization, and to look about it for the lines upon which to work. And at this point the settlement enters into what is more technically known as the labor movement.

The labor movement may be called a concerted effort among the workers in all trades to obtain a more equitable distribution of the product, and to secure a more orderly existence for the laborers. How may the settlement be of value to this effort?

If the design of the settlement is not so much the initiation of new measures, but fraternal co-operation with all good which it finds in its neighborhood, then the most obvious line of action will be organization through the trades-unions, a movement already well established.

The trades-unions say to each workingman, "Associate yourself with the fellow-workers in your trade. Let your trade organization federate with the allied trades, and they, in turn, with the National and International Federation, until working-people become a solid body, ready for concerted action. It is the only possible way to prevent cuts in the rate of wages, and to regulate the hours of work. Capital is organized, and has influence with which to secure legislation in its behalf. We are scattered and feeble because we do not work together."

Trades-unionism, in spite of the many pits into which it has fallen, has the ring of altruism about it. It is clearly the duty of the settlement to keep it to its best ideal, and to bring into it something of the spirit which has of late characterized the unions in England. This keeping to the ideal is not so easy as the more practical work of increasing unions, although that is difficult enough. Of the two women's unions organized at Hull-House, and of the four which have regularly held their meetings there, as well as those that come to us during strikes at various times, I should venture to say of only one of them that it is filled with the new spirit, although they all

have glimpses of it, and even during times of stress and disturbance strive for it.

It was perhaps natural, from the situation, that the unions organized at Hull-House should have been those in the sewing-trades. The shirtmakers were organized in the spring of 1891. The immediate cause was a cut in a large factory from twenty-five cents a dozen for the making of collars and cuffs to twelve cents. The factory was a model in regard to its sanitary arrangements, and the sole complaint of the girls was of the long hours and low rate of wages. The strike which followed the formation of the union was wholly unsuccessful; but the union formed then has thriven ever since, and has lately grown so strong that it has recently succeeded in securing the adoption of the national labels.

The cloakmakers were organized at Hull-House in the spring of 1892. Wages had been steadily falling, and there was great depression among the workers of the trade. The number of employees in the inside shops was being rapidly reduced, and the work of the entire trade handed over to the sweaters. The union among the men numbered two hundred; but the skilled workers were being rapidly supplanted by untrained women, who had no conscience in regard to the wages they accepted. The men had urged organization for several years, but were unable to secure it among the women. One apparently insurmountable obstacle had been the impossibility of securing any room, save one over a saloon, that was large enough and cheap enough for a general meeting. To a saloon hall the women had steadfastly refused to go, save once, when, under the pressure of a strike, the girls in a certain shop had met with the men from the same shop, over one of the more decent saloons, only to be upbraided by their families upon their return home. They of course refused ever to go again. The first meeting at Hull-House was composed of men and girls, and two or three of the residents. The meeting was a revelation to all present. The men, perhaps forty in number, were Russian-Jewish tailors, many of whom could command not even broken English. They were ill-dressed and grimy, suspicious that Hull-House was a spy in the service of the capitalists. They were skilled workers, easily superior to the girls when sewing on a cloak, but shamefaced and constrained in meeting with them. The American-Irish girls were well-dressed, and comparatively at ease. They felt chaperoned by the presence of the residents, and talked volubly among themselves. These two sets of people were held together only

by the pressure upon their trade. They were separated by strong racial differences, by language, by nationality, by religion, by mode of life, by every possible social distinction. The interpreter stood between the two sides of the room, somewhat helpless. He was clear upon the economic necessity for combination; he realized the mutual interdependence; but he was baffled by the social aspect of the situation. The residents felt that between these men and girls was a deeper gulf than the much-talked of "chasm" between the favored and unfavored classes. The working-girls before them, who were being forced to cross such a gulf, had a positive advantage over the cultivated girl who consciously, and sometimes heroically, crosses the "chasm" to join hands with her working sisters.

There was much less difference of any sort between the residents and working-girls than between the men and girls of the same trade. It was a spectacle only to be found in an American city, under the latest conditions of trade-life. Working-people among themselves are being forced into a social democracy from the pressure of the economic situation. It presents an educating and broadening aspect of no small value.

The Woman's Cloakmakers' Union has never been large, but it always has been characterized by the spirit of generosity which marked its organization. It feels a strong sense of obligation toward the most ill-paid and ignorant of the sweaters' victims, and no working-people of Chicago have done more for abolition of the sweating-system than this handful of women.

But the labor movement is by no means so simple as trades-unionism. A settlement finds in the movement devoted men who feel keenly the need for better industrial organization, but who insist that industrial organization must be part of the general re-organization of society. The individualists, for instance, insist that we will never secure equal distribution until we have equality of opportunity; that all State and city franchises, all privilege of railroad, bank, and corporation, must be removed before competition will be absolutely free, and the man with his labor alone to offer will have a fair chance with the man who offers anything else; that the sole function of the State is to secure the freedom of each, guarded by the like freedom of all, and that each man free to work for his own existence and advantage will by this formula work out our industrial development. The individualist then works constantly for the recall of franchise and of special privilege, and for the untrammelled play of each man's

force. There is much in our inheritance that responds to this, and he has followers among workingmen and among capitalists; those who fear to weaken the incentive to individual exertion, and those who believe that any interference would work injuriously. The residents of a settlement hear the individualist pleading in many trades assemblies. Opposite to him, springing up in discussion every time he speaks, is the socialist in all varieties. The scientific socialist reads his Karl Marx, and sees a gradual and inevitable absorption of all the means of production and of all capital by one entity, called the community. He makes out a strong case because he is usually a German or a Russian, with a turn for economic discussion, and widely read. He sees in the present tendency towards the concentration of capital, and in the growth of trusts and monopolies, an inevitable transition to the socialistic state. Every concentration of capital into fewer hands but increases the mass of those whose interests are opposed to the maintenance of its power, and vastly simplifies the final absorption. He contends that we have already had the transformation of scattered private property into capitalistic property, and that it is inevitable that it should be turned into collective property. In the former cases we had the expropriation of the mass of the people by a few usurpers; in the latter we have the expropriation of a few usurpers by the mass of people. He points with pride to the strong tendency towards State regulation of the means of transportation, and of many industries, and he urges legislative check and control at every point.

Between these two divergent points of view we find many shades of opinion and many modifications of philosophy; but perhaps a presentation of these two, as heard many times from earnest workingmen, will illustrate how difficult a settlement finds it to be liberal in tone, and to decide what immediate measures are in the line of advantage to the labor movement and which ones are against it.

It has been said that the imagination in America has been seized in due turn by the minister, the soldier, and the lawyer, who have successively held the political appointments; but that it is now the turn of the economist; that the man who would secure votes and a leadership in politics is the one who has a line of action to propose which shall bring order out of the present industrial chaos. This may be illustrated by the marvellous growth of the single-tax movement, which offers a definite remedial measure. Is it not true that our knotty theological difficulties as matters for prolonged discussion are

laid aside? Is it not true that the interpretation of the Constitution, and the standard of action for the law-abiding and upright citizen, are well determined in men's minds? But that the moral enterprise of each man, not by any means his morality, but his moral enterprise, has to be tested by his attitude toward the industrial problem? The crucial question of the time is, "In what attitude stand ye toward the present industrial system? Are you content that greed and the seizing upon disadvantage and the pushing of the weaker to the wall shall rule your business life, while in your family and social life you live so differently? Are you content that Christianity shall have no play in trade? "If these questions press upon all of us, then a settlement must surely face the industrial problem as a test of its sincerity, as a test of the unification of its interests with the absorbing interests of its neighbors. Must it, then, accept the creeds of one or the other of these schools of social thought, and work for a party; or is there some underlying principle upon which the settlement can stand, as in its Christianity it endeavors to stand on something more primitive than either Catholicism or Protestantism? Can it find the moral question involved? Is there a line of ethics which its action ought to follow? Is it possible to make the slow appeal to the nobler fibre in men, and to connect it with that tradition of what is just and right?

A glance at the labor movement shows that the preponderating force has been given to what may be called negative action. Unions use their power to frustrate the designs of the capitalist, to make trouble for corporations and the public, such as is involved, for instance, in a railroad strike. It has often seemed to be the only method of arresting attention to their demands; but in America, at least, they have come to trust it too far.

A movement cannot be carried on by negating other acts; it must have a positive force, a driving and self-sustaining motive-power. A moral revolution cannot be accomplished by men who are held together merely because they are all smarting under a sense of injury and injustice, although it may be begun by them.

Men thus animated may organize for resistance, they may struggle bravely together, and may destroy that which is injurious, but they cannot build up, associate, and unite. They have no common, collective faith. The labor movement in America bears this trace of its youth and immaturity. As the first social organizations of men were for purposes of war; as they combined to defend themselves,

or to destroy their enemies, and only later they united for creative purposes and pacific undertakings, so the labor organizations first equip themselves for industrial war, and much later attempt to promote peaceful industrial progress. The older unions have already reached the higher development, but the unions among the less intelligent and less skilled workmen are still belligerent and organized on a military basis, and unfortunately give color to the entire movement.

It is doubtless true that men who work excessively certain weeks in the year, and bear enforced idleness, harassed by a fear of starvation, during certain other weeks, as the lumber-shovers and garment-workers do, are too far from that regulated life and sanity of mind in which the quiet inculcation of moral principle is possible. It is also doubtless true that a more uniform leisure and a calmer temper of mind will have to be secured before the sense of injury ceases to be an absorbing emotion. The labor movement is bound, therefore, to work for shorter hours and increased wages and regularity of work, that education and moral reform may come to the individual laborer; that association may be put upon larger principles, and assume the higher fraternal aspect. But it does not want to lose sight of the end in securing the means, nor assume success, nor even necessarily the beginnings of success, when these first aims are attained. It is easy to make this mistake. The workingman is born and reared in a certain discomfort which he is sure the rich man does not share with him. He feels constantly the restriction which comes from untrained power; he realizes that his best efforts are destined to go round and round in a circle circumscribed by his industrial opportunity, and it is inevitable that he should over-estimate the possession of wealth, of leisure, and of education. It is almost impossible for him to keep his sense of proportion.

The settlement may be of value if it can take a larger and steadier view than is always possible to the workingman, smarting under a sense of wrong; or to the capitalist, seeking only to "quiet down," without regard to the historic significance of the case, and insisting upon the inalienable right of "invested capital," to a return of at least four per cent, ignoring human passion. It is possible to recall them both to a sense of the larger development.

A century ago there was an irresistible impulse, an upward movement, among the mass of people to have their share in political life,—hitherto the life of the privileged. The universal franchise was demanded, not only as a holy right, but as a means of entrance into

the sunshine of liberty and equality. There is a similar demand at the close of this century on the part of working-people, but this time it is for a share in the results of industry.

It is an impulse to come out into the sunshine of Prosperity. As the leaders of political democracy overestimated the possession of the franchise, and believed it would obtain blessings for the working-people which it has not done, so, doubtless, the leaders of the labor movement are overestimating the possession of wealth and leisure. Mazzini was the inspired prophet of the political democracy, preaching duties and responsibilities rather than rights and franchises; and we might call Arnold Toynbee the prophet of the second development when we contend that the task of the labor movement is the interpretation of democracy into industrial affairs. In that remarkable exposition called "Industry and Democracy," Toynbee sets forth the struggle between the masters and men during the industrial revolution. Two ideals in regard to the relationship between employer and employee were then developed. Carlyle represented one, pleading passionately for it. He declared that the rich mill-owner's duty did not end with the "cash nexus;" that after he had paid his men he should still cherish them in sickness, protect them in misfortune, and not dismiss them when trade was bad. In one word, he would have the rich govern and protect the poor. But the workers themselves, the mass of the people, had caught another ideal; they dreamed of a time when they should have no need of protection, but when each workman should stand by the side of his employer—the free citizen of a free state. Each workingman demanded, not class protection, but political rights. He wished to be a unit; not that he might be isolated, but that he might unite in a fuller union, first with his fellow-workers, and then with the entire people. Toynbee asks who was right, Carlyle or the people. And replies that the people were right "The people who, sick with hunger and deformed with toil, dreamed that democracy would bring deliverance." And democracy did save industry. It transformed disputes about wages from social feuds into business bargains. It swept away the estranging class elements of suspicion and arrogance. "It gradually did away with the feudal notion among the masters that they would deal with their men one at a time, denying to them the advantages of association." It is singular that in America, where government is founded upon the principle of representation, the capitalist should have been

so slow to accord this right to workingmen; that he should refuse so steadily to treat with a "walking delegate," and so long maintain that no "outsider" could represent the men in his shop.

We must learn to trust our democracy, giant-like and threatening as it may appear in its uncouth strength and untried applications. When the English people were demanding the charter, the English nobility predicted that the franchise would be used to inaugurate all sorts of wild measures, to overturn long-established customs, as the capitalist now sometimes assumes that higher wages will be spent only in the saloons. In both cases there is a failure to count the sobering effect of responsibility in the education and development which attend the entrance into a wider life.

The effort to keep the movement to some consciousness of its historic value in the race development is perhaps no more difficult than to keep before its view the larger ethical aims. There is doubtless a tendency among the working men who reach leadership in the movement to yield to individual ambition, as there is among capitalists to regard class interests, and yield only that which must be yielded. This tendency on one side to yield to ambition, and on the other to give in to threats, may be further illustrated.

The poor man has proverbially been the tyrant of poor men when he has become rich. But while such a man was yet poor, his heart was closed to his fellows, and his eyes were blinded to the exploitation of them and himself, because in his heart he hoped one day to be rich, and to do the exploiting; because he secretly approved the action of his master, and said, "I would do the same if I were he."

Workingmen say, sometimes, that the rich will not hear the complaint of the poor until it rises into a threat, and carries a suggestion of ruin with it; that they then throw the laborers a portion of the product, to save the remainder.

As the tendency to warfare shows the primitive state of the labor movement, so also this division on class lines reveals its present undeveloped condition. The organization of society into huge battalions with syndicates and corporations on the side of capital, and trades-unions and federations on the side of labor, is to divide the world into two hostile camps, and to turn us back into class warfare and class limitations. All our experience tells us that no question of civilization is so simple as that, nor can we any longer settle our perplexities by mere good fighting. One is reminded of one's childish

conception of life—that Right and Wrong were drawn up in battle array into two distinct armies, and that to join the army of Right and fight bravely would be to settle all problems.

But life itself teaches us nothing more inevitable than that right and wrong are most confusedly mixed; that the blackest wrong is by our side and within our own motives; that right does not dazzle our eyes with its radiant shining, but has to be found by exerting patience, discrimination, and impartiality. We cease to listen for the bugle note of victory our childish imagination anticipated, and learn that our finest victories are attained in the midst of self-distrust, and that the waving banner of triumph is sooner or later trailed to the dust by the weight of self-righteousness. It may be that as the labor movement grows older and riper, it will cease to divide all men so sharply into capitalists and proletarians, into exploiter and exploited.

We may live to remind its leaders in later years, as George Eliot has so skilfully reminded us, that the path we all like when we first set out in our youth is the path of martyrdom and endurance, where the palm branches grow; but that later we learn to take the steep highway of tolerance, just allowance, and self-blame, where there are no leafy honors to be gathered and worn. As the labor movement grows older its leaders may catch the larger ethical view which genuine experience always gives; they may have a chance to act free from the pressure of threat or ambition. They should have nothing to gain or lose, save as they rise or fall with their fellows. In raising the mass, men could have a motive-power as much greater than the motive for individual success, as the force which sends the sun above the horizon is greater than the force engendered by the powder behind the rocket.

Is it too much to hope that as the better organized and older trades-unions are fast recognizing a solidarity of labor, and acting upon the literal notion of brotherhood, that they will later perceive the larger solidarity which includes labor and capital, and act upon the notion of universal kinship? That before this larger vision of life there can be no perception of “sides” and no “battle array”? In the light of the developed social conscience the “sympathetic strike” may be criticised, not because it is too broad, but because it is too narrow, and because the strike is but a wasteful and negative demonstration of ethical fellowship. In the summer of 1894 the Chicago unions of Russian-Jewish cloakmakers, German compositors, and Bohemian and Polish butchers, struck in sympathy with the cause

of the American Railway Union, whom they believed to be standing for a principle. Does an event such as this, clumsy and unsatisfactory as its results are, prefigure the time when no factory child in Chicago can be overworked and underpaid without a protest from all good citizens, capitalist and proletarian? Such a protest would be founded upon an ethical sense so strong that it would easily override business interests and class prejudices.

Manifestations of the labor movement are erratic and ill-timed because of the very strength of its motive power. A settlement is not affrighted nor dismayed when it sees in labor-meetings, in caucuses, and turbulent gatherings, men who are—

Groping for the right, with horny, calloused hands,
And staring round for God with bloodshot eyes,

although the clumsy hands may upset some heavy pieces of convention, as a strong blindman overturns furniture, and the bloodshot eyes may be wild and fanatical. The settlement is unworthy of its calling if it is too timid or dull to interpret this groping and staring. But the settlement should be affrighted, and bestir itself to action, when the groping is not for the right, but for the mere purpose of overturning; when the staring is not for God, but for Mammon—and there is a natural temptation towards both.

A settlement may well be dismayed when it sees workingmen apathetic to higher motives, and thinking only of stratagems by which to outwit the capitalists; or when workingmen justify themselves in the use of base measures, saying they have learned the lessons from the other side. Such an attitude at once turns the movement from a development into a struggle, and the sole judge left between the adversaries must in the end be force. Class interests become the governing and motive power, and the settlement can logically be of no value to either side. Its sympathies are naturally much entangled in such a struggle, but to be of value it must keep its judgment clear as to the final ethical outcome—and this requires both perceptions and training.

Fortunately, every action may be analyzed into its permanent and transient aspects. The transient aspect of the strike is the anger and opposition against the employer, and too often the chagrin of failure. The permanent is the binding together of the strikers in the ties of association and brotherhood, and the attainment of a more democratic relation to the employer; and it is because of a growing

sense of brotherhood and of democracy in the labor movement that we see in it a growing ethical power.

Hence the duty of the settlement in keeping the movement from becoming in any sense a class warfare is clear. There is a temperamental bitterness among working-men which is both inherited and fostered by the conditions of their life and trade; but they cannot afford to cherish a class bitterness if the labor movement is to be held to its highest possibilities. A class working for a class, and against another class, implies that within itself there should be trades working for trades, individuals working for individuals. The universal character of the movement is gone from the start, and cannot be caught until an all-embracing ideal is accepted.

A recent writer has called attention to the fact that the position of the power-holding classes—capitalists, as we call them just now—is being gradually undermined by the disintegrating influence of the immense fund of altruistic feeling with which society has become equipped; that it is within this fund of altruism that we find the motive force which is slowly enfranchising all classes and gradually insisting upon equality of condition and opportunity. If we can accept this explanation of the social and political movements of our time, then it is clear that the labor movement is at the bottom an ethical movement, and a manifestation of the orderly development of the race.

The settlement is pledged to insist upon the unity of life, to gather to itself the sense of righteousness to be found in its neighborhood, and as far as possible in its city; to work towards the betterment not of one kind of people or class of people, but for the common good. The settlement believes that just as men deprived of comradeship by circumstances or law go back to the brutality from which they came, so any class or set of men deprived of the companionship of the whole, become correspondingly decivilized and crippled. No part of society can afford to get along without the others.

The settlement, then, urges first, the organization of working people in order that as much leisure and orderly life as possible may be secured to them in which to carry out the higher aims of living; in the second place, it should make a constant effort to bring to bear upon the labor movement a consciousness of its historic development; and lastly, it accentuates the ultimate ethical aims of the movement.

The despair of the labor movement is, as Mazzini said in another cause long ago, that we have torn the great and beautiful ensign of

Democracy. Each party has snatched a rag of it, and parades it as proudly as if it were the whole flag, repudiating and not deigning to look at the others.

It is this feeling of disdain to any class of men or kind of men in the community which is dangerous to the labor movement, which makes it a class-measure. It attacks its democratic character, and substitutes party enthusiasm for the irresistible force of human progress. The labor movement must include all men in its hopes. It must have the communion of universal fellowship. Any drop of gall within its cup is fatal. Any grudge treasured up against a capitalist, any desire to "get even" when the wealth has changed hands, are but the old experiences of human selfishness. All sense of injury must fall away and be absorbed in the consciousness of a common brotherhood. If to insist upon the universality of the best is the function of the settlement, nowhere is its influence more needed than in the labor movement, where there is constant temptation towards a class warfare.

CHAPTER TWO

A PRIVATE TROUBLE BEHIND THE GENDERED DIVISION OF LABOR IN SOCIOLOGY: THE CURIOUS MARRIAGE OF ROBERT E. PARK AND CLARA CAHILL PARK¹

MARY JO DEEGAN

Robert E. Park played a central role in defining sociology as a natural science. He imagined sociologists as unbiased and unaffected by the human behavior they studied: “their role was to be ‘the calm, detached scientist who investigates race relations with the same objectivity and detachment with which the zoologist dissects the potato bug’”² (Ernest W. Burgess cited by Matthews 1977, 116). This perspective attacked the earlier intention of many founders of sociology who envisioned sociology as a moral science. These founders studied society to learn how to alleviate poverty, create social justice, and enhance human freedom (E. Becker 1971; Feagin and Vera 2001; Deegan 1988a).

Park’s assault on sociology as a moral science included his aversion to what he called “do-goodism.” He particularly criticized the work of female sociologists who applied their sociological knowledge with the help of hundreds of thousands of clubwomen. These women changed American society and instituted a plethora of laws and government programs concerning the rights of workers, immigrants, the disabled, children, and mothers. These sociologists were fundamental to the creation of the welfare state in the United States (Goodwin 1997; Deegan 1987a, 1991, 1995, 1997; Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley 1998; Skocpol 1992). An example of Park’s view of the relation between women, politics, and sociology is found in an account

¹ My thanks to Michael R. Hill, who provided a critique of earlier drafts of this paper.

² Park did not use the formal, scientific name for the potato bug. The nickname refers to two types of beetle either *Doryphora decemlineata* or *Lema trilineata* (Oxford Universal Dictionary 1933, p. 1555). Park knew his audience was unfamiliar with the natural sciences, and he would get a better response with a popular, and not a scientific, term.

recorded by a former student, Theodore K. Noss. Here Noss notes a particularly extreme exchange between Park and a female student who engaged in social reform and was apparently a Quaker—as were many female sociologists—e.g. Edith Abbott, Jane Addams, Emily Greene Balch, and Florence Kelley (Deegan 1987a, 1991). After castigating Quakers’ “self-righteous meddling in the abolition movement,” Park allegedly claimed “that the greatest damage done to the city of Chicago was not the product of corrupt politicians or criminals but of women reformers” (Noss cited by Rauschenbush 1979, 97).

I always found Park’s statement to be absurd, a serious misperception of reality and the accomplishments of sociology as an applied science (e.g., Deegan 1985). This view is particularly ridiculous for the city of Chicago where he lived—a city world-famous for its venal politicians; the rapacious gangster Al Capone; and the applied sociologist and Nobel Laureate Jane Addams. Imagine my deep astonishment when I discovered that his wife, Clara Cahill Park, was a social reformer. She was not only what Park referred to as a meddling woman, she was a national leader in “social reconstruction,” as Mead (1999) and Campbell (1992) term such activity. Clara Park was a noted author on social problems, a significant figure in the creation of federal programs to financially support widows and their children, and an active supporter of Chicago women whom Park opposed, especially Addams and her sociological allies. In this paper I analyze this human drama: a husband who disapproves of his wife’s lifework and publicly mocks the intent to help people have better lives, and a wife who eloquently and successfully argues for such compassion, human skills, and social knowledge. This is the “human interest story” (H. Hughes 1940), the backstage drama, behind the public presentation (Goffman 1959) of sociology as a natural science.

In order to keep the performers’ names clear, I refer hereafter to Clara Cahill Park as “C.C. Park” and to Robert E. Park as “R.E. Park.” I begin by introducing the biography and work of C.C. Park. I then connect her work to the wider context of women’s work in sociology. R.E. Park’s thundering voice raised against sociology as a moral science and the work of social reformers is presented next. R.E. Park’s patriarchal paradox is that he claimed to be less biased than reformers, while he loved a woman dedicated to social reform and he, too, engaged in it. Like most human dramas, R.E. Park and C.C. Park lived in a world filled with contradictions and ambivalence.

I demonstrate here that unlike the potato bug, humans behave in ways that call for tools to explain intellectual and emotional complexity, moral choices, and self-reflection (Addams 1910, 1912; Mead 1934).

C.C. Park

C.C. Park was a remarkable, highly educated, public figure as well as a wife and the mother of four children. This background is typical for a number of outstanding women married to male faculty at the University of Chicago. These women and their husbands created a vibrant “world” filled with civic responsibilities, the creation of knowledge, and intimate relationships between families and friends (Deegan 1999). R.E. Park was generally outside this world while his wife was within it (for an exception see Ames 1944). Chicago women also established a “female world of love and ritual” supporting women’s involvement in strong interpersonal relations between women and the enactment of female values to change the patriarchal state (Deegan 1996a). C.C. Park was part of this world, as well (e.g., C.C. Park, 1912a, b; 1913a).

C.C. Park was also part of a national social movement of middle-class women who joined together to change the nation state. Their work, called “maternalism” by Theda Skocpol (1992), drew on women’s traditional interests in marriage, the home, and children to demand social changes to support female-headed households and protect children from the abuses of capitalist society. Joanne Goodwin (1997) differentiates this work from that of “social justice maternalists” who were national figures, intellectuals, and activists who successfully argued and planned for a new welfare state, including innovative legislation and agencies to support disenfranchised Americans. “Social justice maternalists” were usually part of the Chicago female world of love and ritual, and C.C. Park shared their intellectually powerful arguments.

The Early Biography of C.C. Park

Clara Cahill (hereafter “C.C.”) was born around 1869, the daughter of Edward Cahill, an eminent attorney and a member of Michigan’s Supreme Court, and Lucy Crawford Cahill. Her father had

established and led a troop of African American soldiers, the First Michigan Colored Infantry, during the Civil war, and his commitment to ending slavery provided an active political background for his daughter (C.W. Nichols 1923). C.C. studied in the United States at the Cincinnati Art Academy and the Chicago Art Institute, and in Europe in Berlin and Strasburg. C.C. became a noted suffrage supporter, published short stories and articles in the popular press, and had a syndicated newspaper column. She was a Unitarian and supported the Progressive Party ("Park, Clara Cahill" 1914).

The Courtship and Marriage of R.E. Park and C.C. Park

R.E. Park and C.C. met in 1892 while he was a reporter in Detroit, Michigan, and she was a young artist in Lansing, Michigan. Even at this time, R.E. Park was deriding women in social reform through his newspaper writing. In a letter to C.C. he wrote "I did not dare to tell all that I mean about them"; (Rauschenbush 1979, 23) so both of them knew he had little respect for women doing this work. The ever hopeful and oblivious young girlfriend lent him a book on nihilism, and the couple fell more in love with each other.

In June of 1894 they married. For the first four years he was a reporter first in Detroit and then in Chicago, followed by New York from 1894 until 1898 (Rauschenbush 1979, 26–27). While he wrote articles, she often illustrated them with pen and ink sketches (see Scrapbook, Robert E. Park Papers, box 10, folder 1). During this period she wrote two articles for *The Philistine*, "A Periodical of Protest" with wide support by novelists, such as Stephen Crane, and supporters of the arts and crafts movement and the work of John Ruskin (Deegan and Wahl 2003). Her first article "The Manners Tart" (C.C. Park 1895) is hard to decipher today. On the surface it is a curious "fluffy" essay on a pastry that is too self-sacrificing and put on the shelf. It could be read, however, as a radical feminist metaphor on women's sexual restraints, especially if they are too sexually compliant. But this seems to be too political a reading given her second, and last, publication in the journal. Here C.C. Park (1896) criticizes a Miss Lancaster who lives with a socialist named Sullivan without a marriage ceremony. C.C. Park finds this a futile "Protestant [protesting] Service" because commitments are sacred and quickly ritualized, so avoiding the marriage ceremony accomplishes

nothing. This interesting defense of marriage³ is not accepted by the editor, H.P. Taber. He (Taber 1896, 61) followed her article with a lengthy, condescending comment:

Miss Park has written a clever paragraph, but as she is not possessed of the Judicial Mind—that is to say is not a Philosopher like myself—she has missed the vital point of the whole business. What Mr. and Mrs. Sullivan object to is not *a* “ceremony,” God bless you! It is *the* ceremony that carries with it the threat that if this man and woman should ever think best to live apart they will be spit upon by the Church and Society.

He continues with this type of response; C.C. Park did not publish again in this magazine. Perhaps Taber read the first article as a defense of “free sex” and realized his mistake after reading the second article.

In the fall of 1898 Park went to Harvard University and began a seven year odyssey in his higher education. By the fall of 1899 R.E. Park had moved to Berlin with C.C. Park and three small children. When C.C. Park was pregnant again, her parents traveled to Europe and took the two oldest children with them back to the United States. In all these accounts there is no information on how the family obtained their funds, but Rauschenbush (1979, 28) suggests that R.E. Park’s father helped them.

In 1903 R.E. Park worked as an assistant in philosophy at Harvard University, a low paying job for the 39 year-old father of four, and in 1904 he started to work for the Congo Reform Association, where he wrote impassioned dispatches about the corruption of King Leopold II of Belgium (see R.E. Park’s reprinted articles in Lyman 1992). Although the peripatetic Park soon quit this job, he followed it with more reform work. Between 1905 and 1913 Park was the secretary of Booker T. Washington at the Tuskegee Institute. Here Park aided Washington’s effort to provide economic independence and vocational education for African Americans in the South. During these years he lived for significant periods of time in Alabama while his cash-strapped wife and children lived in Massachusetts.

Winifred Rauschenbush, Park’s faithful female assistant (and ghost-writer of at least one of his books) is the only scholar of R.E. Park

³ C.C. Park’s approach is similar to a Durkheimian (1965/c. 1915) argument but written decades before Durkheim advanced it.

who seriously considers his relationship to C.C. Park. Rauschenbush (1979, pp. 22–28, *in passim*) perceptively notes that the young couple's courtship seemed ill-fated from the very start because of their divergent interests. Rauschenbush also quotes from one of their daughters, Margaret Park Redfield, who mildly noted that even by 1910—after Park had spent six winters working in Alabama at the Tuskegee Institute while his family lived in a Boston suburb in Massachusetts: “Clara Park was never wholly reconciled to having her husband away from home so much. Nevertheless, she managed. The children were getting older and more helpful. She developed her own interests and as she had an elderly Irishwoman . . . to help in the kitchen, she was not entirely housebound” (Margaret Park Redfield cited by Rauschenbush 1979, 58).

R.E. Park explained to his father-in-law in 1910 how the family's parsimonious budget was salutary for his wife.

If we had had five hundred dollars more a year Clara would never have written the articles she did. She would never have become one of the distinguished women of America, she would have been less in touch than she is now with the great mass of mankind who have less than we do, she would have been less in touch with real life, more disposed to be peevish, discontented, [and] dissatisfied. (R.E. Park cited by Rauschenbush p. 60)

Unsurprisingly, C.C. Park did not view this financial strain as an opportunity for personal growth, but as an onerous burden for the mother of four who labored alone to raise her family without enough funds, emotional support, or shared parenting. Her parents and her daughter Margaret Park Redfield attested to the terrible nervous strain that C.C. Park experienced as a result of continuously running out of money to pay the household bills. R.E. Park, according to his daughter Margaret Park Redfield (cited by Rauschenbush (1979, 61) “admired and encouraged his wife,” but the evidence against his support—whether it is emotional, financial, or intellectual—is strong. Thus C.C. wrote to her husband that “I have been imposed on, not intentionally, but carelessly and veritably” (C.C. Park cited by Rauschenbush 1979, 62). R.E. Park was stingy toward his family and cavalier, to say the least, toward his responsibilities as a husband and father.

Extensive research on her correspondence, newspaper articles, and female network is an important task that is beyond the scope of this paper. I will note, however, a small correspondence between Mary

Heaton Vorse (1969/c. 1914, 1942, 1985), a popular writer on social problems and women's issues, and C.C. Park. It indicates they had a professional and personal relationship. For example, on 15 October 1907 Vorse thanks C.C. for her support of a story that Vorse had written. Vorse also mentions that both C.C. and R.E. had suggested another possible topic, indicating that the women consulted R.E. Park at least occasionally.⁴ Analysis of her other letters and writings would reveal more about C.C. Park, her friends, ideas, and her marriage.

In March 1911 R.E. Park inherited money from his father's estate, and this money then allowed the family to live more comfortably (Rauschenbush 1979, 62). R.E. Park, nonetheless, kept a tight control over the money. Thus in August 1911 C.C. Park was still limited in her budget and wrote him: "I do not like to go on living in debt, in parsimony, and in unceasing care" (C.C. Park correspondence to R.E. Park cited by Rauschenbush 1979, 62).

In the summer quarter of 1913 R.E. Park moved to Chicago where he taught summer school as a lecturer and earned \$500.00 a year. R.E. Park lived alone in Chicago until his family slowly joined him and finally united in 1916. He lived on the margins of the University until W.I. Thomas, his mentor, was fired abruptly in the spring of 1918 as a result of alleged sexual misconduct (Deegan 1988, 178–86). R.E. Park assumed the coursework of Thomas in 1918, and his career in sociology dramatically improved from this point onward. During the 1920s and until his retirement in 1934, as noted earlier, R.E. Park denigrated the life interests of his wife in the classroom where he lectured about the scientific detachment of sociologists and erased the legacy and views of early applied sociologists who shared his wife's perspective. R.E. Park (1923, 1944b) continued to travel extensively during his tenure at Chicago and to absent himself systematically from his home and family.

C.C. Park and Widows' Pensions

C.C. Park's most important community work supported the state establishment of "widow's pensions." This interest emerged from her

⁴ Four letters sent by Vorse to C.C. Park are found in the Robert E. Park papers, Addendum, Box 1, file 2, Special Collections Research Center, University of Chicago, Regenstein Library.

own economic struggles with her wandering husband (R.E. Park 1923; 1944b) and her sympathy for mothers whose husbands' deaths left their families with insurmountable financial problems. C.C. Park's national influence was evident by April 1911 when she presented a paper on "The State and the Fatherless Child" (Baker 1913, 35). Here she argued that the state should help widows keep their families together and out of state care. In 1911–1912 she introduced a bill to establish a commission to study the needs of widowed mothers with dependent children. She later became a member and secretary of such a commission that recommended a bill to subsidize the children of "good" or morally responsible widows until their children reached legal working age. C.C. Park began a campaign for this work including speeches, letters to editors of newspapers and magazines, and testimony at hearings. She even personally brought widows to public events to tell their own stories.

She quickly came to national prominence on this issue, drawing the attention of former President Theodore Roosevelt. On 8 January, the *New York Times* reported the front page news that Roosevelt had personally given money to the woman who had moved C.C. Park, whose work "was backed by the moral support of ex-President Theodore Roosevelt" ("Plea for Widowed Mothers" 1912). The next day the times reprinted an entire letter from Roosevelt ("Roosevelt for Widows' Aid" 1912) to C.C. Park:

Of course I most emphatically and cordially approve of pensioning mothers under the circumstances you name. A pension given to such a mother, the mother of a large family, who had to be both father and mother and has done her duty well, is as much a matter of right as any pension ever given to the most deserving soldier. What I did, really at your suggestion, in connection with Mrs. Morris, was merely to try to apply practically this principle. Good luck to you. I believe in you and the work you are doing with all my heart.

High praise and endorsement, indeed, and front page news in the *New York Times*! C.C. Park was allied, too, with the well-known Rabbi Stephen Wise and the great jurist, Louis Brandeis.

Soon C.C. Park became the subject of a nationally prominent story written by Ray Stannard Baker (1913), then a famous journalist, and the absence or status of C.C. Park's husband was never mentioned in that or any other article on her (e.g. Hard 1913). Baker's praiseworthy biography on C.C. Park's lifework was published in the popular *American Magazine* in their section on "Interesting

People,” a column that resembles today’s *People* magazine. Baker recounts an article she wrote to help raise money for a new home for a recently bereaved family who faced separation because of their lack of money. C.C. Park’s article, called “Wanted—Rooseveltian Landlords!,” called on the readers’ loyalty to President Theodore Roosevelt and his support for public housing. After Roosevelt read this new article he was moved to write C.C. Park:

I am so much interested in your article about the widow that I send you fifty dollars toward the cottage to be built for her. With all good wishes,

Faithfully Yours,
THEODORE ROOSEVELT (cited in Baker 1913, 35)

The law enacted in Massachusetts as a result of her lobbying set national precedents that were adopted throughout most states (Skocpol 1992). The state of Massachusetts also hired an investigator in 1912 and 1913 who helped the commission develop new legislation.

In these same years, C.C. Park became involved in a public debate over widows’ need for state funds that was published in the *Survey*, the major publication for applied sociology. In her first criticism of the conservative, anti-state positions of the social worker Mary Richmond (e.g., 1913), C.C. Park (1912b) called for “a war on poverty.” She ringingly states that “This social revolution may be like the French revolution” and argues for a public recognition “that the fact of bearing and rearing a child in itself creates a certain, if variable, state of dependence for a woman,” an implicit description of her own reliance on a frequently absent husband.

In July of 1913, Edward T. Devine, an applied sociologist, strongly attacked widows’ pensions as a form of relief or public charity. He proposed instead a national system of social insurance to help any American in financial distress. He specifically rejected a gendered or family-based argument. C.C. Park responded to his article with a powerful statement based on her expertise as a mother and as protector of children. She directed her argument explicitly against male sociologists like Devine and R.E. Park: “Mothers, in spite of the sociologists, feel themselves, for once, on their own ground in this matter; and in possession of all their faculties, and will continue to think that as far as children are concerned, not they, but the learned doctors, are in the amateur class” (C.C. Park 1913c, 669). She continues in this vein, even citing Addams’ (1912) book *A New Conscience*

and an Ancient Evil as her authority. C.C. Park, moreover, links these arguments to children's rights for a free, public education. C.C. Park again takes on Devine (1913b) in 1914, and this reply was included in a national reader used by high school debating teams who argued the two sides of the issue (Bullock 1915, 137–39). As Skocpol (1992) persuasively documents, C.C. Park's reasoning was accepted by the American people while they interpreted Devine's approach as relief when it is applied to able-bodied men. In 1916 C.C. Park became the first vice-president of the Massachusetts branch of the Congress of Mothers and addressed their national convention on "The Relation of the States to the Fatherless Child."

Although R.E. Park never studied the mothers' pension movement, the female sociologist Ada J. Davis (1930) did. She noted that such intervention created social ideas and legislation,⁵ and this active human role in social change contradicted the theories of many male sociologists. Thus Herbert Spencer thought society follows its own evolutionary, natural process, Charles H. Cooley argued that social change occurs only in a slow and tentative manner, and the Chicago sociologist William F. Ogburn stated that changes in technology proceed alterations in "adaptive" or social culture. Of course C.C. Park, Ada Davis, and the women who initiated structural changes are not remembered in sociological annals today, while Spencer, Cooley, and Ogburn are.

Despite the wide differences between C.C. Park and R.E. Park on the topic of social reform, they occasionally shared overlapping interests on the topic of African Americans.

C.C. Park, Africans, and the "Harlem" Renaissance

Both Park's shared a politicized and professional interest in the lives of Africans and their descendants in the United States. As R.E. Park's only African American master's student, the late Loraine Richardson Green told me in three telephone interviews (Deegan interviews of Green, 8 August 1991; 10 August 1992; 10 October 1992), R.E. Park was dedicated to social reform, as was her friend Jane Addams. When I told her that many of his former students asserted that R.E.

⁵ Such a planned program of action based on sociological knowledge is called "participatory action research" by Feagin and Vera (2001).

Park opposed applied sociology, she replied that her view was based on experiences with him that spanned over two decades. To her, he was a committed social reformer on the topic of African Americans. C.C. Park shared this devotion.

Thus C.C. Park wrote an important letter to the editor of the *Boston Transcript* (4 November 1904).⁶ Here C.C. Park poignantly appeals to other American women, especially clubwomen, to reach out to women in Africa who suffer from desperate poverty and the multitude of abuses created by male soldiers during war. "Men, who are doubtless wiser than we in political matters" would know logically that the situation is hopeless. But women continue to hope for better conditions and help each other despite the odds against them. C.C. Park read the work of Mary H. Kingsley, an anthropologist/sociologist whose work was reviewed in Émile Durkheim's journal *L'Année sociologique* (Mauss 1897; Anon. 1899), and notes that African women have enormous influence in many societies, particularly as mothers. Women who are prisoners of war, however, are physically and sexually abused. C.C. Park calls for American women to build bridges to African women and to fight for African nationalism. These positions are completely compatible with those of many early female sociologists, but they are not ideas that R.E. Park developed or defended.

The Park's also shared an interest in the National Urban League and its house organ, *Opportunity*. Charles S. Johnson (1944), who was mentored by R.E. Park at the University of Chicago, established editorial policies at *Opportunity* that influenced one of the most important literary movements in African American history, the "Harlem renaissance." This cultural movement emerged from the artwork, fiction, non-fiction, and music surrounding a group of artists associated with New York's Harlem district during the mid-1920s to the mid-1930s (Bontemps 1972). It is likely that the friendship between R.E. Park and Johnson led to the publication of two *Opportunity* covers in January and March 1929 that reproduced C.C. Park's paintings of women of color (see also C.C. Park, 1928). This is one of the few examples of a shared interest between the couple; another

⁶ It was reprinted as a pamphlet by the Congo Committee of the Massachusetts Commission for International Justice, and is available as a microfiche in *The Gerritsen Collection of Women's History* (No. 2144).

example is found in C.C. Park's writing for the *American Journal of Sociology*.

C.C. Park's connections to social justice maternalism; various forms of art, including painting; African American life; and the Chicago female world of love and ritual overlap with her participation in 1926 in the National and International Committee of the Chicago Women's Club (CWC). In April she was on the waiting list to join the CWC and scheduled to address the committee on "the peoples of the primitive pueblo founded by Cortez southwest of Mexico City. She spent several weeks there doing research work" (National and International Committee of the Chicago Women's Club, box 8, CWC papers, Chicago Historical Society, hereafter referred to as "CWC papers.") This committee ultimately sponsored the 1927 Negro Art Exhibit in Chicago. Addams and her friend Louise deKoven Bowen were patrons for this art event. Mrs. George Herbert Mead and both Parks served as members of its general committee, and Park's former student Loraine Richardson Green chaired the publicity committee (see program in CWC papers, scrapbook box 52, n.p.; for Green see Deegan 2002a). This highly successful event brought in art from around the United States and Africa and sponsored a series of symposia. They brought in James Weldon Johnson and Alain Locke, both noted leaders in the Harlem Renaissance, as speakers. C.C. Park also donated \$5.10 to help defray the bill of \$526.38 comprising the unmet costs after the exhibit closed (see "checks" CWC papers, scrapbook box 52, n.p.).

C.C. Park, Feminist Pragmatism, and the American Journal of Sociology

Although C.C. Park was not an acknowledged sociologist in the world in which Park moved, she published three book reviews in the *American Journal of Sociology*, the preeminent journal sponsored by the Department of Sociology at the University of Chicago. All three books analyze women and were written by women. Two of them, moreover, were about women associated with Hull-House and their approach to sociology: feminist pragmatism.

In 1926 C.C. Park reviewed *Growing Up With a City* by Louise deKoven Bowen, one of the main figures in establishing the world's first Juvenile Court; a major philanthropist, leader in the CWC; activist opposing discrimination against African Americans (e.g. Bowen

1911); and the person who succeeded Addams as the head of Hull-House after the latter's death. As noted above, both C.C. Park and Bowen worked together through the CWC. Thus C.C. Park reveals her knowledge of the women who played major roles in the "Hull-House school of sociology," a professional practice that her husband vehemently opposed. C.C. Park (1936) reviewed the posthumous autobiography, *The Living of Charlotte Perkins Gilman* (1935) by that feminist pragmatist and sociologist (Gilman 1935; see Deegan 1997). C.C. Park found this an excellent memorial to Gilman (1966/c. 1898), who was the first sociologist to study extensively the connection between women's oppression and their limited access to the marketplace. This problem of economic dependence was one that C.C. Park intimately understood. C.C. Park, like Gilman, thought this battle was won by 1935, although both women have been shown to be too optimistic about the changed economic status of women.

The third book C.C. Park (1927) reviewed was on "the new Japanese womanhood." She noted the contradictions in Japanese culture when viewed from the American viewpoint. Although many changes in women's role occurred, she finished with a poem calling for more independence—advice that could have been fruitfully applied to her own anomalous situation.

C.C. Park, Bowen, and Gilman were part of a wide network of women dedicated to the study and improvement of society between 1890 and 1920. This is the network that R.E. Park criticized.

Men's and Women's Work in Sociology, 1892–1920

Two central sociological institutions flourished in Chicago between 1892 and 1920: Hull-House, the famous social settlement founded and led by Jane Addams and the center of applied sociology, and the Department of Sociology at the University of Chicago, the worldwide academic leader of the discipline and men's work in it. These two institutions were gendered, with women gravitating to the social settlement and men gravitating to the academy. This division corresponded to the popular Doctrine of the Separate Spheres (Deegan 1988a, 198–99). In sociology, this meant that white men's work was more abstract, rational, formal, and academic (Deegan 1978, 1981, 1988a) while women's work was more applied, more passionate, more centered on values of the home and the roles of women, children,

and the family. Because women were assumed to have more emotional and cultural sensitivity than men, the women were deemed ideal professionals to improve society and make it more humane.

The Doctrine of the Separate Spheres also affected women in the community who wanted to have greater public participation, often using the knowledge gained by applied sociologists (e.g. Rynbrandt 1999). Middle-class, married women, in particular, were expected to labor outside the home in unpaid, volunteer work. This structure for women's work corresponded to "clubwomen's work" or "civic house-keeping" as Addams (1907) called it. This public work became the foundation for the maternal welfare state in the United States (Goodwin 1997; Skocpol 1992; Siegfried 1998).

Because of the discipline's initial openness to women and the belief in a special "sphere" for women's work in sociology, women flocked to the academy for training between 1892 and 1920. During this "golden era of women in sociology" (Deegan 1991, 1996a, 1997), a fruitful, applied sociology emerged with a sophisticated theory of society: feminist pragmatism. This American theory unites liberal values and belief in a rational public with a cooperative, nurturing, and liberating model of the self, the other, and the community. Feminist pragmatism emphasizes education and democracy as significant mechanisms to organize and improve society (see Campbell 1992; Deegan 1988a, 1991, 1995, 1996a, 2002a, b; Siegfried 1998). It emerged in Chicago where sociologists observed rapid urbanization, immigration, industrialization, migration, and social change that took place before their eyes. The Great Migration of African Americans from the South to the North after World War I was part of this massive movement of people in search of more freedom and prosperity.⁷

The University of Chicago towered over the intellectual and professional landscape of sociology from 1892, when the department was founded, until 1934 when R.E. Park retired (Faris 1967; Fine 1995). It reputedly trained over half of all sociologists in the world by 1930. This large group of scholars fundamentally shaped the discipline through its faculty and their doctorally trained students who produced thousands of books and articles (Kurtz 1984).

The names of R.E. Park and his colleague Ernest W. Burgess became synonymous with Chicago Sociology after 1920. They are

⁷ I (Deegan 2002a) document how R.E. Park's familiarity with the black experience was supportive, as well as problematic, to applied sociologists in this setting.

the perceived leaders of a powerful school that signaled the beginning of “modern” sociology.⁸ This “new” approach was notable in one respect: It loudly and defiantly separated itself from social reform and women’s work in the profession. Identifying themselves as “urban ecologists,” R.E. Park and Burgess (1921) saw society as socially created and maintained through conflict similar to that found in the natural world of plants and animals. They viewed the city as both a human product and a territorial settlement. They studied populations such as immigrants, minorities, and juveniles which their earlier colleagues had studied, too, but R.E. Park’s and Burgess’ efforts to link sociological knowledge with application were truncated, or at least they claimed it was.

Because R.E. Park and Burgess were intrinsically social reformers, they wanted to engage in social reform while asserting that their work was “unbiased.” As a result, they derogated their predecessors’ work while initiating a new form of “social policy” study that was more politically conservative and acceptable to businessmen and administrators in the academy. This approach was much less powerful and effective in improving the everyday life of all citizens than the earlier work. The men gained more academic respectability but lost vitality and political effectiveness. In many ways, C.C. Park and her female allies in sociology fundamentally changed the American state and politics while R.E. Park and his male colleagues did not.

For R.E. Park, Addams was a public person who was personally admirable but not a professional colleague and equal (Deegan 1988, 158–59). The role of social amelioration in sociology, then, became a pivotal concept in understanding the work of Addams and other female sociologists in relation to the Chicago School of the 1920s and 1930s. In contrast to R.E. Park, C.C. Park viewed Addams and other women who applied sociology as mentors and role models. Thus C.C. Park (1913b, 669) wrote: “If we could have always with us the great people of the earth, like Miss Addams, Miss [Julia] Lathrop, [Juvenile Court] Judge [Julian] Mack, and others, there would be no such proverbs [accepting poverty as normal] as those the poor now murmur among themselves.”

⁸ I do not share this interpretation and see great continuity between R.E. Park’s colleagues prior to 1920 and post 1920, with the exception that the first cohort of sociologists was less paradoxical and ambivalent in their sociological practices. See Deegan 1988, 2002a.

R.E. Park and his colleagues, ushered in an age that I (Deegan 1991) call elsewhere the “dark era of patriarchal ascendancy,” in which the study of women was eclipsed. The critique of sexist ideas and practices in this school (summarized in Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley, 1998) has resulted in little internal analysis or reflexive critique. Some scholars curiously vehemently deny that this pattern ever existed. They stress that Park was a natural, unbiased scientist (e.g. Bulmer 1984; Lindner 1996; Lyman 1992). The complex story of R.E. Park and his marriage to a significant female social reformer is a private drama behind the public presentation of sociology as apolitical, objective, rational, and as unaffected by human behavior as is a potato bug.

R.E. Park and his Public Antipathy toward “Do Goodism”

As noted above, R.E. Park mocked clubwomen as early as the 1890s, two decades before he became a sociologist (Matthews 1977; Rauschenbush 1979). During this period R.E. Park was not defending the discipline’s scientific integrity but merely expressing his patriarchal opinion as a journalist. He carried this bias into the profession of sociology where he had the institutional power to claim that his position was objective and unbiased.

R.E. Park labored assiduously to appear to be an opponent of applied sociology; a few quotations illustrate this stance. For example, a frequently repeated anecdote of his effort to separate sociology from ameliorating social problems is the following exchange: “His answer to a student’s question, What did he do for people? was a gruff ‘Not a damn thing!’” (Everett C. Hughes cited by Matthews 1977, 116). Similarly, Martin Bulmer also perpetuates R.E. Park’s self-portrait of being distinct from earlier, applied Chicago sociologists when Bulmer (1984, 39) claims that “Whereas [Charles R.] Henderson and [Charles] Zueblin were reform-oriented, Robert Park was not.” This uncritical acceptance of an image without substance is echoed in the writings of Rolf Lindner (1996), Edward Shils (1991), Everett C. Hughes (1964), and Lee Harvey (1987).

R.E. Park repeated these views in his writings, too. Thus in 1924 he scathingly dismissed all social investigations done by applied sociologists—whom he subsumed under the category of “social workers”—when he wrote: “Generally speaking, we have had nothing

that could be called social research, bearing on the tasks of social workers. The most important contributions of [the] sciences to social research and social work have come from medicine and particularly from psychiatry" (R.E. Park, 1924c, 263). With these and similar statements on the work of his early sociological colleagues—whether they were white male academicians, political activists, white women, and/or people of color—R.E. Park swept away the decades of work done by applied sociologists and their allies in the community (Deegan 1988a, 1996a, 2002a; Rynbrandt 1999; Skocpol 1992).

All this established evidence of his extreme opposition to "women's work" in sociology is analyzed rarely. In fact, several scholars even object to criticism of R.E. Park's patriarchal impact on the development of the discipline.⁹ Given his intense public opposition to these women, this is an important omission. But this failure to analyze the gendered basis of sociological history and practices becomes more serious when this is coupled with the fact that when Park opposed the application of sociological knowledge and singled out clubwomen who engaged in it, he was expressing a complex, personal problem. He was attacking the life work, commitments, and contributions of his talented and remarkable wife, C.C. Park.

R.E. Park was a generally obscure figure until after 1920 when he was 56 years old. His wife, however, received great public acclaim as a clubwoman, a syndicated columnist, and a leader in mother's pensions. She achieved this eminence, moreover, without his personal presence or adequate finances. R.E. Park's private trouble as a problematic husband and father married to a successful wife and mother became a public issue in sociology (Mills 1959). R.E. Park institutionalized his patriarchal conflicts exhibited in his marriage into a definition of sociology as a discipline.

The failure of scholars to seriously examine R.E. Park's relationship to the community-based and powerful work of his wife is so buried in the annals of the discipline that when the sociologist Theda Skocpol (1992) focused on C.C. Park's eminent role in creating the maternal welfare state, Skocpol did not recognize her as the wife of R.E. Park. Skocpol notes C.C. Park's significance by citing one of her speeches (p. 313) and two more writings (see pp. 427, 454).

⁹ See Linder (1990, 53, fn. 224), Lyman (1992, 143, fn. 73), Ross (1991, 22 fn.).

Skocpol (1992, 440) even reproduces a picture of C.C. Park that accompanied an article written by the popular journalist William Hard¹⁰ (1913a) who praised C.C. Park as a national leader who protected motherless children.

R.E. Park frequently expressed his opposition to social reform in sociology as a disinterested scientist who has no more investment in the issue than the zoologist has in the potato bug. This statement has been accepted as a true, basically uncomplicated, disinterested position by many of his students and scholars who document his life's work (e.g., Bulmer 1984; Lindner 1996; Lyman 1992; Rauschenbush 1979). His opposite, equivocal attitudes toward sociological practice are not as well recorded, particularly by sociologists who never met him (see Deegan 1988a for an exception to this statement).

*R.E. Park's Dedication to Social Reform: Or, How Human
Actions Differ from the Potato Bugs*

R.E. Park was deeply attracted to applied sociology—if he engaged it, but not when it was conducted by women. His stance can be characterized as one where he publicly wrote and taught a position amounting to “do as I say but not as I do.” This vacillation had a profound and deleterious public effect on the discipline of sociology. In particular, he did not adopt collegial roles toward great female sociologists associated with Hull-House, notably Abbott, Addams, Sophonisba Breckinridge, Julia Lathrop, and Kelley (Deegan 1988, 1994, 2002a).

E.C. Hughes correctly interpreted Park's commitment to social reform as integral to Park's entire system of thought and action. At R.E. Park's funeral, Hughes (1944, 7) opened his eulogy with these words: “Robert Park was a reformer. All his life he was deeply moved to improve this world.” Again, years later, Hughes noted the key role of social reform in Park's life:

It is in a sense, the dialectic of his own life; reform and action as against detached observation; writing the news of the unique event as against the discovery of the eternal theme and process of history;

¹⁰ Hard resided at the University of Chicago Social Settlement for a period and helped popularize the work of female sociologists from Chicago. For a discussion of the importance of this settlement in the work of G.H. Mead see Deegan (1999).

sympathy for the individual man as against concern for the human race. (Hughes 1950, xiii)

Carrying out this theme of reform's significance to him, R.E. Park (1944b, 11) reflected in his autobiography "that with more accurate and adequate reporting of currents the historical process would be appreciably stepped up, and progress would go forward steadily, without the interruption and disorder of depression or violence, and at a rapid pace." Such views strongly contradict many of his earlier cited claims.

Park felt that his sociological work began when he was a reporter. Such an interpretation reveals the complexity of his relationship to "reform" and "science." When he worked as a journalist, both as an undergraduate and for ten years after that, from 1887 to 1897, he sought to reform the newspaper into something "more accurate" and "in the precise and universal language of science" (Park 1944b, 11). He became dissatisfied with newspaper work, however, and returned to the scholarly life. Shortly after returning to college, he again tired of that routine and longed for more "action." When he was subsequently invited to become the secretary of the Congo *Reform* Association (*italics added*), he accepted. Later, he wrote:

There were at the time reports of great scandals in the Congo, and the secretary of the Baptist Foreign Missions, Dr. Barbour, wanted someone to help advertise the atrocities in order to prepare for some sort of political action which would insure reform. I was not, at that time, strong for missions, but I undertook the job. Eventually, however, I became interested. (Park 1944b, 12)

R.E. Park continued this reform work through numerous publications in applied sociology after he joined the sociology faculty at the University of Chicago.¹¹ Some of these writings include addresses to the conference of social workers (Park 1918, 1920), an article for the socialist journal *The World To-Morrow* (Park 1923), a presentation to the political activists who promoted the establishment of parks and public recreation (Park 1924a), and four articles on race relations for the *Journal of Applied Sociology* (Park 1924b, c, d, and e). In 1926 he even edited a special issue of the *Survey*. He not only wrote

¹¹ R.E. Park wrote dozens of book reviews of books in applied sociology over the course of his career. I include only one sample here.

professionally on applied sociology; it was a major focus within his corpus.¹² (See additional references in bibliography.)

R.E. Park was also President of the National Community Center Association from 1922 to 1924, a group dedicated to increasing democratic involvement in urban life (Rauschenbush 1979, 46). He also co-founded Park House in 1924, although Rauschenbush noted: "His interest in the youth center mystified some of his friends. Had he, who detested do-goodism, himself become a do-gooder? They were also baffled by his attitude toward the religious tone of the enterprise" (Rauschenbush 1979, 47). As a board member, "Park spent a good deal of time there; it had for him the attraction that 'doing good' was combined with, or possibly masked by, an intellectual rationale and the opportunity to meet interesting people of a mildly bohemian character" (Rauschenbush 1979, 48). This Park House was a type of intellectual center for working-class people and was clearly built on the social settlement model that was the center for early female applied sociologists.

Park House, however, never assumed an important role in the city, and it was ignored by the University of Chicago community.

The main attraction of the center seems to have been the opportunity to make friendships; the most successful activity was folk dancing, which seems to have served the same function as a T group in lowering the inhibitions and defenses of middle-class males. (Rauschenbush 1979, 47).

After Park retired from the University of Chicago, moreover, he joined the faculty of the predominantly African American institution Fisk University on an intermittent basis, from 1936 to 1944. Still committed to studying and improving the lives of African Americans, he did not identify his interests as "applied sociology."

R.E. Park's life and sociology were shaped by his concerns with social amelioration, while he claimed to despise such work. Contradicting himself at each step, he wanted people to be more fair and democratic, while he wanted to disassociate himself from activities

¹² R.E. Park even claimed to be first author of an applied sociology book, *Old Worlds Transplanted*, when W.I. Thomas was the primary author. This book was funded by a commission promoting applied sociology through the Americanization of immigrants. R.E. Park opportunistically appropriated the first authorship of the book after Thomas was fired from the University of Chicago. See [Thomas, W.I.], Robert E. Park (listed erroneously as first author) and Herbert A. Miller (1921) and my discussion in Deegan (1988: 184, 1994, and 2002).

demanding such changes. Egocentric, brusque, cantankerous, and charismatic, R.E. Park profoundly embodied the conflicts of the new sociology. He legitimized a conservative political role for sociologists and left a legacy legitimating the *status quo* while mildly condemning it. C.C. Park, in contrast, was a major and successful figure in a powerful movement to bring the state into the process of protecting women and children. Instead of bemoaning her husband's parsimony and long absences, she turned her experiential knowledge into help for other women who experienced even greater deprivations than her own.

Conclusion

R.E. Park legitimated men's abstract and depoliticized academic work in sociology by promoting the natural sciences as an ideal model for the discipline. Simultaneously, he openly displayed his hostility toward "women's work" in the profession and/or in women's clubwork. R.E. Park profoundly embodied the public changes in sociology in his private marriage to the erudite and feisty C.C. Park. She, in stark contrast, defended "women's work" in the profession and in the community and helped create the American maternal welfare state.

In this essay, I analyze R.E. Park's effect on women's work in sociology, emphasizing his patriarchal, formal opposition to the impressive life's work of his wife, C.C. Park. As a wife whose husband left her for many months at a time between 1905 and 1913 while he worked at a low salary for Booker T. Washington in Alabama, C.C. Park turned to writing to earn sufficient money to maintain her home and children in Massachusetts. Through this work she articulated her sympathy with widowed mothers who could not receive financial help from their deceased spouses. C.C. Park understood this poverty since her husband chose to provide his family with an inadequate income for their social status. She also understood the loneliness of the widow since her husband was frequently physically absent—albeit voluntarily—from his wife, children, and home. C.C. Park supported the feminist pragmatism of Charlotte Perkins Gilman and the female sociologists at Hull-House, especially that of Jane Addams. Her husband, in contrast, did not praise feminists, clubwomen, nor female sociologists. His opinions were central in redefining the profession and its position on applied work.

C.C. Park and R.E. Park remained married during an era when divorce was condemned. Perhaps they would have stayed together even if divorce were more acceptable in that era: Love, marriage, parenthood, and shared experiences generate complicated emotions and bonds. At times, their lives and interests overlapped, particularly in their support of social justice for African Americans. By and large, however, R.E. Park's public, front-stage animosity towards the work of clubwomen was an insulting response to the powerful political work in which his wife was a leader.

We need more research to explore the intersection of the Parks' private drama and the discipline's public presentation of the natural sciences as an ideal model to study human behavior. Only then can we begin to understand why applied sociology, early women's work in the profession, and a powerful public presence in American public policy began to weaken after 1920. Only then can we interpret and evaluate the cost to the profession and to society of training and rewarding sociologists who look at human beings in the same way that zoologists look at potato bugs.

CHAPTER THREE

THE SCHOLAR-PRACTITIONERS: THE DEVELOPMENT OF CLINICAL SOCIOLOGY IN THE UNITED STATES

JAN MARIE FRITZ

In the 1890s, when sociology emerged as a discipline in the United States, there was unbridled capitalism and the nation was struggling with issues of democracy and social justice. There was rural and urban poverty; an economic depression had gripped the country in 1893; women were still without the vote; and there were lynchings. Farmers and workers in the late 1800s were frustrated because they could see the centralization of wealth and political power in the hands of limited groups of people. This frustration led to public protests and the development of many reform organizations. In this climate, it is not surprising that many of the early sociologists were scholar-practitioners interested in reducing or solving the pressing social problems that confronted their communities. This chapter begins with a definition of clinical sociology, provides a brief history of the use of the concept, and then focuses on the work of four scholar-practitioners.

Clinical Sociology and Social Justice

Clinical sociology, both scientific and artistic in its approach, is a humanistic, multidisciplinary specialization that seeks to improve the quality of people's lives. Clinical sociologists assess situations and reduce problems through analysis and intervention. Clinical analysis is the critical assessment of beliefs, policies and/or practices with an interest in improving a situation. Intervention, the creation of new systems as well as the change of existing systems, is based on continuing analysis.¹

¹ The practical sociology of the 1890s and early 1900s is now referred to as *sociological practice*. The term encompasses two areas, *clinical sociology* and *applied sociology*.

The clinical sociology specialization is as old as the field of sociology and its roots are found in many parts of the world. The specialization is often traced back to the fourteenth-century work of the Arab scholar and statesperson Abd-al-Rahman ibn Khaldun (1332–1406). Khaldun provided numerous clinical observations based on his varied work experiences such as Secretary of State to the ruler of Morocco and Chief Judge of Egypt.

Clinical sociologists have different areas of expertise—such as health promotion, sustainable communities, social conflict, cultural competence—and work in many capacities. They are, for example, community organizers, sociotherapists, mediators, focus group facilitators, social policy implementers, action researchers and administrators. Many clinical sociologists are full-time or part-time university professors, and these clinical sociologists undertake intervention work in addition to their teaching and research. Their focus may be at one or more levels of inclusiveness or scope, from the individual to the inter-societal. Even though the clinical sociologist specializes in one or two levels of intervention (e.g., marriage counseling, community consulting), the practitioner will move among a number of levels (e.g., individual, organization, community) in order to analyze and/or intervene.

Clinical sociologists usually have education and training in at least one area in addition to sociology. This means that not only are clinical sociologists exposed to the range of theories (e.g., symbolic interaction, structural-functionalism, conflict, social exchange, multi-cultural/liberationist) generally taught in sociology programs, but they also have additional influences from outside of their own programs. The result is that clinical sociologists integrate and use a broad range of theoretical approaches, but there is considerable interest in role, standpoint, multicultural/liberationist, and systems theory.

Clinical sociologists use existing theory to formulate models that will be helpful in identifying and understanding problems and also

Clinical sociology emphasizes hands-on intervention while applied sociology emphasizes research for practical purposes. Some clinical sociologists have applied skills; they may conduct research before beginning an intervention to assess the existing state of affairs; during an intervention (to study, for instance, the process of adaptation) and/or after the completion of an intervention to evaluate the outcome of that intervention. For some clinical sociologists, the research is an important part of their own clinical work. Other clinical sociologists may concentrate on the intervention and leave the research activities to others. Clinical sociologists use and combine a variety of research approaches from different fields, but there is considerable interest in participatory, evaluative, and case study research.

identify strategies to reduce or solve these problems. They also have shown that practice can have an influence on existing theories and help in the development of new ones.

As clinical sociology focuses on the improvement of people's lives, *social justice*, with its emphasis on fairness and equity, is an important consideration. A number of clinical sociologists have made justice and equality central to their choice of work (e.g., full employment or affordable housing advocate) and their approach to that work (e.g., participatory) while others think justice is important but is not the main focus.

Clinical Sociology—A Brief History of the Concept

The term *clinical sociology* is used in many countries (see von Bockstaele, von Bockstaele, Barrot and Magny 1963; Enriquez, Houle, Rheume and Seigny 1993; Gaulejac and Roy 1993; Tosi and Battisti 1995; Rheume 1997 and Luison 1998) and there are clinical sociology divisions in the International Sociological Association and the Association internationale des sociologues de la langue française (International Association of French Language Sociologists). The first known published linking of the words *clinical* and *sociology*, however, was in the United States in 1930. Milton C. Winternitz (1885–1959), a pathologist and dean of the Yale Medical School, wanted to establish a department of clinical sociology within the medical school (Fritz 1989). Winternitz wanted each medical student to have a chance to analyze cases based on a medical speciality as well as a specialty in clinical sociology. After working on the idea at least as early as 1929, he wrote about it in a report to the president of the school; the report was published in the 1930 Yale University *Bulletin*. That same year saw the publication of a speech Winternitz had given at the dedication of the University of Chicago's new social science building. The speech also mentioned clinical sociology.²

Abraham Flexner, a prominent critic of medical education and director of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton, also mentioned clinical sociology in 1930 in his *Universities: American, English, German*. Flexner did not approve of the Institute of Human Relations that Winternitz was establishing at Yale. In the pages of criticism

² For more information see Fritz 1985, 1991a, and 1991b.

devoted to the institute, Flexner briefly mentioned clinical sociology: "Only one apparent novelty is proposed: a professor of clinical sociology."

Winternitz continued to write about the value of clinical sociology until 1936 when his last report as a dean was filed. One of his most forceful statements in support of the field was the contemporary-sounding statement that appeared in his 1930–1931 annual report:

The field for clinical sociology does not seem by any means to be confined to medicine. Within the year it has become more and more evident that a similar development may well be the means of bringing about aid so sorely needed to change the basis of court action in relation to crime . . .

Not only in medicine and in law, but probably in many other fields of activity, the broad preparation of the clinical sociologist is essential . . .

The first course using the words *clinical sociology* in the title was taught by Ernest W. Burgess (1886–1966) at the University of Chicago. Burgess taught the course in 1928 and then offered it twice in 1929. During these years, the course was a "special" course and so it did not appear in the catalog. Burgess offered the clinical sociology course as a regular course five times from 1931 through 1933. The course continued to be listed in the catalog for the next several years but was not taught after 1933. Several of the students enrolled in these first clinical sociology courses were placed in child guidance clinics. Clarence E. Glick, for instance, was the staff sociologist at the Lower North Side Child Guidance Clinic, and Leonard Cottrell was the clinical sociologist at the South Side Child Guidance Clinic.

Two other universities offered clinical sociology courses during the early 1930s—Tulane University in Louisiana and New York University. The Tulane University course was designed to provide students with "clinical demonstration of behavior problems and practice in social therapy through staff conferences and fieldwork in a child guidance center" (Tulane University 1929, 14). Louis Wirth (1897–1952), an assistant professor in sociology and director of the New Orleans Child Guidance Clinic (The *Tulanian* 1928, 8), was scheduled to teach the course in the spring of 1930. When Wirth found that he would be in Europe during that time, the course was taught by someone else.³

³ When Wirth returned to the United States in 1931, he joined the faculty of the University of Chicago. Wirth taught a "minor" course in clinical sociology in the spring but by then he no longer was working with child guidance clinics.

The other institution that offered a clinical sociology course in the early 1930s was New York University. Harvey Warren Zorbaugh (1896–1965) was a faculty member there in the School of Education. Zorbaugh, along with Agnes Conklin, offered the “Seminar in Clinical Practice” in 1930. The course was intended to help qualify students as counselors or advisers dealing with behavioral difficulties in schools. From 1931–1933 the clinical practice course was called “Seminar in Clinical Sociology.” The course was open to graduate students who were writing theses or engaged in research projects in the fields of educational guidance and social work.

Zorbaugh, author of *The Gold Coast and the Slum: A Sociological Study of Chicago's Near North Side*, had been involved with clinics at least since 1924. That was the year he and Clifford Shaw organized two sociological clinics in Chicago—the Lower North and South Side Child Guidance Clinics. Zorbaugh was associate director of the Lower North Child Guidance Clinic in 1925. He was also a founder, in 1928, of the Clinic for the Social Adjustment of the Gifted at New York University. He was director of this clinic at its inception and was actively involved in its work over the next fifteen years. The clinic, for intellectually gifted and talented children of preadolescent ages, gave graduate students the opportunity to have supervised experiences in teaching, clinical diagnosis and treatment of children with behavioral problems. The clinic also served as a base for research (Zorbaugh 1939).

The first published discussion of clinical sociology by a sociologist was Louis Wirth's 1931 article, “Clinical Sociology,” in *The American Journal of Sociology*. Wirth wrote at length about the possibility of sociologists working in child development clinics, though he did not specifically mention his own clinical work in New Orleans. Wirth wrote “it may not be an exaggeration of the facts to speak of the genesis of a new division of sociology in the form of clinical sociology.” In 1931, he also wrote a career development pamphlet that stated:

The various activities that have grown up around child-guidance clinics, penal and correctional institutions, the courts, police systems, and similar facilities designed to deal with problems of misconduct have increasingly turned to sociologists to become members of their professional staffs.

He “urged (sociology students) to become specialists in one of the major divisions of sociology, such as social psychology, urban sociology . . . or clinical sociology.”

In 1931, Saul Alinsky was a University of Chicago student who was enrolled in Burgess' clinical sociology course. Three years later, Alinsky's article, "A Sociological Technique in Clinical Criminology," appeared in the *Proceedings of the Sixty-Fourth Annual Congress of the American Prison Association*. Alinsky, best known now for his work in community organizing, was, in 1934, a staff sociologist and member of the classification board of the Illinois State Penitentiary.

In 1944, the first formal definition of clinical sociology appeared in H.P. Fairchild's *Dictionary of Sociology*. Alfred McClung Lee, the author of that definition, was, along with his wife Elizabeth Briant Lee (Fritz 1991c), one of the founders of the Society for the Study of Social Problems, the Association for Humanist Sociology, and the Sociological Practice Association. Alfred McClung Lee later used the word *clinical* in the title of two articles—his 1945 "Analysis of Propaganda: A Clinical Summary" and the 1955 article "The Clinical Study of Society."

Also appearing in 1944 was Edward McDonagh's "An Approach to Clinical Sociology." McDonagh had read Lee's definition of clinical sociology but had not seen Wirth's 1931 article. McDonagh, in his *Sociology and Social Research* article, proposed establishing social research clinics that had "a group way of studying and solving problems."

In 1946, George Edmund Haynes' "Clinical Methods in Interracial and Intercultural Relations" appeared in *The Journal of Educational Sociology*. Haynes was a co-founder of the National Urban League (1910) and the first African American to hold a U.S.-government sub-cabinet post. His 1946 article, written while he was executive secretary of the Department of Race Relations at the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, discussed the department's urban clinics. The clinics were designed to deal with interracial tensions and conflicts by developing limited, concrete programs of action.

During the 1953–54 academic year, Alvin W. Gouldner (1920–1980) was teaching in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at Antioch College in Ohio. Before joining the faculty, Gouldner had been a university teacher for four years and then worked, for one year, as a consultant to Standard Oil of New Jersey. Gouldner offered "Foundations of Clinical Sociology" at Antioch. The course was taught at the highest undergraduate level, and students who enrolled in the course were expected to have completed the department's course in social pathology. The college bulletin provided the following description of the course:

A sociological counterpart to clinical psychology with the group as the unit of diagnosis and therapy. Emphasis on developing skills useful in the diagnosis and therapy of group tensions. Principles of functional analysis, group dynamics, and organizational and small group analysis examined and applied to case histories. Representative research in the area assessed.

While publications mentioning clinical sociology appeared at least every few years after the 1930s, the number of publications increased substantially after the founding of the Clinical Sociology Association in 1978. The Association made publications a high priority. Individuals were encouraged to publish and identify their work as clinical sociology, and the Association established publication possibilities for its members. The *Clinical Sociology Review* and the theme journal, *Sociological Practice*, were published by the Association beginning in the early 1980s.

The Sociological Practice Association and its predecessor, the Clinical Sociology Association, have had a central role in the development of American clinical sociology. The Association helped make available the world's most extensive collection of teaching, research and intervention literature under the label of clinical sociology (e.g., Fritz 2001; Straus 1979, 2002).

The Work of Four Scholar-Practitioners

The four scholar-practitioners who are featured here were selected because of their special interest in justice. The first two individuals, Frank Blackmar and Jane Addams, were involved with American sociology at the earliest stages of its development; and the latter two, Charles Gomillion and James Laue, were later figures.

Frank Blackmar and the Quality of Life in Kansas

When Frank Wilson Blackmar (1854–1931) began his 40-year tenure at the University of Kansas in 1889, as professor of history and sociology, times were more than difficult in the state. According to historian Carl Becker (1960:344–45), in a piece first published in 1910,

Kansas has been subjected, not only to the ordinary hardships of the frontier, but to a succession of reverses and disasters that could be survived only by those for whom defeat is worse than death. . . . Those who remained in Kansas from 1875–1895 must have originally possessed staying qualities of no ordinary sort. . . .

Conditions were so desperate for farmers in Kansas in 1895 “that the University of Kansas faculty voted to contribute part of their salaries to aid sufferers in Western Kansas” (Clark 1965, 96).

Blackmar was the first dean and “guiding genius” (Patterson 1931, 7) of the University of Kansas’ graduate school and headed the Department of Sociology for almost 30 years. He thought sociology’s purpose was “first to understand society; then to enable us to formulate a scientific program of social betterment” (Blackmar and Gillin, 1924, 37). He taught some of the first sociology courses in the country—e.g., *Elements of Sociology* (1890), *Status of Women* (1893), *Questions of Practical Sociology* (1897), and *Remedial and Corrective Agencies* (1897). In 1914, he discussed his department’s plan for a separate department of sociology in *The American Journal of Sociology*. The plan involved four groups of courses—biosocial, pure/general sociology, applied/specialized sociology, and social technology/social engineering. The applied category included such courses as applied sociology, rural sociology, social pathology, socialism and remedial/corrective agencies. The social technology and social engineering courses were: Preparation for Social Service, State Work in Connection with the Conference of Charities and Correction, State Work in Connection with the State Board of Health, State Work in Relation to the Board of Control, State Work in Relation to Penal and Reformatory Practice, Field Work in Social Surveys of Rural and Urban Communities, and Municipal Engineering.

Blackmar was the author of more than 18 books and 90 articles and pamphlets including *The Study of History and Sociology* (1890), *Spanish Colonization* (1890), *Spanish Institutions of the Southwest* (1891), *History of Higher Education in Kansas* (1900), *The Elements of Sociology* (1905) and, with John Gillin, *Outlines of Sociology* (1915; 1923; 1924) (see Fritz, 1990b). He was also the co-founder and ninth president of the American Sociological Society (1919), served on four state prison commissions as well as commissions for city planning, child welfare and mental hygiene, and he wrote state juvenile court and child labor laws. He was also the organizer and first president of the Kansas Conference of Charities and Corrections (1900), an influential organization of leading citizens from around the state that worked for reform legislation. According to Harvey Hougen (1977), the independent penal reform movement that developed in Kansas was “a one-man crusade by Frank Wilson Blackmar”:

As early as 1893, Blackmar accused the state of placing profits ahead of prisoner rehabilitation, and called for a complete depoliticization of the institution. Firm in his belief that the prison could produce reformatory results if it were properly run, the scholar developed a master plan to correct the situation. The main elements of this plan called for a nonpartisan board of control, which would have supervisory responsibility over all state institutions, and a tough civil service law. Boards of control had already been employed by several states to shield charitable and correctional institutions from direct political influence. The civil service law proposed by the reformer would have required all applicants for institutional positions to be screened by competitive examination. . . . Once hired, employees would be paid a salary attractive enough to keep them on the job.

Jane Addams and the Pullman Strike

Jane Addams (1860–1935), the first American woman to win a Nobel Peace Prize (1931), is remembered as a clinical sociologist, social worker, peace activist and urban reformer (Fritz 1991b, 2004). In 1889, Addams and her good friend Ellen Gates Starr established a settlement house in the decaying Hull Mansion in Chicago, Illinois. Hull-House, as it was called, had many aims, not the least of which was to give privileged, educated young people contact with the real life of the majority of the population. The core Hull-House residents, an important group in the development of urban sociology, were well-educated women bound together by their commitment to progressive causes such as labor unions, the National Consumers League, and the women's suffrage movement. During the next 45 years, Jane Addams traveled widely, but Hull-House remained her home.

Hull-House, a national symbol of the settlement house movement, was a center for activities for the ethnically diverse, impoverished immigrants in the Nineteenth Ward of Chicago. Within five years, some forty clubs were based in the settlement house, and over 2,000 people came into the facility each week. Hull-House operated a day nursery, hosted meetings of four women's unions, established a labor museum, ran a coffee house, and held economic conferences bringing together business owners and workers. The Working People's Social Science Club held weekly meetings, and a college extension program offered evening courses for neighborhood residents. A few University of Chicago courses were available there, and the Chicago Public Library had a branch reading room on the premises.

Addams challenged the competency of male city administrators.

She criticized their civic housekeeping skills, questioned their willingness to meet social needs, and thought they deprived American citizens of genuine democracy. Nearly every major reform proposal in Chicago (1895–1930) had Jane Addams' name attached in some way. Her involvement in major issues—such as factory inspection, child labor laws, improvements in welfare procedures, recognition of labor unions, compulsory school attendance, and labor disputes—catapulted her to national prominence. Intellectuals, including Beatrice Webb and Sidney Webb, came from around the world to Chicago to meet Addams and her colleagues. Hull-House was known as a base for social investigation as well as promoting political, economic and social reform. In 1895, *Hull-House Maps and Papers* (Residents of Hull-House 1970) was published. This groundbreaking document, dealing with tenement conditions, sweatshops and child labor, was the first systematic attempt to describe immigrant communities in an American city.⁴

In May of 1894, when Jane Addams had been the head of Hull-House for less than five years, the Pullman strike began. George Pullman had made his fortune by building luxury sleeping cars for the railroads and, beginning in 1880, he built the “model town” of Pullman, Illinois, just outside of Chicago, to house his company and his workers. The town and company were seen by some as “successful”⁵ for a number of years, but the country's economic depression in 1893 and 1894 had a strong impact on the company. The company laid off two thirds of the workforce and severely cut wages, but did not lower the rents in the workers' tenements and houses. The Pullman workers had been organized by the American Railway Union that year and attempted to negotiate with management. Management refused to negotiate or to consider arbitration, and railroad workers refused to move any train that had a Pullman car

⁴ According to Rosenberg (1982:32–4): “Most of the Chicago social scientists participated in some way in the work of Hull House, leading seminars, giving lectures or just having dinner with the exciting group of people who always gathered there . . . Hull House became a laboratory for sociologists, psychologists, and economists, who helped to transform it from a home for moral uplifting of impoverished immigrants to a center for systematic social investigation and an agency of political and economic reform.”

⁵ Success can be defined in many ways. While to some it was a clean community that provided a comfortable living for workers, others noted that Pullman families couldn't own their own homes, workers feared retaliation, workers couldn't join unions and women were encouraged not to work outside the home.

attached to it. Chicago was the most important rail junction in the country, and so the strike and boycott were noticed throughout the country. Soon a federal injunction was granted, and President Cleveland ordered federal troops to Chicago.

Jane Addams was involved in the strike because of her role “as a member of the board of trustees (and one of the incorporators) of the newly-formed Civic Federation of Chicago and, more specifically, as a member of the federation’s Industrial Committee and its Board of Conciliation” (Brown 1999, 133). Addams went to Pullman, met there with union representatives and attempted to meet with company representatives, on behalf of the Board of Conciliation (which included prominent Chicago business representatives), to discuss the possibility of arbitrating the strike. The union was interested in discussing arbitration but, even though a number of other strikes in Chicago had been settled by arbitration, the Pullman Car Company was not interested in even discussing the possibility. George Pullman (OAH Magazine of History 1997) later indicated to the Strike Commission that, “It must be clear to every business man, and to every thinking workman, that no prudent employer could submit to arbitration the question whether he should commit such a piece of business folly (as to give in to workers’ demands).”

Some, like Allen Davis (1973, 110–11) have characterized Addams’ role in the following way: “. . . when a violent strike broke out, Jane Addams preferred to stand aside and interpret rather than to get involved in the fray.” Addams’ writing and her community activities demonstrate Addams’ strong commitment to social justice, unions and an improved quality of life for everyone in a community. At times, she was an advocate. But Addams also knew the value of being an impartial third-party. Community members trusted her, and she found she could help, as a third party, to improve communication and relations between segments of the community. Jane Addams did not just “stand aside.”

*Charles Gomillion and Racial Gerrymandering*⁶

Charles Goode Gomillion (1900–1995) was born in Johnston, a small town in rural Edgefield County, South Carolina (Fritz 1988). His

⁶ Gerrymandering is the outlining or redrawing of district boundaries to give a political advantage to an individual or group.

father, a custodian, was illiterate, and his mother could barely read and write. At the age of 16, with only 26 months of formal education, Gomillion left his hometown to attend high school at Paine College in Augusta, Georgia. Paine, one of the historically Black colleges, provided secondary education at the time in addition to college classes.

After Gomillion finished his undergraduate work at Paine, he passed up a position selling life insurance to take a teaching job with the high school program at Tuskegee Institute (now Tuskegee University) in Tuskegee, Alabama. Tuskegee, founded by Booker T. Washington in 1881, also was a high school and college for African American students and had an all African American faculty and administration. Gomillion taught in Tuskegee's high school for five years and then was promoted to the college program. He later became a professor of sociology there and served as Dean of the Division of Social Sciences, Dean of Students, Chair of the Division of Social Sciences and Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. During his time at Tuskegee, Gomillion took graduate courses for one year at Fisk University (1933–34) and, seven years later began attending, periodically, graduate courses in sociology at Ohio State University. He finally received his Ph.D. in sociology in 1959, when he was 59 years old.

Gomillion is remembered for his involvement in the civil rights struggle. He was the forceful, patient president of the Tuskegee Civic Association (TCA) from 1941–45 and again from 1951–68 and in 1970. As president, he and TCA began to challenge Tuskegee and Macon County's treatment of African Americans. The struggle was long and difficult. Numerous legal actions had to be initiated. A boycott of Tuskegee's white-owned businesses began in the early 1950s, several years before the Montgomery bus boycott. The Tuskegee boycott—or, as it was known locally, the trade-with-your-friends campaign—was officially endorsed by the TCA in 1957 and lasted two more years. It was so effective that half of the white-owned businesses were gone by the spring of 1958 and sales were down 45–60% for those that survived. As a result, white resistance finally started to diminish, voter registration of African Americans began to take place, and the courts started to be responsive.

Gomillion won his most impressive legal victory (*Gomillion v. Lightfoot*) in the U.S. Supreme Court in 1960. Gomillion's successful

suit stopped the local gerrymandering which had kept all but about ten African Americans from voting in town elections. According to the attorney for the Tuskegee Civic Association (Guzman, 1984:xi),

the Gomillion case is one of the landmark cases of the century. It opened the door for the redistricting and reapportioning of various legislative bodies from city hall to the U.S. capitol and also laid the foundation for the concept of “one-(person)-one-vote.”

Gomillion described his life's work as that of an educator and community activist. He wanted his students and colleagues to understand the importance of using their gift—their education—to improve conditions of the society. Although Gomillion did publish (e.g., 1942; 1947; 1957; 1962; 1965), he seemed almost embarrassed when he discussed his research and writing. Gomillion (1987 interview) said “sometimes I felt I hadn't done what was expected of me . . . the research that gives prestige. But when I hear from my students and alumni, I think maybe I wasn't intended to be a research sociologist.”

James Laue and a Framework for Community Intervention

James Laue, the former Lynch Professor of Conflict Resolution at George Mason University in Virginia, died of diabetes complications in 1993 when he was only 56 years old. Laue had been at George Mason since 1987 and, from 1971 to 1987, he had been a vice chancellor at Washington University in St. Louis and director of the Center for Metropolitan Studies at the University of Missouri-St. Louis.

Before taking these academic/practice positions, Laue, beginning in 1965, was the assistant director for community analysis for the Community Relations Service (CRS). The CRS was the “first congressional effort to establish a Federal agency to assist communities to restore or maintain racial peace” (Community Relations Service 1994, 1–2). The CRS was established in 1964 under Title X of the Civil Rights Act. Originally placed under the US Department of Commerce (because of the number of disputes involving public accommodations), the CRS was transferred to the US Department of Justice in 1966. In 1968, Laue was in Memphis, Tennessee as a federal mediator trying to help resolve the garbage collectors' strike, and he was on the balcony of the Lorraine Motel when the Rev. Martin Luther King was assassinated.

Laue (Grimes 1993) was a mediator⁷ who joked of being a “conflict resolutionary.” Among his accomplishments: he helped start a conflict clinic at the University of Missouri at St. Louis; was vice chair of a bipartisan commission that led to the creation of the U.S. Institute of Peace; mediated civil rights disputes from Selma, Alabama, in the 1960s to Northern Ireland in the 1990s, helped with the development of former President Jimmy Carter’s conflict resolution program, and was the first chair of the National Peace Foundation. Laue, with the support of the Kettering Foundation in Ohio, also was the lead mediator/facilitator working on developing “a shared commitment to deal with the chief problems and/or opportunities” (Kunde 1997) in Gary, Indiana. Gary’s eight-month process (a Negotiated Investment Strategy)⁸ involved stakeholders from all levels of government and the community (Fritz 2002, 255–56).

Once when Laue testified before Congress, he noted that “Peace is a positive concept. . . . And it is possible . . . to cause peace among persons and among groups and among nations in the same way that we talk about the ‘causes’ of war” (Grimes 1993). Ron Kraybill (2002, 33), noting Laue’s pivotal role in the development of mediation in the United States, has written that Laue is one of the two godfathers of mediation in this country. One of the best ways to understand Laue’s values and approach to community conflict is to examine “The Ethics of Intervention in Community Disputes, a chapter he wrote, with Gerald Cormick, that was published in 1978. Laue and Cormick (1978, 217–18) thought the

single ethical question that must be asked of every intervenor in community disputes at every decision-making point . . . is “Does the intervention contribute to the ability of relatively powerless individuals and groups in the situation to determine their own destinies to the greatest extent consistent with the common good?”

The “framework and flow” of Laue’s ethical system was composed of four building blocks. The first one was identifying assumptions

⁷ Mediation is a humanistic, creative, non-adversarial, semi-structured process in which an impartial third party helps individuals who want to discuss one or more issues identify their individual and mutual interests and perhaps reduce or resolve their differences (Fritz, 2004).

⁸ The Negotiated Investment Strategy is described in Jan Fritz’s (2002) chapter, “Community Matters,” in *Using Sociology*.

about human nature, the second (which was based on the first) was identification of values, the third was the establishment of ethical principles (these principles “flow from basic values”) and the fourth was the actions of the intervenor.⁹ Laue’s (1978, 218) basic assumptions about human beings—that people are “fallible, decision-making creatures” who seek meaning from their actions with others and that people “ought to be treated as ends in themselves”—were evident in his writing, workshops¹⁰ and mediations. His core values, based on his assumptions, were empowerment, freedom and justice. *Empowerment* occurs when individuals and groups are able to represent their own interests, make their own decisions, and live with the results. Laue and Cormick (1978, 219) thought “a person’s nature is most fully honored . . . when he or she has the maximum degree of *freedom* to determine his or her destiny consistent with the common good.” And the authors (1978, 219) had this to say about *justice*:

Justice is the ultimate social good. The just social system would be one in which power (control of decisions) is diffused, decision making is participatory, accountability for decisions is visible, and resources are adequate and equitably distributed. Justice can only result from the continuous interplay of individuals and groups adequately empowered to represent their own interests with a minimum of superordinate umpiring to prevent power concentrations and, therefore, abuses. Given human fallibility, a system of justice cannot be constructed and implanted on a social system by wise and/or powerful outsiders. It must emerge from the interplay of empowered, meaning-seeking individuals and groups.

Laue (1978, 221) believed that social change that moved toward justice was the “proper general goal” for those intervening in community disputes and that the “empowerment of relatively powerless individuals and groups becomes the immediate ethical mandate.” Laue thought intervenors make contributions to structural changes and had a responsibility to “assess the relative level of information, negotiating skills, and analytical ability of the parties and, if there is a considerable differential, help even the odds through training or other forms of advocacy.”

⁹ Laue and Cormick (1978:212) identified five roles for intervening in community disputes: activist, advocate, mediator, researcher and enforcer.

¹⁰ James Laue and Jan Fritz co-led workshops on intervention in social conflicts in Washington, D.C. (1983) and St. Louis, Missouri (1985).

Conclusion

In 1896, Albion Small, chair of the Graduate Department of Sociology at the University of Chicago and founding editor of *The American Journal of Sociology*, published his article "Scholarship and Social Agitation." Small thought the primary reason for the existence of sociology was its "practical application to the improvement of social life" (Timasheff and Theodorson 1976, 2). In Small's (1896, 564) words:

Let us go about our business with the understanding that within the scope of scholarship there is first science, and second something better than science. That something better is first prevision by means of science, and second intelligent direction of endeavor to realize visions. I would have American scholars, especially in the social sciences, declare their independence of do-nothing traditions. I would have them repeal the law of custom which bars marriage of thought with action. I would have them become more profoundly and sympathetically scholarly by enriching the wisdom which comes from knowing with the larger wisdom which comes from doing.

By 1939, Harvey Zorbaugh (1939, 344) noted that "a quarter of a century ago the majority of sociologists may fairly have been called philosophers or reformers." Zorbaugh thought the older approach to sociology was represented by Small and the newer approach was represented by someone such as Burgess (who taught the first course entitled clinical sociology) because he used a scientific approach and emphasized methodology.

The first scholar-practitioners made strong calls for sociologists to either be involved in action or help, in a variety of ways, to develop programs of "social betterment." But when contemporary sociologists speak of the history of American sociology, they frequently focus on just the development of sociology as a science and only value scientific achievements. There are other lines in the history of sociology, however. They may not be researched as thoroughly or so widely known but these continuing stories take nothing away from the view of sociology as a science. One of these lines, the development of clinical sociology, unites scholarship and intervention and has just as long a history as the general field of sociology. And some of these clinical sociologists—such as Frank Blackmar, Jane Addams, Charles Gomillion, and James Laue—have used their scholarship and intervention skills to help keep our society moving toward what James Laue called the "proper general goal" of justice.

The activities of the scholar-practitioners deserve to be included in the general history of our field. They should be included, however, not as isolated examples of the contributions, for instance, of one particular African American or one woman. Nor should they just be described as scientists without mentioning or stressing their practice activities. In addition, the individuals should also be connected to the practice tradition. The scholar-practitioners featured here are connected to a long-standing practice tradition (that has considerable variation) within sociology. This tradition is not just part of our past but a vital part of our future. Their “public sociology”¹¹ was heard, in part, because they combined scientific contributions with practical experience—“the wisdom that comes from knowing with the wisdom that comes from doing” (Small 1896, 564).

¹¹ According to Michael Burawoy and Jonathan VanAntwerpen (2001), “Public sociology (engages) the large social issues of the day—not in isolation but in dialogue with policy analysts and critical intellectuals. . . . We believe that our vocation as a community of social scientists is to deploy our tools, methods, concepts and theories, developed for a specialized audience, in the construction of bridges to a broader public. And we do so with a view of enhancing and deepening debate about social trends and transformations.

PART TWO

ALTERNATIVE SOCIOLOGICAL VOICES

Alternative voices are simply those not usually heard from. In the context of American sociology, alternative voices are those of people who have not been writing the history of sociology and whose works have been less well-known by those reviewing the scholarly literature on various topics. Of particular interest are the voices of those who have been made marginal by category because of their minority status in the wider society. What category of people is marginal changes from decade to decade. There is the tendency to “discover” the work of scholars who had been marginal in the past but who, if alive in the present, would not be so. Thus the identification of alternative voices is as much a function of the present as of the past.

The second group of essays features sociology as practiced by American social minorities. In Chapter 4 Kay Richards Broschart reports the results of her own quest for the sociological heritage of southern women. There were secondary reference works based on regional marginality and sources based on gender marginality, but somehow the two had not come together; female sociologists were under represented in the reference sources on the South and southern sociologists in the reference sources on women.

In Chapter 5, Robert Wortham goes beyond the better-known legacy of W.E.B. Du Bois to reveal just how much of an accomplishment the early specifically sociological works were. Du Bois has become an icon of the African American civil rights movement, but the focus has largely been upon his movement activity rather than his sociology, and what little has been written about the latter focuses on his urban study, *The Philadelphia Negro*. The equally impressive sociology embodied in the “Atlanta Studies” series, however, which Wortham describes, is hardly accessible.

In Chapter 7 Victor Rios, Jr., looks at sociological theory-development in the research-engaged context of the Latino students of the late Julian Samora. In a manner more typical in Latino than in Anglo culture, he examines the emergence of a theoretical perspective in a scholarly community rather than highlight the career

of one person. Hence his focus is not on the biography of the first Mexican American sociologist but on the student legacy of that major figure in Mexican American studies.

It is difficult to realize now in the twenty-first century, but a century ago American Catholics were a minority, with particular resistance raised against their denominational institutions. In Chapter 8, Anthony J. Blasi focuses on the sociology of William J. Kerby of the Catholic University of America, remembered today more as an ecclesiastical activist than sociologist. Nevertheless, it is shown that Kerby had a distinctive sociology within a broadly Simmelian framework.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE NEGLECTED CONTRIBUTIONS OF FEMALE SOCIOLOGISTS IN THE AMERICAN SOUTH

KAY RICHARDS BROSCART

Most accounts of the history of sociology in the United States fail to mention any early female sociologists who practiced in the American South. Does the absence of southern women in the historical record simply indicate that few, if any, important sociological contributions have been made by southern females? Or is the history of sociology, as commonly recorded, an incomplete and partial chronicle of this discipline's significant participants?

In an effort to contribute to a more inclusive history of sociology, it was decided to critically examine the historical place and contributions, if any, of early southern female sociologists. This inquiry was guided by a number of fundamental questions: First, were there any southern women practicing sociology in the late nineteenth century when this field was first emerging as a discipline in the United States? If there were southern women engaged in significant sociological endeavors, what was the scope and nature of their practice? Second, were there any noteworthy female sociologists practicing in the South in early decades of the twentieth century when American Sociology was becoming established and institutionalized in the academy? If so, what were their contributions and the patterns of their sociological careers?

This chapter describes an ongoing study, undertaken over the past decade and a half, of late nineteenth and early twentieth century southern female sociologists. Descriptions of methods of inquiry employed as well as the results and conclusions drawn from the study are included in this report. Problems initially encountered in the process of searching for and identifying important but formerly unrecognized contributors to the discipline will be discussed. Methods and resources that proved to be useful in this investigation also will be identified. The characteristics and sociological endeavors of two generations of southern women who made significant contributions to the discipline will be described and compared.

Research Methods: The Search for Early Southern Female Sociologists

In order to identify southern women who have contributed to the development of sociology, a search was made of a computerized database of information on southern women and women of color located at the Center for Research on Women at Memphis State University. In addition to this computerized database survey, a systematic inspection of library catalogs, reference volumes, abstract journals, and journal indexes was carried out at several large regional state university libraries. These initial information-seeking efforts were, unfortunately, discouraging and frustrating. Using these methods, not one previously unknown early southern female sociologist was identified. It became apparent that different research strategies would need to be adopted, if any early southern female sociologists were to be discovered.

Abandoning conventional library research methods, a broad reading program in southern history, African American history and the history of American women was initiated. In addition to this historical study, an expanded and redirected library inquiry also was conducted. This second library search concentrated on biographical and bibliographical reference works, directories, newspaper and journal obituaries, and publications of professional associations. From these resources, an initial list of potential subjects and some promising sources of further information were identified. After examining the information gathered by these means, a pool of possible candidates was generated for further study. Additional information on each subject was then collected and evaluated. This lengthy screening process eventually led to the identification of two distinct cohorts of early southern women in sociology:

- I. Southern foremothers of sociology
- II. Early twentieth-century southern female sociologists

*The Findings**Southern Foremothers of Sociology*

The group designated as Southern Foremothers of Sociology is comprised of five women, born in the third quarter of the nineteenth century. Listed chronologically by birthdate they are: Anna Julia

Cooper (1858–1964); Ida Bell Wells-Barnett (1862–1931); Janie Porter Barrett (1865–1948); Mary McLeod Bethune (1875–1955) and Elizabeth Ross Haynes (1883–1953). Although not sociologists by formal training or occupational label, these pioneering women laid a foundation for the subsequent development of the discipline and profession. Furthermore, these female founders shared a set of basic ideas and modes of practice that are unquestionably sociological. More specifically:

1. They tested and challenged traditional beliefs by systematically gathering and analyzing social facts.
2. They shared a belief in social causes for social behavior and, by extension, a belief in social solutions to social problems.
3. They based their practice, social reform or social welfare programs on objective observations or knowledge about social life.
4. They helped to found and develop organizations that promoted social research, contributed to social welfare, and helped to establish sociology as a discipline in the region and the nation.¹

An analysis of the social characteristics of the southern foremothers of sociology is presented in Table 4.1. It is surprising to note that all of these early women who contributed to the development of the discipline were African American. Born during the Civil War (1861–1865), or in the postwar period of Reconstruction, these African American women came of age in a war-torn region of the nation, in a era marked by extensive social and economic upheaval, poverty, and racial discrimination.

Before the emancipation of the slaves in 1865, it was illegal for enslaved African Americans to be educated. It is remarkable, therefore, to note that the southern foremothers, all daughters of former

¹ Käsler (1981) has suggested that a sociologist may be defined as someone who fulfills at least one of the following criteria:

- occupies a chair of sociology and/or teaches sociology
- member of a national sociological society
- co-author of sociological articles or textbooks
- defines self as a “sociologist.”

Although the claim is not made that foremothers or forefathers of sociology are necessarily sociologists, three of the Southern foremothers can be considered sociologists on the basis of at least one of Käsler’s criteria. The exceptions are Barrett, who engaged in sociological practice, and Cooper, who was a social theorist and analyst. Käsler’s criteria appear to favor academic sociologists over applied practitioners or independent scholars.

slaves, were unusually well educated. Two of the women (Cooper and Haynes) earned master's degrees and one (Cooper) earned a Ph.D. Two of the women (Barrett and Bethune) graduated from postsecondary institutions, while the fifth foremother (Wells-Barnett) enrolled in post secondary classes. With the exception of Anna Julia Cooper and Elizabeth Ross Haynes, all of these pioneering African American women were educated in racially segregated schools and institutes. Nevertheless, the extent of their education was higher than average for southern women of any color in their generation (James 1971, xlv-xlvi; Rogers-Rose 1980, 23). The southern African American foremothers were exceptional in their patterns of labor force participation as well as in the level of their education. In America, as late as 1910, more than ninety percent of all African American working women were employed as agricultural workers, servants or laundresses (Rogers-Rose 1980, 22-23). The southern founding mothers, however, as Table 4.1 shows, worked in higher-ranking positions as journalists, educators, social welfare and civil rights leaders, and public officials.

While these African American foremothers of sociology had demanding public roles and occupations, they also assumed traditionally female family responsibilities. Although the majority of white working women, who were their contemporaries, never married or had children, all of these women founders married and raised children, in addition to pursuing their public projects (Degler 1980, 383-84, 388-89).

What were the major sociological contributions made by the early Southern Foremothers of Sociology?

Anna Julia Cooper's unusually long 105 year life-span encompassed the eras of both the nineteenth century southern foremothers and the early twentieth century southern women sociologists. The extent of her education is more characteristic of the later cohort of women contributors rather than the earlier generation into which she was born. Cooper received both a bachelor's and a master's degree from Oberlin College in the 1880s. She also earned a doctorate from the University of Paris in 1925. For most of her working life Cooper was employed as a teacher and principal at the M Street (Dunbar) High School in Washington, D.C. Widowed after only two years of marriage, she adopted and raised five orphaned children during her late middle age. A pioneering social theorist and life long advocate of racial and sexual equality, Cooper is designated

a southern foremother of sociology on the basis of her groundbreaking analysis of the intersection of race, gender, and region, which was published in *A Voice from the South in 1892*. Writing from a feminist as well as a sociological perspective, Cooper argued "there is a feminine as well as a masculine side to truth" (Cooper 1988 [1892], 60). Although clearly influenced by the prevailing doctrine of separate spheres, Cooper's recognition of gender issues is unprecedented among early scholars. Less well known, and less accessible, than Anna Julia Cooper's treatise on racism and sexism in the American South, is her doctoral dissertation originally written in French at the Sorbonne. First translated and published in English in 1988 under the title *Slavery and the French Revolutionists*, this original and insightful analysis brings an international perspective to Cooper's analysis of race, gender and society.

Ida Bell Wells-Barnett's most lasting and significant contributions lie in the realm of social research and social reform. While working as an investigative reporter, Wells carried out a groundbreaking, sociological research project on lynching. Especially noteworthy in this undertaking was the collection of in-depth, first-hand information and the use of systematic data analysis. Committed to exposing and debunking prevailing myths about the practice of lynching, Wells courageously worked to disseminate the findings of her studies through her own publications and public speaking engagements. Ida B. Wells subsequently became a catalyst and leader in the international anti-lynching movement. She was also a leader and advocate for Black civil rights and woman's suffrage. Her most significant published works include: *Southern Horrors: Lynch Law In All Its Phases*, 1892; *The Reasons Why the Colored American is Not in the World's Columbian Exposition*, 1893; *A Red Record: Tabulated Statistics and Alleged Causes of Lynchings in the United States*, 1895; and *Mob Rule in New Orleans*, 1900 (Wells-Barnett 1991). Her autobiography, *Crusade for Justice: The Autobiography of Ida B. Wells*, edited by her daughter Alfreda Dunster, was published posthumously in 1970.

Janie Porter Barrett was a pioneer in the field of sociological practice. She founded the Locust Street Social Settlement in Hampton, Virginia in 1890. It was the first institution of its kind in the state and one of the first in the nation. In 1914, recognizing a need for a rehabilitation center for girls, Barrett also founded the Virginia Industrial School for Colored Girls. She served as resident superintendent of this school from 1915 until her retirement in 1941 (James

et al. 1971, 96). Barrett viewed the Virginia Industrial School as a “moral hospital” or social laboratory. Upon admission, each girl was studied and an individual treatment plan was developed (Daniels 1931, 68). Under Barrett’s direction, the school achieved national recognition. A Russell Sage Foundation survey in the early 1920s placed it among the top five institutions of its type in the nation (Daniels 1931, 76).

Mary McLeod Bethune was a highly influential educator, government official and civil rights leader. She was the founder of the Daytona Normal and Industrial Institute in Florida, which later became Bethune-Cookman College. She served as president of this innovative Black educational institution from 1904 until 1942. In the 1930s Bethune entered a second career in government service. In 1935 she was appointed to the Advisory Committee of the National Youth Administration. Four years later she was named Director of the Division of Negro Affairs, the first African American woman to be appointed to a position in the federal government at that level. Bethune was the only woman who served as a member of President Franklin Roosevelt’s informal “Black Cabinet.” In this capacity, she worked to influence public policy and implement social solutions to social problems and inequities. As an educator and government official, Bethune was dedicated to improving the educational and occupational opportunities of African American youth. As a citizen she was also committed to the advancement of African American women. For example, she was the founder, and a national leader, of a number of prominent African American women’s organizations.

Mary McLeod Bethune qualifies as a southern foremother of sociology on several grounds. She was one of the initial members of the Southern Sociological Congress. She also served as President of the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History. In both of these organizations she urged scholars and teachers to discover, interpret, and disseminate truth “in the field of Negro life” (Mainiero 1979, 149).

Like Anna Julia Cooper, Elizabeth Ross Haynes acquired an unusually high level of post secondary education. Moreover, she also was educated at white as well as traditionally black institutions of higher education. Haynes earned a bachelor’s degree from Fisk University in 1903, and enrolled in summer graduate courses at the University of Chicago from 1905 to 1907. She earned a master’s degree in sociology from Columbia University in 1923.

After teaching high school for several years, Haynes was appointed national secretary of the YWCA. She assumed responsibility for expanding the association's presence on college campuses and establishing African American YWCA's across the nation (Smith 1992, 477). At the time of her appointment Haynes was one of only "a handful of college educated social service administrators" (Wilson 1997, xvii).

After her marriage in 1910 to George Edmund Haynes, "a sociologist and later a founder and executive director of the National Urban League", Elizabeth Ross Haynes held a number of unpaid positions in organizations where her husband was employed (Smith 1992, 477). From 1918 to 1922, while working as a "dollar-a-year employee" of the United States Department of Labor, Haynes undertook one of the first systematic studies of Black women workers (Wilson 1997, xix). She continued to serve the YWCA as a volunteer for a quarter of a century, culminating in a ten year term of service on the national board from 1924 to 1934 (Smith 1992, 478). She was also actively involved in reform work in a number of religious and political organizations and community groups. Haynes published *Unsung Heroes* (1921) and *The Black Boy of Atlanta* (1952), as well as writing her master's thesis of 1923, "Negroes in Domestic Service in the United States" (Haynes 1997).

Haynes qualifies as a Southern Foremother of Sociology for her significant contributions to the National YWCA Movement and her groundbreaking research and reform efforts associated with African American women in the labor force.

Early Twentieth Century Southern Women Sociologists

The second generation of southern women, the early female sociologists, were born in the years between 1888 and 1907. They include Katharine Jocher (1888–1983), Harriet Laura Herring (1892–1976), Katharine DuPre Lumpkin (1897–1988), Belle Boone Beard (1898–1984), Ellen Irene Diggs (1906–1998), and Margaret Jarman Hagood (1907–1963). The social characteristics of these early twentieth century women are displayed in Table 4.2. An inspection of this table reveals several shared attributes and patterns of behavior. It is interesting to note, for example, that all but one of these southern sociologists were single and childless. The only married woman in the group (Hagood), moreover, divorced her husband after ten years of

marriage and the birth of one child. The practice of avoiding marriage and motherhood was not confined to these early southern female sociologists. It was common for well-educated professional women in America to remain single in the first half of the twentieth century (Clinton 1984, 136–137).

The data in Table 4.2 show that these early female southern sociologists were very well educated. The least educated women in the group (Herring) completed a master's degree plus several additional years of graduate study. Each of the other women graduated from a doctoral program in sociology. It is noteworthy that the majority of these female sociologists received some of their education at women's colleges. Four of them (Jocher, Herring, Lumpkin and Hagood) completed their undergraduate studies at one of the southern colleges for women. Another (Beard) earned two graduate degrees in sociology from a well-known northern women's college. The only woman who did not attend a sex-segregated institution, Irene Diggs, enrolled in a racially segregated university while pursuing her master's degree.

The second generation of southern women who made significant sociological contributions, were employed, as well as educated, as sociologists. With one exception (Hagood), all of these women ultimately secured permanent faculty positions in colleges or universities. In addition to establishing respectable academic affiliations, these remarkable female sociologists also held high-ranking administrative, editorial or research posts within the academy, the profession, or the federal government.

Two early twentieth century southern female sociologists, Harriet Herring and Margaret Hagood, centered their careers in research, focusing on studies of rural and regional problems. While Herring was employed as a research professor in a university-based research institute, Hagood worked as researcher and administrator at the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Katharine Jocher was the first woman at the University of North Carolina to be promoted to the rank of full professor. For many years, she also held an administrative appointment at the Institute for Research in Social Science and served as managing editor of *Social Forces*. Both Belle Boone Beard and Katharine Lumpkin were tenured members of the teaching faculty at private, predominantly white, women's colleges. From 1921 to 1936, Beard, a professor at Sweet Briar College, also served as Head of the Department of Economics and Sociology. Professor Lumpkin engaged

in research and writing about southern issues and women, in addition to her teaching responsibilities, at Smith College and Wells College.

Early in her career, Irene Diggs worked as a research assistant for W.E.B. DuBois. She held this position from 1933 to 1943 and again from 1945 to 1947. From 1947 to 1976 Diggs was employed as Professor of Anthropology and Sociology at Morgan State College. At this Black, coeducational, public institution, she continued to be engaged in research as well as teaching. Her extensive writings and publications concentrated on topics in international and Black studies.

What were the major contributions made by the members of this second generation of southern women sociologists?

Katharine Jocher contributed to the discipline in several significant ways. As previously noted, she served from 1931 to 1961 as managing editor of *Social Forces*, the official journal of the Southern Sociological Society. In the 1940s she also held the offices of Second Vice President and President of that professional organization. Jocher was a national as well as regional leader in the profession. She was elected Second Vice President of the American Sociological Association in 1942 and served on the Association's Executive Committee from 1947 to 1950. She was also a member of the Council of the American Sociological Association from 1952–1955. She published two volumes in collaboration with Howard Odum: a textbook, *An Invitation to Social Research*, 1929, and a jointly edited handbook, *In Search of the Regional Balance of America*, 1945.

The most tangible legacies of Harriet Herring and Katharine Lumpkin lie in their research and publications. Herring produced a series of monographs based on her studies of southern economic activities and development: *Welfare Work in Mill Villages*, 1929; *Southern Industry and Regional Development*, 1940; *Southern Resources for Industrial Development*, 1948; and *Passing of the Mill Village*, 1949. Lumpkin also wrote and published four volumes. One of these works is a study of child labor while the other three can be characterized as southern studies: *Child Workers in America*, 1937; *The South in Progress*, 1940; *The Making of a Southerner*, 1947; and *The Emancipation of Angelina Grimke*, 1974.

Belle Boone Beard is recognized for her leadership and service in professional associations. She served as a member of the Executive Committee at the Southern Sociological Society from 1936 to 1940 and from 1949 to 1951. She was elected Second Vice President of the Southern Sociological Society in 1940 and First Vice President

in 1946. Beard also held office in the Virginia Social Science Association. She served as President of that organization from 1942 to 1944 and Vice President from 1945–46.

Throughout her professional life, Irene Diggs was a prolific writer. She contributed more than 150 articles to professional journals, magazines, and newspapers. Included among her longer published works are several monographs and a major reference volume. Diggs most noteworthy publications include: *Encyclopedia of the Negro*, 1945 (Editor); *Chronology of Notable Events and Dates in the History of the African and His Descendants During the Period of Slavery and the Slave Trade*, 1970; *Black Innovators*, 1975; *Black Chronology From 4000 B.C. to the Abolition of the Slave Trade*, 1983; and “Introduction” to W.E.B. DuBois, *Dusk of Dawn: An Essay Toward An Autobiography of the Race Concept*, 1983. In addition to creating a large body of published works, Diggs also made a lasting contribution as co-founder of *Phylon*, a journal devoted to the study of race and culture.

Margaret Hagood was a sociological pioneer who made significant contributions to both statistics and demography. Her ground breaking dissertation was “a pioneering statistical analysis of the fertility of white women in the rural Southeast,” (Scott, in Sicherman and Green 1980, 297). It was followed by another highly original study of tenant farmers’ wives, subsequently published as *Mothers of the South* (1939). Hagood’s textbook *Statistics for Sociologists* (1941) was widely adopted and influential. It has been credited with increasing the statistical sophistication of an entire generation of graduate students. Hagood is also acknowledged for inventing the *Farm Operator Level-of-Living Index for Counties in the United States*, published in 1957. Recognized by the federal government as well as her colleagues, Hagood served from 1952 to 1962 as head of the Rural Life Branch of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. She was elected President of the Population Association of America in 1954 and of the Rural Sociological Society in 1956.

Summary and Conclusions

This exploratory study was undertaken in an effort to contribute to a more inclusive history of sociology. More specifically, the inquiry sought to identify early southern American women who have contributed to the discipline. To my knowledge, no other investigation

has previously attempted to document, or analyze, the careers, characteristics and contributions of late nineteenth or early twentieth century southern female sociologists.²

The research ultimately led to the identification of two groups of early women contributors. The first group, southern foremothers of sociology, was born between 1858 and 1883. The second cohort, born close to the turn of the century, was designated early twentieth-century southern female sociologists. These two generations of women differed considerably in their social background characteristics. While the earliest southern women to practice sociology were typically married African American women with families, those who followed later were primarily white, unmarried, childless women.

Compared to their female contemporaries, the early southern female sociologists were unusually well educated. The average nineteenth century foremother, for example, completed several years of schooling beyond high school. The sociologists in the next generation, moreover, typically earned one or more graduate degrees. Although their occupations ranged from journalist to educator, each of the foremothers was engaged in work that was intrinsically sociological. The members of the second cohort of women in sociology, however, held academic or research positions and occupationally were labeled as sociologists.

A summary of the major contributions of the two identified groups of early Southern women sociologists is presented in Table 4.3. As the table shows, the contributions of the southern foremothers of sociology are substantial and varied. These pioneering women founded specialized schools and professional organizations, designed and implemented social welfare programs and legislation, and conducted and promoted social research. The early twentieth-century southern female sociologists also made significant and lasting contributions. Their contributions were concentrated in the areas of research and publications and in leadership and service in professional associations. Clearly, many original and significant contributions were made by the two cohorts of early southern women sociologists identified in this study. Both the late nineteenth century southern foremothers of sociology and the early-twentieth century southern female sociologists deserve

² One study has focused on women's participation in the Southern Sociological Society from 1973–1980. See Wylie 1984.

to be recognized and included in any future account of the history at the discipline and its founders in the United States.

If the history of sociology is to be accurate rather than mythological, it should recognize all categories of persons who have significantly contributed to building the disciplinary enterprise. It should acknowledge the sociological contributions of women as well as those of men. It should document noteworthy work of sociologists of all races. It should recognize the efforts of sociologists outside the academy as well as those working in academic settings. It should also include the contributions of sociologists from all geographical regions of the nation and all societies where sociology has emerged and flourished.

Table 4.1: Social Characteristics of Southern Foremothers of Sociology

| Name | Place of Birth/ Upbring | Education | Marital Status | Number of Children | Race | Occupation(s) |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|---|------------------------|-----------------------|-------|---|
| Anna Julia Cooper (1858–1964) | North Carolina | BA Oberlin, 1884 MA Oberlin, 1887 Ph.D. Univ. of Paris, 1925 | Married Widowed | Five (Adopted) | Black | Educator Scholar |
| Ida Bell Wells-Barnett (1862–1931) | Mississippi | Coursework at Fisk and Lemoyne Institute | Married | Four | Black | Journalist Social Reform Advocate/Civil Rights Leader/Woman's Suffrage Advocate |
| Janie Porter Barrett (1865–1948) | Georgia | Graduate Hampton Institute 1884 | Married | Four | Black | Educator Social Welfare Leader |
| Mary McLeod Bethune (1875–1955) | South Carolina | Graduate Scotia Seminary 1894 | Married (Separated) | One | Black | Educator Civil Rights Leader Government Official |
| Elizabeth Ross Haynes (1883–1953) | Alabama | BA Fisk, 1903 MA Columbia University, 1923 | Married | One | Black | Social Service Administrator Social and Political Activist/Author |

Table 4.2: Social Characteristics of Early Twentieth-Century Southern Female Sociologists

| Name | Place of Birth/ Employment | Education | Family Status | Race | Occupation(s) | Employer(s) |
|---|--|---|------------------------|-------|--|---|
| Katharine Jocher (1888–1983) | Pennsylvania/ North Carolina | BA, Goucher ^{ac} 1922 MA, U of PA 1923 Ph.D., UNC 1929 | Single | White | Social Worker Researcher/Research Institute Admin. Research Professor Journal Editor | Institute for Research in Social Science ^c U. of NC ^c |
| Harriet Laura Herring (1892–1976) | Virginia/ North Carolina | BA, Meredith ^{ac} 1913 MA, Radcliff ^a 1918 Post. Grad UNC ^c 1925–28 | Single | White | High School Teacher Community Worker Researcher | Research Institute in Social Science ^c U. of NC ^c |
| Katharine DuPre Lumpkin (1897–1988) | Georgia/ New York | BS, Brenau ^{ac} 1915 MA, Columbia 1919 Ph.D., Wisconsin 1928 | Single | White | Research Professor Professor of Sociology Researcher | Smith College ^a Inst. of Labor Studies Wells College ^a |
| Belle Boone Beard (1898–1984) | Virginia/ Virginia | BA, Lynchburg ^c 1923 MA, Bryn Mawr ^a Ph.D., Bryn Mawr ^a 1932 | Single | White | High School Teacher Professor of Sociology College Administrator | Sweet Briar College ^{ac} |
| Ellen Irene Diggs (1906–1998) | Illinois/ Georgia/ Maryland | BA, Minn/Twin Cities 1928 MS, Atlanta U ^{bc} 1933 Ph.D., Havana U 1945 | Single | Black | Research Assistant Researcher Professor | Atlanta University ^{bc} Havana University Morgan State College ^{bc} |
| Margaret Jarman Hagood (1907–1963) | Georgia/ North Carolina/ District of Columbia | BA, Queens ^{ac} 1929 MA, Emory ^c 1930 Ph.D., UNC ^c 1937 | Divorced/ One Child | White | Researcher Statistician Demographer | Institute for Research in Social Science ^c US Dept. of Agriculture |

^a Women's College ^b Black Institution ^c Southern Institution

Table 4.3: Major Contributors of Early Southern Women in Sociology

| SOCIOLOGICAL CONTRIBUTIONS | | |
|--|---|--|
| <i>Southern Foremothers of Sociology</i> | <i>Sociological Research/Theory</i> Wells-Barnett—Lynching Cooper—Race/Gender/Social Stratification Haynes—Black Women in Labor Force | <i>Founder/Officer Professional Organization</i> Bethune—Association for the Study of Negro Life and History |
| | <i>Applied Sociological Principles to Social Problems or Issues</i> Barrett—Virginia Industrial School for Girls Bethune—National Youth Administration | <i>Founder Social Welfare/Educational Institutions</i> Barrett—Virginia Industrial School for Girls Bethune—Bethune-Cookman College Cooper—Frelinghuysen University |
| | <i>Social Research/Publications</i> Hagood—Regionalism, South Herring—Regionalism, South Jocher—Regionalism, South Lumpkin—Regionalism, South Diggs—Race/History Hagood—Statistics Jocher—Research Methods | <i>Officer Professional Organization(s)</i> Beard—Southern Sociological Society Virginia Social Science Association Hagood—DC Sociological Society American Sociological Association Population Association of America Rural Sociological Society Jocher—Southern Sociological Society American Sociological Association |
| <i>Early Twentieth-Century Southern Women Sociologists</i> | <i>Applied Sociological Principles to Social Problems or Issues</i> Hagood—U.S. Department of Agriculture | <i>Founder/Editor of Journal</i> Diggs—Co-founder Phylon Jocher—Managing Editor, <i>Social Forces</i> |

CHAPTER FIVE

THE EARLY SOCIOLOGICAL LEGACY OF W.E.B. DU BOIS

ROBERT A. WORTHAM

Du Bois' contributions to the study of race relations and his political and social activism are well known. He was a key figure in the Niagara Movement and the NAACP. In fact he served as the editor of the NAACP's *The Crisis* from 1910 to 1934. *The Souls of Black Folk* (1903), *Darkwater: Voices from within the Veil* (1921) and *Dusk of Dawn: An Essay Toward an Autobiography of a Race Concept* (1940) are classic statements on African American quality of life. He was also a gifted poet and novelist and was able to articulate effectively his hopes for a "just society" for general and specific audiences. He held positions inside and outside of academia and tried his hand at a political career having run unsuccessfully for one of the senate seats from New York in 1950. While Du Bois may have aligned himself with the Progressive movement during his early years, his attraction to Marx, socialism, and communism became more pronounced in the later half of his career. Du Bois left the U.S. for Ghana in 1961, having become disillusioned by the lack of progress that had been made in American race relations. Devoting his life to "dismantling the veil," Du Bois died a citizen of Ghana in 1963 on the eve of the successes of the U.S. Civil Rights Movement.

Du Bois' sociological contributions are less known. Essentially Du Bois remained a sociologist throughout his career by blending academic and activist sociology (Fritz, 1990a). Following his exit from Atlanta University in 1910, the empirical, academic focus gave way to public sociology and a focus on social change. The present essay describes Du Bois' early sociological experiences at the University of Pennsylvania (1896–1897) and Atlanta University (1897–1910). This focus is particularly warranted as leading introductory sociology textbooks, like Henslin (2005) and Stark (2004), have given significant attention to Du Bois' contributions to the development of sociology in the U.S. While a new generation of students is learning about

Du Bois' connection with the development of the U.S. sociological tradition, these skeletal summaries understate the magnitude of his contribution.

More specifically, is *The Philadelphia Negro* (1899) portrayed as one of the earliest empirical studies in urban sociology (Anderson, 1996)? While Stark (2004) mentions the Atlanta tradition, are students aware that the Atlanta Sociological Laboratory predates the "Chicago School" and may be the first U.S. sociological school (Wright, 2002a, 2002b, 2002c)? Although introductory sociology texts are beginning to mention Du Bois, how often is Du Bois addressed in the social problems literature? The Kornblum, Julian and Smith (2004) social problems text has been through eleven editions, but there is no discussion on Du Bois' contributions to the field. Yet from 1898 to 1913, Du Bois directed and either edited or co-edited the annual Atlanta University Conference publications on "the Negro Problem." Each of these volumes addressed a different aspect of African American quality of life.

This chapter addresses these issues first by focusing on Du Bois' early sociological interests and the significance of *The Philadelphia Negro* (1899). The focus then shifts to the Atlanta Sociological Laboratory. Attention is given to the Atlanta University sociology curriculum, the creation of a sociological school and the annual conferences on "the Negro problem." Summaries of the conference studies on religion, crime and health are provided. Here the reader will be exposed to Du Bois' extensive use of methodological triangulation. The chapter concludes with a general assessment of Du Bois' contributions to the early development of empirical sociology.

Early Sociological Training and The Philadelphia Negro (1899)

Although Du Bois' degrees at Harvard (B.A. 1890, M.A. 1891 and Ph.D. 1894) were in history, statements from his 1940 autobiography, *Dusk of Dawn*, and a 1944 essay, "My Evolving Program for Negro Freedom," indicate that his coursework in the social sciences was extensive (Fritz, 1990a). Prior to receiving his Ph.D., Du Bois spent two years at the University of Berlin where he studied under Gustav Schmoller and met Max Weber. Upon graduation from Harvard, Du Bois assumed a teaching position at Wilberforce University. While he was employed to teach classics, he expressed a desire to teach

social science but was unsuccessful in obtaining that assignment (Du Bois, 1940).

An opportunity to engage in sociological work was provided in 1896 when he was contacted by the University of Pennsylvania to conduct a detailed study of the social and economic conditions of African Americans residing in Philadelphia's seventh ward. Du Bois was listed as an assistant in sociology but was not allowed to teach. The study was conducted over a fifteen-month period from August 1, 1896 through December 31, 1897, and, except for a brief report on domestic servants, Du Bois was the sole investigator (Anderson, 1996; Du Bois, 1940). *The Philadelphia Negro* was published in 1899.

Du Bois' use of methodological triangulation, which would also characterize his approach to the Atlanta University Conference studies, is evident in this definitive study in urban ecology and racial and ethnic stratification. Secondary analysis of census data, interview and questionnaire data collection formats (house-to-house and general follow-up surveys), and participant observation and ethnographic approaches were carefully blended. Du Bois was aware of the problems associated with researcher and methodological bias and stated these concerns at the beginning of the study (sections 1–3). He also believed that the utilization of multiple research methods would minimize rather than compound these biases. The influence of Weber and his insistence on researcher neutrality may be evident here. Writing within the Progressive tradition, Du Bois argued that the social and economic inequalities associated with “the Negro Problem” were a byproduct of ignorance. If the public were presented with empirically verifiable “facts,” the need for change would be obvious and change would follow. Du Bois (1996 [1899], 4) concluded the introductory methodology section with the following remark: “They [the findings] are therefore presented to the public, not as complete and without error, but as possessing on the whole enough reliable matter to serve as the scientific basis of further study, and of practical reform.”

The quality of life topics covered by this classic study are exhaustive and cover many of the social issues addressed in contemporary social problems courses. For instance, the standard social problems course coverage includes such topics as the sociological perspective, health care, mental health, alcohol and drugs, crime, poverty, prejudice and discrimination, gender issues, aging, family, education, work and the economy, urban problems, population change, and

technology and the environment (see Kornblum, Julian and Smith, 2004). Du Bois essentially addresses the same issues in *The Philadelphia Negro* (1899) as he outlines the social and economic dimensions of “the Negro Problem.” He begins with a discussion of methodological issues and the problems associated with the African American quality of life in Philadelphia (chapters 1–2). After providing a brief history of African Americans in Philadelphia since 1638 (chapters 3–4), he moves to discussions of population composition (chapter 5), marital status (chapter 6), migration (chapter 7), education (chapter 8), occupational status (chapter 9), health (chapter 10), family (chapter 11), voluntary associations such as the church (chapter 12), crime (chapter 13), poverty and alcoholism (chapter 14), housing (chapter 15), prejudice and intermarriage (chapter 16) and political participation (chapter 16). The final chapter includes a summary of the major findings and recommendations for actions that African Americans and whites may take to help improve African American quality of life in Philadelphia. As will be seen later, this selection of topics provided the framework for the 1898 to 1913 (volumes 3 to 18) Atlanta University Conferences on “the Negro Problem.”

A glimpse of Du Bois’ empirical approach to the study of “the Negro Problem” in Philadelphia may be gleaned from a brief discussion of his assessment of church participation. His comments (1996 [1899], 197–221) begin with a historical overview spanning the previous century. A discussion of the functions of the church comes next, and the section concludes with a demographic description of the current (1897) levels of religious participation. Ten statistical tables are interspersed throughout the twenty-four-page discussion of African American religious life, providing detailed information on membership, salaries, property values, debts, and moneys allocated to support missions. These data were obtained from the 1890 *Census of Religious Bodies* and the family and individual interview schedules that were part of his Philadelphia survey.

Focusing on the functions of the Black Church, Du Bois argued that the church preserved the traditional values of African life, such as family life. Thus, the church became the center of religious, political and social life. The church also provided opportunities for social interaction, educational stimulation, and mutual support. Du Bois concludes that the functions of the Black Church were, in order of importance, raising an annual budget, maintaining membership, providing social activities, reinforcing moral standards, supporting further

educational opportunities, and providing benevolent aid. While each of these functions strengthened the Black Church as a social institution, Du Bois could also provide biting criticism. He maintained that the church was primarily a social organization that was unwilling to establish high moral standards for its membership. Ministers were primarily “executive officers” who failed to provide “spiritual leadership.” Finally, Du Bois noted that African American church membership and attendance varied by social class and that these boundaries were rarely crossed.

As noted earlier, Du Bois believed that if the general public were “presented with the facts” about a particular problem or situation, the appropriate actions would follow. Here Du Bois was articulating an optimism that was characteristic of the Progressive movement of the time (Zuckerman, Barnes and Cady, 2003). In concluding *The Philadelphia Negro*, Du Bois argued that “the Negro Problem” was grounded in such related issues as the lack of relevant information, economic inequality, crime, and xenophobia. The nation as a whole would be strengthened if the social and economic gaps separating various racial and ethnic groups were closed and, foreshadowing Allport’s (1958) work on the nature of prejudice, if the various groups were willing to interact in a spirit of cooperation rather than competition. Attempting to move race relations forward, Du Bois (1996 [1899], 386, 389) concludes by reminding Americans that “the differences in men are not so vast as we had assumed” and that “the two races should strive side by side to realize the ideals of the republic and make this truly a land of equal opportunity for all men.”

As Du Bois completed the collection of data on “the Negro Problem” in Philadelphia in 1897, he accepted an offer to affiliate with Atlanta University. His tasks were to 1) teach history and economics, 2) create a sociology department and 3) assume the leadership of the annual Atlanta University Conferences. He also established Atlanta University’s first sociology club (Fritz, 1990a; Wright, 2002c). At last, during his first tenure at Atlanta University (1897–1910), Du Bois’ desire to teach sociology was fulfilled, and his attempt to train a new generation of researchers and to coordinate the efforts of other researchers to study the various social and economic dimensions of “the Negro Problem” were implemented. Here one also witnesses Du Bois’ blending of empirical sociology and social policy. He would return to Atlanta University a second time from 1934–1944 as sociology department chair.

*Du Bois and the Atlanta Sociological Laboratory:
The Early Years (1897–1913)*

When Du Bois arrived at Atlanta University, he helped develop a two-year undergraduate program focusing on the study of economics and sociology and a graduate program that stressed original research. Du Bois provided an outline of the sociology curriculum in an article (Du Bois, 1995 [1903a], “The Laboratory in Sociology at Atlanta University,” where one finds a discussion of the academic study of a discipline that is still in its infancy but which demonstrates great promise. The question of the suitability of sociological study at the college and high school level is raised, and the particular experiences of the Atlanta University program are shared.

The study of “the Negro Problem” was the unifying theme of the Atlanta University program. The goal was to identify and understand the social conditions that may be associated with a particular problem through the use of comparative, empirical analysis. For instance, Du Bois believed that it was important for students to discover the trends in U.S. mortality rates by race, ethnicity and class and to then search for plausible explanations in the observed patterns. To do this students and researchers would need to know how to work with census data, have an elementary understanding of statistics, know how to engage in library research and not rely completely on the information presented in a textbook. Thus, during the junior and senior years, undergraduates embarked along a yearlong course of study that blended classroom instruction with library research among primary sources, and fieldwork. Students studied economics during their junior year while the focus shifted to sociology during the senior year. Since Du Bois believed that the existing sociology texts failed to cover the various dimensions of “the Negro Problem” adequately, and given the program’s empirical focus, Mayo-Smith’s *Science of Statistics* (1899) came close to becoming the only assigned text for the yearlong course in sociological inquiry. Du Bois’ blending of library research, statistical training, and fieldwork proved to be successful as several of the senior class’ research findings were published in U.S. Department of Labor bulletins or the Atlanta University Conference volumes (Du Bois, 1995 [1903a]; 2003 [1903b], 69–79; 1908, 68–80). While undergraduates were involved in data collection, the graduate program stressed original research. These paths of instruction and research were part of the foundation for the

Atlanta Sociological Laboratory and its related conference publications.

In the same article (Du Bois, 1995 [1903a]) Du Bois provides a brief summary of the Atlanta University Conference agenda. Each year one particular aspect of “the Negro Problem” was selected for in-depth study. Survey schedules were prepared and sent out to known contacts; the information would then be gathered, and additional contextual material would be supplied. This process would take six to eight months and would culminate in a one-day annual conference and the publication of the yearlong study’s findings. From 1896 until 1917, the proceedings of twenty different conferences were published. Du Bois was the primary editor for twelve of the studies, from 1898 to 1909, and worked as a co-editor with Augustus Dill for four volumes, from 1910–1913, after he had left Atlanta University to become editor of the NAACP’s *The Crisis*. These conference publications were a significant accomplishment, given the fact that financial resources were scarce and statistical resources and clerical help were limited. The John F. Slater Fund and the Carnegie Institute provided some financial support for several of the later volumes.

The tenth conference proceedings (Du Bois, 1905a; 1905b) included a ten-year assessment of the first cycle of studies on “the Negro Problem” and a proposal for a second cycle. The first cycle (1895–1905) included volumes on mortality (volume 1), the family (volume 2), social betterment (volume 3 and Du Bois’ first volume as editor), business (volume 4), college education (volume 5), common schools (volume 6), workers (volume 7), the Negro Church (volume 8), crime (volume 9) and a methods and results summary study (volume 10). This cycle of nine focused studies and a summary volume was to be repeated on a decennial basis with the goal of providing a better understanding of the nature and causes of racial inequality as well as providing continuous empirical documentation of changes in the degree of racial inequality (Du Bois, 1905a; 1905b; Wright, 2002c). A second round of studies (volumes 11–20) was published between 1906 and 1917, but then the publications ceased even though annual conferences were held through 1924 (Wright, 2002c). A list of the twelve volumes edited by Du Bois and the four volumes co-edited with Augustus Dill is provided in Table 5.1.

Although *The Philadelphia Negro* (1899) is probably Du Bois’ most familiar work in empirical sociology, the Atlanta University Conference studies provide a more comprehensive, in-depth look at “the Negro Problem.” While the study on the Negro church (2003 [1903b]) has

been republished recently, many of the conference studies are not readily available. To address this problem and familiarize interested readers with their scope and content, short summaries of three of these studies follow.

Selected Atlanta University Conference Studies

The three summaries are presented in their order of publication. The study on the Negro Church (volume 8, [1903b], 2003) is presented first, then the summary of the studies on crime (volume 9, 1904) and health (volume 11, 1906).

A. *The Negro Church (1903)*

The Negro Church (2003 [1903b]) appears to be the first empirically based book-length sociological study of a religious group (Zuckerman, Barnes and Cady, 2003). The conference report was based on data from the 1890 *Census of Religious Bodies*, denominational reports, case studies from cities like Richmond, Atlanta and Chicago, and interviews and surveys of pastors, church officials, educational leaders, Atlanta public school children, and African American and white laity. The study also included data from a demographic survey and ethnographic study of Atlanta Black Church congregations conducted by students from Atlanta University's 1902–03 senior and junior classes. The study was patterned after the section on religion in *The Philadelphia Negro* (1899) and covered such topics as African American religion from slavery to the present, an assessment of the current state of affairs based on the most recent *Census of Religious Bodies* data, local and regional case studies, denominational profiles, critical assessments of the Black Church from African American and white professionals and laity, and a statement of policy implications.

In this particular report, Du Bois utilized historical reconstruction, ethnographic description, survey design, and public use data to provide a comprehensive overview of the African American religious experience and Black Church organizational development from slavery to the present. In addition to being a groundbreaking study in the sociology of religion, this study provided a foundation for later sociological studies of the Black Church by Mays and Nicholson (1933), Frazier (1963), and Lincoln and Mamiya (1990). Furthermore, the regional and community studies anticipate the work of Park and

Burgess and the Chicago School, and the overall study is a pioneering example of congregational analysis, evaluation research, and public sociology.

In a leading text on congregational studies, Carroll, Dudley and McKinney (1986) maintain that program, process, context, and identity are the four pillars of congregational study. Thus, a congregational analysis should include data on a congregation's history, activities, leadership, members' basic beliefs, as well as a demographic profile of the church's social setting. *The Negro Church* covers these bases. The work of the Atlanta University undergraduates on the current condition of the Atlanta Black Churches is offered as a more specific example.

The Atlanta Black Church profile is based on a survey of fifty-four Atlanta churches (Du Bois 2003 [1903b], 69–79). Following the format introduced in the various *Census of Religious Bodies* reports, data are provided on active membership, value of church property, income and expenses, debt, missions, and benevolence for all fifty-four congregations and for six different denominational classifications. For example, in 1902 the fifty-four Atlanta Black Churches claimed a total membership of 16,261 of whom 8,423 (52%) were active members. Total church property was valued at \$252,508, and total church income equaled \$51,812.84. These statistical profiles were presented along with a series of ethnographic descriptions of particular congregations. The following excerpt (Du Bois 2003 [1903b], 72) suggests that the students had received some rudimentary training in ethnography.

The character of the pastors in the seven Methodist churches in my district seems, in every case, to be good. Such phrases as "you could not find any one to say anything against his character," express the sentiments of the members of these churches. . . . The education of the members seems to vary from fair to very poor. . . . A great majority of the members of the smaller churches are common laborers and are quite poor. The members of the larger churches are in moderate circumstances, and although most of them are laborers, there is a fair percent of artisans and businessmen among them.

Here is an example of where quantitative and qualitative data may be combined to provide a more comprehensive demographic profile of congregational life.

Delving into the area of public sociology and social policy research, the volume on religion concludes with a section on resolutions, where

the focus shifts to the role the Black Church could play in strengthening moral values. The Conference also called for church reform if the Black Church was to become an effective moral and social reform agent. The study concludes on the sobering note that racial problems could be resolved if persons would simply live the Christian life (Du Bois 2003 [1903b], 207–208).

B. *Some Notes on Negro Crime, Particularly in Georgia (1904)*

The study on crime in Georgia follows a similar format. The data sources utilized are identified in the preface. A general statement of the problem follows, and the association between crime, the legacy of slavery, and the marginal status of African Americans after Emancipation is addressed. Du Bois next moves to a discussion of crime among African Americans based on a descriptive analysis of 1890 census data, reports on crime for various counties and towns in Georgia provided by the Prison Commission, white officials (police chiefs) and citizens, and African American leaders. A discussion of the perception of crime based on the results of a survey of 1,500 African American Atlanta public school children aged 9–15 is presented next. The study concludes with discussions of the causes of crime among African Americans, an identification of important increasing and decreasing trends, and some general conclusions and recommendations concerning the amount of African American crime, major causes of African American crime, possible deterrents, and actions that may be taken by white citizens that could help reduce crime.

Like the previous volume on the Negro church, this volume's preface includes a formal appeal for funds. Du Bois argues that the continuation of the conference publications and the need to cover the costs associated with support staff and data collection are directly tied to the university's ability to secure external funding. It appears that this was not achieved for another three years when volume 12 on the *Economic Co-Operation among Negro Americans* (1907) was published with financial assistance provided by the Carnegie Institute.

Stratification theories of crime and deviance address the association between crime and social class as well as portraying crime as a consequence of poverty. One of the most familiar theories in this tradition is Merton's (1968) structure-strain theory. The various forms of deviance (innovation, ritualism, retreatism and rebellion) are a by-product of the mismatch between a society's goals and the socially

acceptable means for achieving those goals. Du Bois (1904, 8) foreshadows this argument by stating that crime “among Southern Negroes is a symptom of wrong social conditions—of a stress of life greater than a large part of the community can bear.” Crime is linked to the status inequality created by the legacy of slavery and the marginal social status that accompanied Emancipation. A viable market for convict labor and the lack of juvenal reform centers for African American youth were also identified as important structural factors impacting crime.

Turning to an extensive analysis of 1890 census data on crime among African Americans, Du Bois (1904, 9–16) identifies several national trends involving African Americans and crime. However, before presenting these findings attention is given to specifying several of the statistical problems inherent in the data. These problems, based on earlier work by Roland Falkner, include problems inherent with specific point in time measures, geographic distortions, overrepresentation of males, and distortions associated with different types of crime. Here again one encounters Du Bois’ ongoing concern with researcher and methodological bias. Summarizing the trends discovered in the census data Du Bois remarks that while African Americans comprised only one-eighth of the 1890 total population, they accounted for one-fifth of the crimes committed. Furthermore, African American prisoners were predominately from the South (80%), and half of all African American prisoners were aged 20 to 30. This age bias in crime is also reflected in the current deviance literature (Gove, 1985; Stark, 2004). Du Bois suggests that a weak link may exist between literacy and crime.

Some interesting findings on crime in Georgia at the county and town level are obtained from the reports provided by white and African American leaders. This section (Du Bois, 1904, 35–48) includes two tables (one for white reports, the other involving African American reports) of information on the amount of crime and the crime trend for various towns and counties. While the list of towns and counties is not complete, the available data provide an opportunity for the reader to discern racial differences in the perception of African American crime trends in Georgia. Several pages of additional remarks offered by the various respondents are also provided. While Du Bois does not specifically comment on the racial difference in perception, he does note that an increase in the number of crimes committed by African Americans was reported for 11 towns while a decrease

was noted for 67. Furthermore, crime and population heterogeneity were found to vary directly as crime was lower in Georgia's Black Belt and White Belt.

A clearer picture of the racial difference in the perception of crime, however, can be reconstructed from the categorical data Du Bois provides in the separate tables. The reconstructed table (Table 5.2) is provided below. These data are based on reports received by 36 white citizens representing 36 different towns and 65 African American citizens representing 65 different towns. The reconstructed, combined table is based on the responses for the crime pattern question. Here it is evident that white respondents were slightly more likely to perceive African American crime as increasing (19.4% versus 15.4%) while African American respondents were twice as likely to perceive African American crime as decreasing (64.6% versus 33.3%). It is also noteworthy that three out of ten white respondents failed to answer the question.

The survey of African American Atlanta public school children also yields some interesting findings. These trends are based on a survey administered to approximately 1,500 African American children aged 9–15 that addressed their perception of laws, the court system and policemen. Almost four out of ten children (38.9%) understood that laws exist to provide protection, but only a little more than one-fourth of the children (26.5%) felt that the courts function to determine a person's guilt or innocence. More of the children believed that policemen primarily arrest people (34.8%) rather than protect people (23.1%), but more children perceived policemen as being kind (41.2%) rather than unkind (30.6%). Once again one encounters Du Bois' attempt to study an issue from multiple perspective as he bases this study on crime on national and state level data (1890 U.S. Census and the 1899 Georgia Prison Commission report), reports from local African American and white adults, and finally African American public school children.

In summarizing the major state-level trends, Du Bois (1904, 60–64) identifies three increasing and three decreasing trends that are particular to Georgia. The declining trends involve a decrease in the amount of African American crime, a decline in the number of lynchings, and a weakening in the market for prison labor. On the other hand, both the African American and white populations were growing, and literacy had increased dramatically from 1870 to 1900. Property ownership among African Americans was also increasing.

Undoubtedly, increases in literacy and continued access to property ownership could potentially reduce racial differences in status inequality over time. Following a structural argument, Du Bois believed that crime among African Americans would decline as their social and economic status improved.

Du Bois (1904, 65–66) concludes the study by associating African American crime with such factors as African American's marginal social status, the persistence of racial prejudice, the paucity of good job opportunities, and the perpetuation of a judicial system that was not color-blind. Cultural and structural solutions were then offered to bring about needed change. From the cultural perspective, Du Bois maintained that the churches, schools, job training centers, and youth training centers could play a key role in strengthening African American moral standards. On the other hand the white community was asked to push for legal reform, support the abolition of the prison labor system, and favor prisoner rehabilitation programs over harsh penal systems.

C. The Health and Physique of the Negro American (1906)

This volume is a classic study in demography and to a lesser extent epidemiology. Du Bois addresses a variety of typical demographic and epidemiological matters in the volume—size and density of the population, sex ratios, age-sex pyramids, spatial variations in population characteristics, population dynamics (fertility, mortality and migration), and spatial patterns in the cause of death. Significant attention is also directed toward the association between social and economic development and changes in the major cause of death (“the epidemiological transition”).

This study begins like the others with a brief overview of the previous studies, the identification of the major sources of empirical data, and an appeal for external funding. Du Bois then devotes several sections (1–5) to a discussion of race. In addition to providing a pictorial insert portraying the extensive variation in African American physical features and skin tones, Du Bois confronts the claims of the emerging field of physical anthropology by entering into discussions of the race concept, the size of the African American brain, as well as height and weight variations by age. It is worth noting that Franz Boas, a noted anthropologist, addressed the annual conference speaking on the topic of “Negro Physique” and joined Du Bois on the

committee drafting the conference resolutions. Issues concerning memory are discussed in section 6. The demographic focus is developed in sections 7 through 9, where Du Bois addresses population growth, birth rates, urban variations in fertility, age and sex composition, racial variations in death rates, major causes of death, infant mortality and urban variations in mortality. Important health care issues such as the availability of insurance (section 10) and access to hospitals (section 11) are addressed next. Attention then shifts to a discussion of the resources available for medical training (section 12) and the supply of African American physicians, dentists and pharmacists (sections 13–14). Resolutions are presented in the concluding section.

Du Bois' discussion of African American fertility patterns (1906, 60–64) relies heavily on available census data and particularly focuses on the findings from the 1900 census. He provides a comprehensive fertility profile by providing data on the crude birth rate, the total fertility rate, median age, age composition, and the sex ratio. Compared to whites the African American birth rate is higher; however, the total fertility rate for African American and white women declined over the 1850–1900 period. While the African American median age is approximately three and one-half years younger than that for whites, the age structure for the two racial groups is essentially the same. Approximately 39% of the population was under age 15, while 56% of the population was aged 15–59 and 5% of the population was age 60 and other. Thus it is difficult to determine to what extent the difference in median age is attributable to racial differences in fertility and/or life expectancy. Du Bois concludes the section on fertility with a discussion of the sex ratio. Information is provided showing that African American females have outnumbered African American males since 1850, whereas, among whites, males continue to outnumber females. Du Bois suggests that the shift in the African American sex ratio may be linked to the legacy of slavery.

Turning to mortality Du Bois (1906, 72–80) notes a reverse pattern. Compared to whites African American crude death rates are higher. African American mortality is also substantially higher in urban areas, and infectious disease is the major cause of death. More specifically, the three major causes of death for African Americans are consumption (tuberculosis), pneumonia, and diseases of the nervous system. The pattern is reversed for whites. The interesting observation here is the absence of heart disease as a leading cause of death

for either racial group. Obviously, the U.S. population had not moved through the epidemiological transition in 1900. Deaths from chronic diseases had not replaced deaths from infectious diseases.

Du Bois (1906, 76–90) attempts to account for the variations in African American mortality differentials. First, he maintains that rural African American mortality data were unreliable because information on the rural African American population was significantly under-reported. He maintains that if this factor were corrected, the African American crude death rate would decline by as much as 8 deaths per 1,000 population. The high rate of African American mortality is also tied to the occupational structure as African Americans are disproportionately employed as laborers and servants, two high-risk occupations. The high rates of infant mortality are linked to neglect and malnutrition, and Du Bois compares data for African Americans and whites residing in the North and the South to argue that mortality and climate are essentially unrelated. He concludes by maintaining that better sanitation, more education and, improved economic opportunities could reduce African American mortality further.

Quality of life is also a function of the access to adequate health care. This access includes the ability to acquire low-cost health insurance, availability of medical facilities, and the supply of trained medical personnel. Here Du Bois (1906, 91–109) comments on the insurance industry's practice of offering race-based premiums. He notes the discontinuation of this practice in some Northern states and makes reference to the insurance companies' concern over the high policy default rate among African Americans. Turning to the availability of health facilities, Du Bois comments on the segregated Southern health care system and the shortage of hospitals and nursing programs. Information is provided on 41 private African American hospitals and 160 African American drug stores. While medical personnel are in short supply, Du Bois does provide census data that indicate the number of African American physicians and dentists increasing by 91% and 77% respectively during the 1890–1900 decade.

Some fascinating information is provided on Black medical schools and white officials' assessments of the success and moral character of African American students in predominately white medical schools (Du Bois, 1906, 95–109). While the majority of African American physicians (1,667) appear to have received their training from one of the five Black medical schools, available data suggest that 213

African American physicians had graduated from white northern medical programs. The comments of many of the official representatives of these northern schools are included. Some are more favorable than others. The response from the Yale representative is interesting (Du Bois, 1906, 101):

One of these eight graduates I should rank as being exceptionally good, and the others as about the average of our pass men. If the colored men had sufficient means to pay their way without being obliged to do work and drudgery for a living through college, their chances would be much better.

Here the need to work and the lack of financial assistance is evident. Attention is also drawn to the fact that it is quite difficult to work and go to school at the same time.

The five Black medical schools in 1906 “in order of size and importance” were Meharry Medical College, Walden University (TN); Howard University Medical Department, Howard University (Washington, DC); Leonard Medical School, Shaw University (NC); Flint Medical College, New Orleans University (LA); and Louisville National Medical College (KY). While Du Bois (1906, 95–109) scatters the information about these programs throughout the section on medical schools, a reconstructed table (Table 5.3) provides a concise portrayal of the type and number of medical professionals trained, the year the program started, and the funding agency.

From their inception through May 1906, these five medical programs were responsible for graduating 1,667 physicians and 266 pharmacists. The three programs offering nursing training graduated 52 nurses, and the two dental programs graduated 141 dentists. Taken together, these five institutions were responsible for training 2,126 African American health professionals. It is also interesting to note that the U.S. government supported only one of the five programs and that all had been established between 1867 and 1889. Meharry provided the most comprehensive program and claimed the most graduates.

In concluding the conference, Du Bois (1906, 110) noted that in general the health of the African American population was improving as the conference was able to document important declines in the crude death rate, the infant mortality rate, and deaths from consumption (tuberculosis), the leading cause of death. The conference also recommended establishing “local health leagues.” These

organizations could provide information on sanitation and advocate the need for preventive medicine. The eradication of consumption was called for, and a plea for better hospitals and more trained medical professionals was issued. The conference findings also established that, compared to other racial and ethnic groups, African Americans were not inferior physically. The final remarks restated the need for continued study of health related issues impacting the African American community. The study concludes (Du Bois, 1906, 110) by stating, "The conference above all reiterates its well known attitude toward this and all other social problems: the way to make conditions better is to study the conditions." It is ironic that Du Bois specifically addresses health issues as a "social problem;" yet he is rarely mentioned in the social problems literature.

Du Bois' Sociological Legacy

As the American Sociological Association celebrates its centennial, this celebration of the organization's first hundred years would be incomplete without some attention being directed to the work of early U.S. sociological pioneers. A discussion of Du Bois' lasting contributions is thus warranted.

While Atlanta University originally hired Du Bois to develop a sociology program and to take control of the Atlanta University Conference program, he in effect may have established the first U.S. school of sociology, a school that predated the "Chicago School" by approximately twenty years. Wright (2002a, 2002b, 2002c) makes a convincing case for this in his series of articles on the Atlanta Sociological Laboratory. Wright's (2002a) argument hinges on meeting Bulmer's nine criteria for the existence of a school: A school must be established around a central figure and be located in a university setting where interaction with students is provided. Links with the local community must be forged, and the key figure must be a leader with vision and possess a dominating personality. Interaction must also take place between graduate students and faculty, and the school must be able to provide a publication outlet. Furthermore, the school must be able to attract external funding, be willing to expand beyond its primary academic discipline, and does not last beyond the time of its key figure.

Du Bois and the Atlanta Sociological Laboratory satisfy these cri-

teria (Wright, 2002a; 2002b; 2002c). Du Bois was a major figure that without question possessed a dominating personality. His comprehensive plan to study “the Negro Problem” was visionary, and the curriculum he designed encouraged interaction between faculty, undergraduate and graduate students, colleagues from other universities and work settings, as well as leaders of the larger Atlanta community. The program of study extended beyond sociology to include economics, and the majority of the proceedings of the annual conferences on “the Negro Problem” were published. While Atlanta University and the Atlanta Sociological Laboratory did experience financial hardships, external funding was obtained from philanthropic organization to support the publication of several annual conference proceedings. Finally, the Atlanta Sociological Laboratory declined after Du Bois’ departure in 1910. While he assisted with the editing of four conference volumes between 1910–1913, the last volume was published in 1917, and the conferences were discontinued after 1924. Du Bois returned to Atlanta University as chair of the sociology department in 1934, but was forced to retire 1944 after achieving some measure of success with the program. Given Bulmer’s criteria, it does appear that Wright is correct in maintaining that Du Bois played a key role in developing the first American school of sociology at Atlanta University.

What are some of Du Bois’ other contributions? He was one of the first U.S. sociologists to consistently utilize methodological triangulation to ground his empirical studies. His work routinely blended the analysis of census and survey data with participant observation and ethnographic description. He argued that the use of multiple approaches would minimize methodological and researcher bias.

Second, Du Bois was an early pioneer of what Mills called the “sociological imagination.” He promoted sociological literacy and believed that students learned by doing. In describing the work of the Atlanta Sociological Laboratory (1995 [1905b], 251), he compared Atlanta University to a “social settlement” and stated that the university intended to “. . . do more than teach the slums; it seeks also by studying the slums to teach the world what slums mean.” By providing students with fieldwork opportunities and encouraging them to engage in ethnographic description, Du Bois reminds us that academia’s recent interest in promoting “service learning” is not all that new. What we now call service learning apparently was one of the pillars of the Atlanta Sociological laboratory.

Third, Du Bois wanted the study of “the Negro Problem” to move beyond the confines of academia. In a recent address to the North Carolina Sociological Association (NCSA) on public sociology, Burawoy (2004) distinguishes professional sociology, critical sociology, policy sociology and public sociology. The first two sociologies appeal primarily to academic audiences while the latter two address “extra-academic” audiences. This model suggests that sociological tasks are partitioned. Boundaries and territories are defined, but dialogue is necessary. Rather than separating audiences or speaking primarily to one audience, Du Bois spent his career addressing both audiences. Empirical sociology and social policy were combined. Research findings represent social commentary and may be a catalyst for change. The researcher must be able to effectively mediate the social dialogue among academic and popular audiences. Du Bois was an early innovative leader on this front. He could communicate effectively with each audience. In other words many of the themes that were popularized in his classic *The Souls of Black Folk* (1903) were stated empirically in *The Philadelphia Negro* (1899) and in volumes 3 through 8 (1898–1903) of the Atlanta University Conferences on the study of “the Negro Problem.”

Fourth, it is unfortunate that students can complete an undergraduate or graduate program in sociology without ever reading *The Philadelphia Negro* (1899). This work may be the definitive work in urban sociology having preceded the work of Park and the Chicago school by approximately fifteen years. Given the scope of the quality of life issues addressed and the racial, ethnic and class comparisons maintained throughout the study, it is also a classic social problems and race and ethnicity text. Furthermore, the study maintains the methodological rigor that is also evident in Durkheim’s *Suicide* (1897). Yet, unlike Durkheim, Du Bois does not rely completely on secondary data. Census data are employed, but these data are complemented by the collection of relevant survey data and first-hand ethnographic description. It appears that each of these studies is seminal. Also, McRoberts’ (2003) recent study of Boston’s “Four Corners” religious district represents somewhat of a contemporary parallel to the approach to urban ecology Du Bois set forth in *The Philadelphia Negro*. The blending of secondary and ethnographic data resembles Du Bois’ methodological triangulation.

Fifth, contemporary introductory sociology textbooks like Kendall (2004) are devoting more attention to the critical interaction among

race, class, and gender. Likewise, texts on group conflict and social change such as Healey's (2002) also address the critical association among race, ethnicity, gender, and class. Undoubtedly these factors are major factors impacting social stratification in the U.S. Here again, Du Bois was ahead of his time. Cross-sectional analysis was an essential part of Du Bois' empirical approach to "the Negro Problem." In *The Philadelphia Negro* and throughout the various Atlanta University Conference publications, the "Negro Problem" was addressed by looking at the intersections of race, gender, age, place of residence (rural-urban), and region.

Finally, Du Bois could be addressed as the father of the "sociology of the Black Church" and one of the founders of the "congregational studies" movement. *The Negro Church* provided a blueprint for the groundbreaking studies of the Black Church by Mays and Nicholson (1933), Frazier (1963), and Lincoln and Mamiya (1990). Researchers studying contemporary U.S. religious congregations (Chaves, 2004; Woolever and Bruce, 2002) will discover that Du Bois' work provided an adequate framework for studying the association between a congregation's organizational structure and its demographic environment. In other words, Du Bois understood the importance of contextual analysis.

So where does all of this lead? Du Bois' contributions to the field are massive. He played a key role in establishing what can convincingly be argued was the first U.S. sociological school. He was a pioneer in empirical sociology, and he provided a definitive urban ethnography on African American quality of life. He understood the importance of blending academic sociology with service learning and public sociology. In short, he was one of the pioneers of the U.S. sociological tradition. Perhaps it is time to lift his "sociological veil."

Table 5.1: Atlanta University Conference Publications
Edited or Co-Edited by Du Bois

| |
|---|
| 1. <i>Some Efforts of American Negroes for Their Own Social Betterment</i> , Volume 3 (1898). |
| 2. <i>The Negro in Business</i> , Volume 4 (1899). |
| 3. <i>The College-Bred Negro</i> , Volume 5 (1900). |
| 4. <i>The Negro Common School</i> , Volume 6 (1901). |
| 5. <i>The Negro Artisan</i> , Volume 7 (1902). |
| 6. <i>The Negro Church</i> , Volume 8 (1903); Reprinted 2003. |
| 7. <i>Some Notes on Negro Crime in Georgia</i> , Volume 9 (1904). |
| 8. <i>A Select Bibliography of the American Negro</i> , Volume 10 (1905). |
| 9. <i>The Health and Physique of the Negro American</i> , Volume 11 (1906). |
| 10. <i>Economic Co-operation among Negro Americans</i> , Volume 12 (1907). |
| 11. <i>The Negro American Family</i> , Volume 13 (1908); Reprinted 1970. |
| 12. <i>Efforts for Social Betterment among Negro Americans</i> , Volume 14 (1909). |
| 13. <i>The College-Bred Negro American</i> , Volume 15 (1910).* |
| 14. <i>The Common School and the American Negro</i> , Volume 16 (1911).* |
| 15. <i>The Negro American Artisan</i> , Volume 17 (1912).* |
| 16. <i>Morals and Manners among Negro Americans</i> , Volume 18 (1913).* |

* Volume co-edited with Augustus Dill.

Table 5.2: Perception of African American Crime
Trend by Race of Respondent

| Crime Trend | Race of Respondent | | | |
|-------------|--------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| | African American | | White | |
| | N | % | N | % |
| Increasing | 10 | 15.4 | 7 | 19.4 |
| Same | 9 | 13.8 | 6 | 16.7 |
| Decreasing | 42 | 64.6 | 12 | 33.3 |
| Not Stated | 4 | 6.2 | 11 | 30.6 |
| Total | 65 | 100.0 | 36 | 100.0 |

Source: Du Bois, *Some Notes on Negro Crime Particularly in Georgia* (1904).

Table 5.3: Known Graduates of Black Medical Schools, 1906

| School | Type Medical Professional | | | | | Year Program Established, Support* |
|------------|---------------------------|----------|-------------|--------|-------|--|
| | Doctors | Dentists | Pharmacists | Nurses | Total | |
| Meharry | 733 | 74 | 85 | 15 | 907 | 1876; Methodist Episcopal |
| Howard | 542 | 67 | 108 | — | 717 | 1867; U.S. Government |
| Leonard | 236 | — | 64 | — | 300 | 1882; Northern Baptist |
| Flint | 73 | — | 8 | 26 | 107 | 1889; Methodist Episcopal |
| Louisville | 83 | — | 1 | 11 | 95 | 1887; Not Stated |
| Total | 1,667** | 141 | 266 | 52 | 2,126 | |

Source: Du Bois, *The Health and Physique of the Negro American* (1906).

* Knoxville College established a medical department in 1895. The program was discontinued by 1905 and produced only one graduate.

** There were 213 known African American graduates of Northern medical schools by 1906.

CHAPTER SIX

THE SAMORA LEGACY: THE DEVELOPMENT OF THEORY FOR THE STUDY OF UNDOCUMENTED IMMIGRATION

VICTOR RIOS, JR.

Scholarly research on undocumented labor migration from Mexico to the United States underwent significant changes in the 1970s and 1980s. Changes occurred both in the amount of research conducted and in the approaches taken in that research. After 1971, when Julian Samora's *Los Mojados: The Wetback Story* appeared, there was a tremendous increase in the amount of work done in the field. When in the late 1970s and early 1980s I conducted an exhaustive search for works on the subject, for instance, I found that more than half (55%) of the literature I came across had been published *since* 1970. This included a few articles dating back to 1908. Along with that substantial increase came a parallel development of the theoretical frameworks used in the studies. These developments were of no small significance considering that in the social sciences, paradigmatic changes often take centuries to occur.

It is the aim of this paper to show that Julian Samora's early research interest in undocumented migration and his students' consequent focus on this topic over two decades provided much of the impetus for the increased research on undocumented labor migration and the consequent development of labor migration theory.¹ The focus of the discussion will be on works that appeared in the 1970s and early 1980s.

¹ The late Julian Samora was the first Mexican American to earn a Ph.D. in sociology (Washington University 1953). His early career focused on qualitative research in medical sociology in the Rocky Mountain region. Most of his career was spent at the University of Notre Dame, where he established a Mexican American Studies Program and mentored a generation of Latino, mostly Mexican American, sociologists. An account of the program is found in Blasi (2002, 247–82).

*Development, General Migration, and Undocumented
Labor Migration Theories*

Theory development in undocumented migration research during the last two decades, if not completely parallel to changes in the development and general migration literature, certainly resembled and was influenced by developments in those areas. All three research areas were initially characterized by a duality in focus that resulted in either a micro or macro level of analysis; later efforts attempted to bridge the theoretical gap between the two levels. Because of the links among the three areas of research, a discussion of theoretical changes in undocumented migration research is enhanced by examining similar changes that occurred in the development and general migration research areas.

Development Theory

Modernization

Early studies of development were rooted in modernization theory (cf. Kuznets 1955; Eisenstadt 1961; Lipset 1963; Weiner 1966, *inter alia*). Modernization theory regarded underdevelopment as a social problem that would be solved as soon as the developing countries were able to make the transition from precapitalist to capitalist economies. A model of development based on the European transition from feudalism to capitalism was applied to the Third World. A macrostructural perspective within modernization theory focused on this transition and attempted to identify "modernism" and "achievement" syndromes among former colonies. At the concrete level, the literature dealt with the diffusion of innovations in rural areas and with the adaptation and socialization of rural migrants in the cities. Modernization theory concentrated on problems internal to the developing countries, rather than on the mechanisms tying the Third World to advanced nations.

Initial Broad-Based Theories

Early in this century, Hobson's and Lenin's writings on imperialism had introduced a broad-based perspective into the intellectual debate

on development. For Hobson (1971), the central problem of the advanced economies was the growth of a mass of surplus capital lacking outlets in the domestic economy. The nonindustrialized world (colonies) thus became a receptacle for surplus capital in search of profits. For Lenin (1939), imperialism could not be understood without reference to the continuing process of capital accumulation and concentration. Monopoly, financial imperialism, and an "aristocracy of labor" created "unequal exchange" between a metropolis and its colonies. The Marxist theory of imperialism developed by Bukharin (1929), following Hobson and Lenin, suffered from the failure to understand that the world economy contained different concurrently existing modes of production. Rosa Luxemburg contributed this observation in her writings (1951). She noted that capitalism relied on its articulation with economic structures different from it.

With their work of the late 1940s and the 1950s, the United Nations Economic Commission on Latin America (ECLA) and Raul Prebisch introduced the concepts of core and periphery. During this time ECLA studies empirically disproved the orthodox economic prediction of improving terms of trade for the periphery. They showed that the benefits of improved productivity were being kept in the centers in the form of profits and higher wages, while increased productivity in the periphery was exported in the form of cheaper goods. Despite this, the ECLA analysis did not explain why technical innovation led to a rise in workers' wages in the core, but to a decline in the periphery. ECLA attributed it to the creation of a surplus labor force in the periphery by advanced technology. However, there was no logical reason why the same thing could not happen in the core. Unlike Lenin in his analysis, the United Nations ECLA did not present this contradiction as a result of the rise of monopoly capital and its ability to reduce price competition and allow the transfer of productivity increases into corresponding wage increases in the center.

Development theory was advanced by redefining development as a process embedded in the structure of the world economy and as consequential for both developed and underdeveloped countries. This shift of perspectives is usually associated with Andre Gunder Frank's (1967) analysis of the "development of underdevelopment" and with the studies of the origins of the world capitalist economy by Immanuel Wallerstein (1974).

Dependency

Dependency theory emerged in part as a reaction to the shortcomings of the policies recommended by ECLA, particularly import-substitution. Andre Gunder Frank saw underdevelopment as created and modified by the requirements of capitalist expansion. However, much as ECLA failed to take advantage of Lenin's previous analysis, Frank failed to benefit from Luxemburg's earlier observations. He neglected the existence of alternative modes of production and their patterned interaction with capitalism. This limited the understanding of the actual processes of reproduction of the peripheral labor force and, in the same way, of the maintenance of low-wage economies. Because of its static nature, dependency theory also could not explain the historical changes in the relative positions of domination and subordination between regions of the world economy. Dependency theories were also criticized for placing too much emphasis on the external determination of the peripheral economies and minimizing the autonomous capitalist growth possible within the periphery.

World-System

World-system analysis was able to document the process whereby surplus value finds its way from peripheral production to the core. World-system theory argued that unequal exchange took place whenever labor of equal productivity received proportionally lower wages in the periphery than in the center. This was possible because pre-capitalist structures in the periphery absorbed much of the costs of reproduction of the labor force. This involved both absorption of redundant workers (workers that become superfluous during crises of unemployment at the center) and raising the new generation at no cost to the capitalist sector.

The world-system perspective was not entirely without problems, however. For one, it functioned almost exclusively on the "world" level, thus perpetuating the gap between research and theory inherited from modernization theory.² Two major concerns were voiced about this focus. One was that it was too speculative, much like classical political economy, and was not practicing historical materialist

² A "world" in world-system theory is not necessarily global; it need only embrace the totality of relevant relationships in a system of societies.

analysis. Another criticism was that the lack of attention to concrete subprocesses slowed down the application of this general perspective to specific research topics.

The lack of attention to intermediate sub-processes led to interpretive failures and to frequent surprises as concrete events overtook theoretical axioms. For example, the assumption of the differential mobility of capital and labor became less tenable with the movement of labor toward the centers. Subsequently, labor migrations began to be regarded, not as a secondary process, but as theoretically central to the world economy. Also, the assignment of responsibility for the reproduction of the peripheral labor force to rural subsistence sectors was eventually challenged. This happened as the segment of the peasantry producing exclusively under subsistence arrangements began to disintegrate in many countries.

Other less specific, but no less important criticisms were (1) that there was little or no concern with ideology and attitudes and the role they play in the legitimation process; and, (2) that the world level focus presented an overly schematic account of class structure in different regions of the system. It presented economies of the center as being "articulated" and those of the periphery as "disarticulated." Articulated economies, the theory held, occur in the center where there is an organic convergence between the interests of core capital and labor, whereas this convergence does not occur in the disarticulated peripheral economies (de Janvry and Garramon 1977). Yet this was and is contradicted by the deteriorating situation of segments of the traditional and competitive sectors of the American working class—the export of production and employment and the importation of labor into the center to combat the organizational efforts of the domestic working class.

Integration Attempts

Despite the advances in development theory, the duality of approaches remained. Broad-based theory did not concern itself with concrete processes of change within specific countries or regions, while studies at the community, regional, or national level did not develop the theory. These latter more micro studies seldom addressed the more general problems confronted by the new theories. Broad-based theory, on the other hand, accumulated hypotheses at a highly abstract level, but missed insights from close-range empirical investigation.

Portes and Walton (1981) proposed that an intermediate level of analysis be used to bridge the gap between the general and the particular by addressing certain topics such as the labor process. This entailed an analysis of class structures within specific nation-states as they are shaped by and in turn react to world capitalist penetration. Among the topics suggested were the shifting character of the working class in response to labor migration and locational decisions of companies; contradictions within core and peripheral class structures provoked by the global strategies of capital; and types of class struggle in response to those contradictions. Such a focus, Portes and Walton argued, uncovered hidden structures sustaining unequal exchange and global accumulation. Further, they asserted, analyses of class structures made sense since the major contradictions of the system are located in the interaction between classes, not between nation states.

General Migration Theory

Equilibrium Approach

A parallel duality of currents within the general migration literature found expression in the equilibrium and historical-structural approaches. Equilibrium theory viewed migration as an "intrusion" of people from one economy into another. Each economy was assumed to be a separate entity and bounded by a state. The state defined the boundaries and served to protect national economic sovereignty (Bach 1978).

Although the equilibrium approach by the late 1970s relied on a micro-economic model of migration that emphasized individual decisions to migrate, it had not always done so. John Stuart Mill's analysis of population movements (1909) is an example of broad-based equilibrium theory. Eventually, however, the equilibrium approach, for the most part, was narrowed to neoclassical economic theory and ignored political and economic crises in favor of an individualistic orientation (Bach and Schraml 1982). According to this view, human capital is distributed from places of low productivity to places of high productivity. Labor moves from places where capital is scarce and where labor is plentiful to areas where capital is abundant and labor is scarce. Migration thus corrects rural-urban and interregional imbalances in the factors of production. Along the same lines, international

migration was seen as fostering development as the remittances of migrant laborers stimulated savings and investment in the sending country. When the immigrants returned home they applied the ideas and skills acquired abroad to establish farms and businesses (Wood 1982).

Equilibrium theory was criticized as a reductionist approach that did not allow for the analysis of macro-structural change and for not linking the insights derived from survey research with the broader socioeconomic and political transformations under way in developing countries. Another criticism was that migration based on wage and price differentials was applicable only to a capitalist mode of production. In addition, the micro-economic model lends an unwarranted veneer of free choice to migration. To attribute migration to a cost-benefit analysis overlooks the fact that the individual in many cases has no real alternative. Thus, the reductionism of equilibrium theory offers little insight into the larger conditions that compel the decisions to move in the first place. The notion that free market forces will achieve an optimum distribution of resources has great political implications. For one thing, it implies that the state should neither discourage or encourage migration and is, in essence, a justification of the status quo (Wood 1982).

Historical-Structural Approach

The historical-structural approach assumes that migration can only be viewed in the context of historical analysis of the broader structural transformations under way in a particular social formation. Migration is considered as primarily a macro-social rather than an individual process. In this approach labor migrations are seen as a reserve labor force. The world-system approach, for instance, maintains that labor migration does not occur as an external process between independent entities, but as part of the internal dynamics of the same overarching unit. This unit, the international capitalist system, is constantly changing with forces that allow its components to modify their relative positions without significantly altering the basic order.

By definition, and in actuality, the historical structural view initially paid little attention to the factors that motivate individual actors. Therefore, it was less effective in identifying specific costs and benefits that affect the decision to move and other factors such as social

networks that could affect the propensity to migrate and the direction of the migratory stream. Historical-structural theory needed to see individuals as *actors* rather than as mere puppets pulled here and there by social change, and to appreciate migration as a strategy used by workers to maximize economic opportunities. There was also the question of whether population movements were being overemphasized—were they as necessary for global capitalist accumulation as previously thought? Around the mid-1970s the attractiveness of immigrant labor to core states and capital decreased to an extent. This prompted some (e.g., Cohen 1980) to claim that immigrant labor was no longer a necessity for late capitalist societies. A further argument was that core states could develop strategies to perform the functions once served by immigrant labor with other means. Meanwhile, labor migrations within the periphery and semi-periphery were increasing. The profound changes occurring in the world system caused theoretical positions to come and go as regularly as the population flows.

Integration Attempts

Like the development writers, labor migration researchers also attempted to bridge the gap between the broad-based and individualistic approaches. Sassen-Koob (1979) suggested studying particular immigrant groups within the context of general propositions. She noted that the study of particular groups helped to formulate the more general and historical propositions.

Wood (1982) proposed using households as a unit of analysis to bridge the gap. The household unit was seen as mediating between the individual and structural opportunities. Bach and Schraml (1982) argued, however, that using households as a unit of analysis to solve the impasse between the individual and structural approaches would not work because the social action of the household was reduced to a collective neoclassical model of cost-benefit analysis. They further added that the integration of equilibrium and structural theories needs to emerge from principles of collective behavior, people reacting to and dependent on other people.

Integration of the two approaches did not just involve reconciliation of scope and methods, however. It required a compromise of the theoretical base of one or both of the theories being integrated. This would prove to be very difficult given the fundamentally opposed

nature of the paradigmatic assumptions informing the two theories. Such a difficulty could be a reason for the current paucity of works attempting to enhance migration theory after a seeming surge of such attempts in the late seventies and early eighties (cf. Portes and Borocz 1989; Zolberg 1989).

Undocumented Labor Migration Theory

As mentioned earlier, undocumented labor migration research has been voluminous during the last two decades. A thorough discussion of this literature (as it is for the development and general migration literatures) is beyond the scope of this paper. Therefore, my discussion in this section, in keeping with my thesis, focuses on the work of Julian Samora and his students and their contributions to the development of undocumented labor migration theory.

Equilibrium

Up until the mid-1970s, the prevalent orientation in the study of undocumented labor migration from Mexico to the United States was one that focused on particular data and processes. The trend was toward detailed, isolated analyses of characteristics of the population and of the process of immigration. Examples of such research include descriptive (Grebler 1966; Graham 1977), demographic (Avante 1978; Orange County Task Force 1978), biological (Lasker 1952, 1954), and empirical accounts (Cornelius 1978; Estrada et al., 1978). The focus of such works was on migrants' age, marital status, length of stay, sex, residence, method of entry, place of entry, impact, settlement plans, etc. To be sure, the gathering of this information was and is important; however, because of this focus the impact of larger social, political, and economic processes within the system of social relations was often given little consideration or neglected entirely. Much of this research fell within the domain of equilibrium or push-pull theory.

Historical-Structural

The entrance of Jorge Bustamante and Gilbert Cardenas into the sociology graduate program at the University of Notre Dame in the late 1960s set in motion the beginning formulations of an alternative

approach to the study of undocumented Mexican labor migration. They began to work with Dr. Julian Samora and in 1971, Samora's *Los Mojados: The Wetback Story*, was published. This book, up to then the best scholarly study of the subject since Manuel Gamio's *Mexican Immigration To The United States* (1930), stimulated the interest that produced the veritable gusher of research in the following two decades.

Los Mojados used the push-pull hypothesis to explain undocumented immigration. As such, it fell under equilibrium theory; however, Bustamante and Cardenas were grappling with the issue and working on reformulating the theoretical framework. In 1972, Bustamante published an article in which labeling theory was employed to describe how undocumented immigrants become "labeled" as deviant. By 1975, Bustamante presented his Ph.D. dissertation which looked at Mexican labor migration within the theoretical framework of historical materialism and argued that Mexican immigration must be studied as an integral part of the social relations of production. Bustamante's analysis of commodity labor migration represented a significant shift in conceptual focus and development of undocumented migration theory. The concept of "migrant as commodity" was used to explain (1) the association between immigration and capital expansion in the historical context of class structure, and (2) the process of formation of cultural meanings and social policies in the superstructural dimension of capitalist relations of production. Cheap labor was seen as a necessity for the capitalist mode of production.

Cardenas' (1977) dissertation assumed a critical perspective to examine the literature for approaches, assumptions and orientations that had a bearing on labor migration. His aim was to establish an historical context by which a capital-labor problematic, in contrast to simply an immigration problematic, could be analyzed and its direct bearing on policy and migration assessed. For Cardenas, the study of Mexican labor migration emerged as a study of political economy with labor as a central question. This remains one of the very few research efforts that focuses exclusively on the process of theory development.

Following this, Cardenas and Estevan Flores (1978) utilized a political economy approach that relied on a theoretical framework based on the commodity form of labor—the imposition of work. They identified their approach with the sociology of labor, encompassing economic as well as social and political phenomena. They argued that the focus for social scientists should be placed on the capitalist

production process and not on immigrant workers as the central question regarding the study of Mexican immigration to the United States.

In 1978, Flores proposed that “the movement of workers and families from Mexico to the United States was a working class demand for access to social wealth.” In this view, the immigrant becomes an international worker in order to internationalize the class struggle. This approach addressed the concern expressed by some critics that historical-structural theory tends to view immigrants as pawns within processes of social change who were affected by structural forces rather than as actors who both affect and are affected by broader structural forces. With this work and his dissertation in 1982, Flores applied and refined the concept/process of “political recomposition,” which he refers to as a political unity of action between Chicanos and undocumented Mexicans.

Victor Rios, Jr.’s (1982) Ph.D. dissertation also used a political economic framework to connect the worldwide migrations of labor, and specifically the movement of Mexican labor to the United States, to the worldwide movements of capital. Here again, the emphasis was on analyzing Mexican labor migration in terms of its relations to a larger process, the political economy of the United States within a context of world capitalism.

Integration Attempts

Much like researchers of international political economy and general migration theorists, students of undocumented Mexican-U.S. migration also attempted a theoretical synthesis between the macro and micro approaches to the phenomenon. Again, some of Julian Samora’s former students were at the forefront of these efforts. Bustamante and Martinez (1979) presented undocumented immigration from Mexico as an aspect of a larger “international” system, yet focused on regional “characterological” factors that shape the Mexico-U.S. border region and determine who emigrates and who does not. In essence, their theoretical framework was an attempt at a regional focus within an international system; that is, an intermediate level of analysis that acknowledges the impact of a larger, encompassing level. Later on (1985), Bustamante noted that progress in undocumented immigration research had been made by the increasing consensus that “the basic thrust of Mexican immigration to the

United States corresponds to an international labor market, where the demand is located in the United States and the supply in Mexico” (1985:12). Bustamante went on to present a conceptual framework for documenting the interplay of forces within the international labor market that shape immigration. Concerning undocumented Mexico-U.S. immigration specifically, he said there was a need to establish: (1) the dynamics of the interplay of factors associated separately with the supply and demand of labor in the interior of each country, (2) the interplay of each internal factor with the shaping of the supply of migrant workers and the shaping of the demand for them in each of the respective countries, and (3) the actual interplay of supply from Mexico and demand from the United States of the labor of Mexican migrants, by geographical regions and sectors of the economy of each country. With this latter effort Bustamante continued to insist on the need to embed Mexico-U.S. undocumented immigration within a larger international or maybe “world” economic system, while at the same time attempting to offer a conceptual framework that allows for “concrete” (i.e. statistical) data analyses.

Cardenas and Flores (1980; Flores, 1983, 1984) also furthered attempts to integrate an intermediate level of analysis and a historical-structural approach. They did this by focusing on pragmatic, fundamental problems of people at the level of individuals and/or collectivities, seeing these individuals as active subjects of change, and acknowledging and allowing for the fact that all this activity and behavior is mediated by large-scale social, political, and economic structures of the world-system.

Although many prominent scholars have advanced and continue to advance the study of immigration both methodologically and theoretically, the impetus for this advance was provided by the work of Julian Samora and his students in the Mexican American Studies Program at the University of Notre Dame during the late 1960s and throughout the 1970s. Jorge Bustamante’s Ph.D. dissertation (1975) in particular was a milestone in the transition from descriptive, uncritical studies to the more critical, historically embedded studies. This work was followed by Gilbert Cardenas’ (1977) dissertation that made theory and the construction of the immigration problematic the focus of attention.

In comparison, when we look at the work of Alejandro Portes and Wayne Cornelius (probably the two most highly regarded immigration scholars of the 1980s and 1990s) during this same time we find

that only Portes had begun to formulate the broader historical-structural context that they both now employ to assess undocumented immigration. As early as 1974, Portes noted the need to understand the structural context under which labor migration takes place (1974, 40–46), but it was not until 1977 that he incorporated a core-periphery, economic development, historical transformation framework to analyze migration. By 1978, Portes had definitely linked migration to an international capitalist system, and by 1981 both his analyses of migration and the theories of migration were framed by a world system perspective. His later work continues this critique (See especially, Portes and Borocz 1989).

Wayne Cornelius, on the other hand, did not look at undocumented immigration from a global framework until much later. Initially, Cornelius examined Mexican immigration in terms of the economic rationality of individuals who attempted to maximize their utility (wealth, prestige, security) through migration (Cornelius and Canedo 1976; Cornelius *et al.* 1976). He asserted that the long-term solution to the immigration “problem” lay in fundamental structural change in Mexican society and economy, but he did not tie the possibility or impossibility of these changes to the interwoven tapestry of the world system. By the late 1970s, Cornelius was still using the “push-pull” schema, but began to acknowledge the use of an “international” perspective on the part of other scholars, as some of his attention turned toward theoretical critique (1977; 1979a; 1979b; 1979c). In the early 1980s, Cornelius began to pay more focused attention to the role of United States government policies and U.S. private sector actions in creating and maintaining the immigrant flow (1980a; 1980b; 1981). This continued his move to a more encompassing perspective on migration. Cornelius’ continued analysis of the various paradigms used to explain undocumented immigration (1983) eventually led to his incorporation of a “global economy” perspective for understanding immigration (1987).

Conclusion

Theoretical approaches in the development, general migration, and undocumented immigration research fields were initially characterized by a duality of focus that eventually resulted in attempts that are still ongoing, to provide intermediate levels of analysis. In the

development literature this duality manifested itself in research focusing on broad processes of structural change involving comparisons between historical periods or between large geo-political units on the one hand, and research concerned with concrete local issues—the way a particular community coped with the problems of underdevelopment, for example—on the other. The general migration literature similarly presented migration as either the outcome of broad economic and political forces (historical-structural approach) or as rooted in individualistic factors (equilibrium approach). In a similar manner, the study of undocumented labor migration was characterized by one approach that emphasized the impact of larger social, political, and economic processes within the system of social relations and another that emphasized detailed, isolated analyses of characteristics of the immigrant populations. By the late 1970s, however, efforts were being made to find a theoretical middle ground between the seemingly unbridgeable micro and macro levels of analysis in all three of the research areas.

In the specific area of undocumented immigration from Mexico to the United States, researchers have examined the causes of immigration, immigration policy and laws, the adaptation of immigrants, the impacts of immigration on sending and receiving areas, attitudes toward immigrants and emigrants, the process of immigration, decision-making, streams of immigration, settlement patterns, profiles of immigrants, and immigrant population estimates, among other issues. As the interest in this topic developed and the aspects of the issue being addressed increased, so was there a parallel development in the approaches being used to study the topic and the theoretical frameworks used to analyze it. The trend was from micro-oriented studies of individual decision-making to macro-oriented studies placing the process of immigration within a larger structural-historical context. This uncritical to critical trend included efforts to find an intermediate level of analysis that addressed the substantive and methodological issues that a macro and micro levels of analysis taken alone ignored. Both primary and secondary research employing such a synthesis framework was being carried out by the late 1970s and early 1980s (cf. Cue 1977; Arroyo-Alejandre 1979; Wiest 1979; Roberts 1980; Arizpe 1981; Dinerman 1982; Crummett 1984; Mines 1984; *inter alia*).

Julian Samora's students began their paradigmatic shift in the early 1970s and can certainly be described as forerunners in the transition

to a broader, more encompassing perspective for the study of immigration. By forging ahead in a field of study that had been more or less neglected for almost four decades, Julian Samora provided the impetus for paradigmatic changes that not only altered the way undocumented labor migration is perceived and conceptualized, but also the way it is treated in state policy.

CHAPTER SEVEN

THE SOCIOLOGY OF WILLIAM J. KERBY OF CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY¹

ANTHONY J. BLASI

Not a familiar personage among American sociologists today, William Joseph Kerby (1870–1936) was among the American Sociological Society’s first members in 1906 and served as a member of its Executive Committee from 1918 to 1920.² The reason he is not well-known is that while teaching a full schedule at Catholic University of America he was also occupied with projects in social work and church-related enterprises. Catholic denominational institutions of higher education were at the margin of American higher education in his day, and he had little time, given his other publishing and administrative ventures, to publish his sociology. Yet he learned his sociology from no less a personage than Georg Simmel and published an essay, “Sociological Aspects of Lying” (Kerby, 1908–09) that shows Simmel’s influence on his work.³ The essay, however, was published in a journal that few sociologists read. He did present a paper on social processes in radicalism at an American Sociological Society meeting that was published by the Society (1921). Urged by colleagues and students to put his basic teaching into written form, he drafted and re-drafted a book in his last years that remained in manuscript form; it was only published posthumously (Kerby 1948). He wrote both the essay on lying and his sociological book, *Introduction to Social Living*, within an applied, even moralizing, framework that would put off any pure social scientist of the time who might have read them.

¹ I wish to express my gratitude to Dean Hoge, William V. D’Antonio, and the Life Cycle Institute of Catholic University of America for their hospitality while I was using the Catholic University of America Archives.

² See the first published list of members (*American Journal of Sociology* 1907, 737).

³ Nuesse (2000, 82) notes that “a published effort to identify American sociologists who were once students of Simmel does not include Kerby among them.” He cites Levine, Carter, and Gorman (1976).

Despite all this, Kerby is of historical relevance today because of his direct and indirect impact on a number of other sociologists and because of his unique approach to the question of values in social science. Concerning his influence, it should be noted that he was not only the first real sociologist at Catholic University of America but the major professor of the other early sociologists there as well. He was also an influential church activist whose peculiar charisma inspired much of the Catholic clergy to see social issues from a sociological perspective; bishops and major superiors of religious communities sent promising scholars to Catholic University to learn Kerby's perspective in order to spread that view of the social world. The vast majority of sociologists in Catholic colleges and universities throughout the nation came under the influence of Kerby and those around him.⁴

The present account is not intended as a complete biography of William J. Kerby.⁵ Suffice it to say that he organized the National Conference of Catholic Charities, the National Catholic School of Social Work, and the *American Ecclesiastical Review*, spending some years with administrative responsibilities with all three enterprises. He also authored numerous works on church affairs and Catholic charitable works and maintained an intensive speaking schedule, giving retreats and lectures at clerical and lay gatherings. His interests in empirical sociology were largely taken up in theses and dissertations written by the graduate students in sociology and social work at the Catholic University of America. Many of these theses and dissertations took the form of historical sociologies of welfare organizations. Students destined for careers at the smaller Catholic teaching colleges wrote on the social thought of various Catholic historical figures.

⁴ A perusal of the Catholic institutions in the database on early American professors of sociology, which is described elsewhere in this volume, shows that most of their sociologists held Catholic University of America graduate degrees. Nuesse (2000, 78) describes Kerby's long-term influence as institutionalization; he says that Kerby's contribution "was to the institutionalization of sociology rather than to its theoretical or empirical development. He did not pose a system or found a school and, except for his teaching of basic courses, in which he showed originality, he gave his energies mostly to social reform and, preeminently, to the professionalization of Catholic social work."

⁵ A brief biographical essay is Furfey (1967); a thesis on his life is Dolan (1981). Assessments and characterizations of Kerby's importance in the social conscience of twentieth century American Catholicism are Lavey (1988) and Lescher (1990). Nuesse (2000) appears to be the only account to date of Kerby's sociological approach.

Sociological Disciplinary Context

Kerby came to sociology looking for an intellectual approach to social issues. He was sympathetic to the aims of working-class populism and socialism, but not its apparent anti-intellectualism. It may seem unusual today to put populism and socialism in the same category; populists today tend to be on the right wing politically, and socialists are known for scientifically-researched position papers. But Kerby was born in 1870 in Lawler, Iowa, and the movement appeared to his eyes to have its heart in the right place but its mind closed. Kerby would be open to a cosmopolitan intellectuality. Catholicism had an intellectual subculture that transcended the folk religion of many believers, but it tended to be insular, especially before and after the reign of Pope Leo XIII (1878–1903). As was the case with many progressive Catholics, Kerby would find his intellect in tension with major currents of the Catholic subculture⁶ but his sympathies entirely in tune with Catholic pastoral concerns.

Kerby was culturally middle class. His father was an Irish immigrant who had studied classics at St. Patrick's College, Maynooth, and who organized the first bank in Lawler in 1875. Not satisfied with his son's education in the local schools, the elder Kerby instructed him in Greek and Latin at home. Kerby's mother, who died when he was 10, taught him to bring food to poor families on holy days (Lescher 1990, 17–19). He graduated from St. Joseph's College (now Loras College) in Dubuque and entered St. Francis Seminary in Milwaukee. His seminary training promoted questioning and intellectuality. His seminary student notes from 1887 to 1890 show that he was assigned to participate in debates on such topics as the Knights of Labor, women's suffrage, the importance of people in the mechanical trades, and immigration. There is a student essay among his seminary papers that, notably for the future sociologist, argues that education rather than nature is responsible for success.⁷

Kerby earned the S.T.B. (equivalent to a M.Div.) at Catholic University of America, was ordained, and was then assigned to continue

⁶ Kerby was a partisan of the liberal "Americanist" bishops in Church politics; see his letters to family members penned while in Europe: March 25, 1896 to his sister Ora Kerby, April 11, 1897 letter to Ed Kerby, June 13, 1897 letter to Mrs. R.J. McHugh (his sister)—all in Kerby Papers, box 1, folder 2.

⁷ Kerby Papers in the Catholic University of America Archives, Box 2, Folder 1.

studying for the S.T.L.,⁸ which he earned at Catholic University in 1894. His mentor at Catholic University was the Belgian-born moral theologian Thomas Bouquillon, who argued on behalf of justice for the worker and the empirical study of problems related to social justice.⁹ Bouquillon was quite critical of the state of Catholic moral theology in his day. He noted that its manuals consisted of collections of opinions rather than analyses, and that they failed to address new issues. He termed it “senile.” He saw social science as normative as well as descriptive and analytical in nature, and as a dimension of moral theology.

We referred above to the intimate relations between Moral Theology and the other social or normative sciences. These latter, originally contained in the former, have been differentiated from it gradually since the Reformation, and they have practically lost contact with the Gospel. (Bouquillon 1899, 260)

The critique of the social sciences implicit in this stance would in future years typify the thought of Paul Hanly Furfey, who spoke of a “supra-empirical postulates” in a “metasociology,” more than it would that of William Kerby (see Furfey 1953, 1–51).

Kerby came to the attention of the rector of Catholic University, Bishop John J. Keane. Keane was an “Americanist,” one of a number of liberal prelates who sought to improve relations between American Catholics and Protestants. In 1893 he delivered a famous address at Harvard University in a gesture at establishing cordial relations with the center of American academia. The Harvard administration, in the person of University President Charles William Eliot, offered the rituals of friendship but soon began to discount credits from Catholic institutions of higher education. The Jesuits rather than Catholic University were most affected by the Harvard policy, but the effect of the Harvard policy was to undercut the Americanist position in Catholic educational circles (Mahoney 2003, especially

⁸ The S.T.L. is a Vatican-chartered degree usually described as ranking between a master’s degree and a doctorate.

⁹ Thomas Bouquillon was born at Warneton in Belgium, May 16, 1842. He studied at Roulers and Bruges, and was ordained in Rome 1865. He earned the doctorate in theology in 1867 at the Gregorian University. He taught moral theology in the seminary of Bruges, and in 1877 became a professor at the Catholic University of Lille, France. He came to the Catholic University of America in 1889 as a professor of moral theology and taught there until his death in 1902.

30–31). Kerby, open to cosmopolitan intellectuality, was the kind of person that Keane wanted at Catholic University. While Kerby's bishop assigned him to teach at St. Joseph's College in Dubuque (1893–94), Keane and Kerby were in a delicate correspondence. After a Catholic University Faculty Senate resolution and a recommendation from Bouquillon, Bishop Keane persuaded Archbishop Hennessy of Dubuque to allow Catholic University to send Kerby to Europe for further study and then to appoint him to the Catholic University faculty. As a matter of University policy, Kerby was to gain social science credentials and return to Catholic University to promote the use of intellectuality in addressing social issues on behalf of the working poor.

Sociology in 1895

In 1895 William Kerby arrived at l'Université Catholique de Louvain in Belgium, the foremost Catholic institution of higher education in the world, only to find that it had no courses in sociology. In fact, one of the University's leading social scientists, Simon Deploige, was a leading critic of Émile Durkheim's science of morals. Only in the Faculty of Arts would the Thomistic theologians have a stance favorable to the kind of program that Thomas Bouquillon, Bishop Keane, and William Kerby had in mind.¹⁰ By letter, Bouquillon recommended that Kerby go to Germany instead for his studies; he went to Berlin. While in Europe, Kerby was appalled at the widespread anti-semitism he found there.¹¹

The major names associated with sociology at the time were Auguste Comte (still), Herbert Spencer, and Émile Durkheim. The neo-Kantian approach to the field, which most sociologists today know under the form of Max Weber's pure types, was not yet widespread. Ferdinand Tönnies had published *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft* by then, and Gustav Ratzenhofer had begun to write important works. The early works of Karl Marx were forgotten and yet to be revived. Empirical *Volkerpsychologie* was to be found in Leipzig with

¹⁰ In 1882, at the urging of Pope Leo XIII, the Belgian bishops created a chair in Thomistic thought at Louvain and filled it with Désiré Mercier, the future cardinal, who taught there until 1892. The position was expanded into an institute over the next twenty years.

¹¹ Marach 25, 1896 letter to his sister Ora Kerby; Kerby Papers, box 1, folder 2.

Wilhelm Max Wundt, but William I. Thomas had yet to make it common sociological currency in the English-speaking world. Gustav Schmoller was beginning a tradition of community studies, which W.E.B. DuBois was soon to exemplify in Philadelphia; but DuBois's work would be largely ignored when it was published. *Hull-House Maps and Papers* was just being published.

In Berlin, the important courses Kerby took were three in national economics from Schmoller and one course in sociology from Georg Simmel. The first part of Kerby's notes from Simmel's course, covering a history of sociological thought, refer to Auguste Comte, Lester Ward, Herbert Spencer, Guillaume DeGreef, and Karl Marx. The second part of the notes reflect themes that later turned up in Simmel's text, *Soziologie* (1908).¹² In addition to the course notes, the Kerby Papers from his Berlin years include notes and materials pertaining to the involvement of the Catholic and evangelical (Lutheran) churches in social reform in Germany; Kerby was evidently planning a dissertation or other major manuscript on that topic.¹³

Meanwhile back in the U.S., it became clear at Catholic University that trends in American higher education would require that Kerby not only know social science but that he possess a doctoral-level degree. Moreover, a school of social science was being planned for the University, and Kerby would be expected to train a faculty for it. It would not do for Catholic University to simply grant Kerby a degree; he had to arrive as a member of the faculty already possessing authority in his field.¹⁴ To obtain a European doctorate in the most efficient manner possible, Kerby returned to Louvain and wrote a dissertation in political science on American socialist parties, demonstrating that they would not become as important as the socialist parties in various European nations had become (Kerby 1897).

Kerby's Sociology

As noted above, the principal materials embodying William Kerby's sociology are the drafts he made for the posthumous book *Introduction*

¹² Kerby Papers, box 2, folder 2.

¹³ Kerby Papers, box 2, folder 2.

¹⁴ Thomas Bouquillon, writing in French, explains all this in an undated letter to Kerby, seemingly timed with the end of his studies in Berlin (Kerby Papers, box 4, file 9).

to *Social Living* (1948), his essay on the sociology of lying (1908–09), and his analysis of processes in radicalism (1921). In the various hand-written drafts of the introductory book, the earlier ones best illustrate his sociological method.¹⁵ The later drafts are expanded with illustrations and ancillary points that, no doubt, were good pedagogy but obscure what are, to my mind, the clearest examples of his mind at work. Simmel's form sociology is key to Kerby's approach. A form for Simmel is analogous to a weberian pure type; it applies a mental category to social interaction. Such a form, proper to the noumenal world, was to be used for purposes of interpreting data from the phenomenal world. Unlike Weber's pure types, Simmel's form tended to focus on the micro-sociological rather than the civilizational. Simmel seemed to prefer the term form (*Gestalt*) so that he could make analogies with the physical world and speak of form and content, and with geometry (see Simmel 1971a). Kerby used the expression "patterns of behavior" rather than "form."

Kerby believed that education should make the student a better person. His teaching of sociology would not be analogous to geometry, remaining an analytical exercise. To the social form, Kerby added a moral assessment, and herein lies a story. Morality for Kerby was not a matter of religious commands. In his day, Catholic moral thought had moved away from a normative approach. The pedagogical method in moral theology moved away from running through the Ten Commandments and instead used the Thomistic catalog of virtues and vices. The focus was on the quality of dispositions to act, not on rules. Kerby and moral theologians of the time deemed legal codes proscribing and prescribing acts inadequate because of social change. They reasoned, for example, that one could not continue condemning the charging of interest. They similarly reasoned that one could not condone allowing poverty to persist on the grounds that there was no command against doing so. By focusing on interior intent and predispositions, the revived Thomistic approach would have the moral actor consider the quality of a proposed action, the quality of the means of accomplishing it, and the circumstances under which the action would be performed. In self-defense, the proposed act and the means (e.g., killing by stabbing) were negative in quality

¹⁵ The earliest draft appears to be that on the fragile pages in box 5 of the Kerby Papers.

but could be justified by the circumstances (e.g., lack of an alternative). The changed system of Catholic moral theology involved an analysis of the empirical situation, not a mechanical reading of a normative code. Empirical goods included one's own welfare, but also the welfare of individual others and of the society as a whole ("common good").

Along with a shift from law to consequences, and from legal analysis to empirical analysis, came a shift from normative to value criteria. One would not readily break a law, since law as an institution is for the common good, but situations could require setting the law aside. One makes a value response, finding good or evil in how one's values are excited, rather than in ratiocination over laws. In the intellectual movement associated with this shift in moral theory, two Catholic followers of the phenomenologist Edmund Husserl—the philosopher Dietrich von Hildebrand and the sometime sociologist Max Scheler—would elaborate "material" ethics on the basis of sensitivities to values.¹⁶ Kerby did not elaborate an ethical system on the order of those of von Hildebrand and Scheler, but he did elaborate assessments of "patterns of behavior" in social contexts. He showed the advantages, for example, of personal restraint and truthfulness.

This approach to a contextualized morality of social forms gives Kerby's sociology its practical or applied flavor. It also lends it a Durkheimian or even Parsonian aspect, though Kerby does not speak of mysterious unintended functions but of foreseeable consequences.

The point of sociological knowledge is to affect how people live. People experience a conflict between short-term personal preferences and the general preferences of others in society; a child may steal a dollar or an adult bank teller may steal thousands, but consideration of the preferences of others is what opposes such action. Personal restraint is exercised in the interests of the common welfare. Property, customs, moral laws, civil laws, and noble ideals come together in support of a pattern such as honesty, which works for the common welfare. Renunciation and obedience are the individual correlates of the common welfare.¹⁷

The sociological perspective, for Kerby, provides a contextual view that raises moral issues that would not come to light in an entirely

¹⁶ See Hildebrand 1969, consisting of much older essays, and Scheler 1973 (originally published in German 1913–16). I survey the relevant literature in Blasi (1988, 43–83).

¹⁷ Kerby Papers, box 5, file 7.

individual perspective. There is an analogy between his approach and Simmel's writings on orientations toward the wider social circle (1971c), as well as Mead's universal religious, political, and economic perspectives (1934, 289ff.).

Kerby's view of sociology as a wider moral contextualization affected the manner in which he taught. In his sociology classes, Kerby required his students to interpret their own experiences and actions, as he highlighted patterns. He in effect supplied forms ("patterns of behavior") as the students brought in their own empirical data. His introductory manuscript extended this same procedure:

Formal training of the young has the purpose of preparing them for living. Within that are the subsidiary purposes of training them to make a living, to make a life, and to contribute to the making of social life. Making a living presupposes a system of property. Carried to excess, making a living can be reduced to greed. Making a life consists of understanding and appreciation. Contributing to the making of social life means enriching the common life, which requires a shared understanding of interests.¹⁸

From this perspective, poverty and an unrestrained economic ambition are not only problems of making a living but of understanding and enriching the common life as well. It is thus not enough to look at poverty from a personal perspective or from a macro one, but it is necessary to see it as a macro phenomenon with personal correlates.

Socialization was at the center of Kerby's sociology. He characteristically mentions three objects of socialization: 1) socialization into skills so that one becomes a contributing member of society, 2) socialization into the preferences of others, and 3) socialization into a sensitivity toward the common good. The socialization process itself involves the development of thought, interests, cooperation, competition, groups, and conscience. Thought is a social as well as individual phenomenon. The socialization of thought presupposes a group within which mental perspectives emerge. For a group to have a successful relationship with other groups requires innovation, social change within the group. The emergence of new ideas is a pattern of behavior that, if stifled, leads to group disintegration. Differences are an aspect of group survival, as some members change and others do not. Kerby cites Charles Ellwood in observing that thought is a

¹⁸ Kerby Papers, box 5, file 7.

form of social interaction.¹⁹ Judging from the letters to members of his family from Europe, which are cited above, Kerby applied this analysis to the Catholic Church. Generalized, it comprises a sociology of internal organizational conflict.

The socialization of interests is as important as the socialization of thought. Different property interests, of course, are associated with different classes. If property interests are insufficiently socialized, not only will they lead to social injustice but they will divert people from wider cultural and social values that are of more value than increasing the sizes of fortunes. One is reminded by this of Marx's attack on the unnatural social relationships that market economics and the division of labor engender.

If thought and interests are social forms, so are cooperation and competition. The socialization of cooperation focuses on the values of helpfulness and generosity. Kerby would have people socialized into a moderate level of competition. An unreasonable transformation of everything into competition would lead to a concomitant shrinking of the imagination and a narrowing of the power of sympathy.

Kerby held that the socialization of groups was much neglected by the sociology of his day. Today one might use the term *identity* to indicate what Kerby meant when he used the term *group*.

Very often, members will go to extremes in group interest to which they would never resort otherwise. Bigotry, race antagonism, special interests, partisanship create bodies of thought and lead to courses of action that display acute social attitudes and disturb social peace. The resources of propaganda facilitate such results greatly. Ideals of truth, justice and culture suffer and bitterness and misrepresentation are promoted.²⁰

Thus racial, ethnic, and religious antagonism as well as political violence—phenomena very much with us even today—betray an insufficient socialization. The insufficiency is not a matter of quantity, since too much socialization into the perspective of a circumscribed group is at the center of the problem, but a matter of quality.

Kerby also mentions a socialization of the conscience. An adequately socialized conscience would not be one that simply received ethical judgments from the past but one that was updated. Social reform movements need to agitate when most people's consciences

¹⁹ This, of course, was a central teaching of George H. Mead.

²⁰ Kerby Papers, box 5, file 6, pp. 97–98.

are lagging behind current situations. The socialization of the conscience would be deliberate; it would be a planned program rather than a natural phenomenon. It would aim at social mindedness, individualization, and idealization. Social mindedness is the supra-individual sensitivity mentioned above. Individualization was a matter of avoiding an extreme individualism, of an awareness of the rights of both self and others, individuals and groups. Kerby develops his thoughts on individualization using the I/me dialectic from William James as a basic framework. Idealization is a matter of depicting valuable social patterns to oneself and others.

Kerby's essay on lying (1908–09) is a case in point illustrating his sociology. He does not focus on the act of the individual who uses untruthful statements but on the situations that give the individual reason to do that.

It is not easy to understand the lie if we take it as an act of mere individual morality. It is a social phenomenon. Very often if not always, it is the outcome of a definite social process and a response to a well-defined social pressure. (Kerby 14:4, 357)²¹

Very often it is an unjust situation, or at least one that involves a more or less rigid stratification system, that makes lying tempting and even necessary for some people.

The lie is the weapon of the weak against the strong. Where weakness and strength meet in any form of antagonism, there the lie may be expected. If it takes two to speak the truth, as Thoreau said, may it not usually require two to tell a lie,—one to make it necessary, and another to tell it. (Kerby 14:4, 359)

The phenomenon of lying is thus to be explained in terms of the larger social structure.

Once society converts industry and trade into a competitive struggle and throws the individual upon his own resources to make a living, the lie appears as a valuable institution and truthfulness is penalized. (Kerby 14:6, 547)

Kerby presupposed, as do most sociologists, that social structures are comprised of interlocking networks of reciprocal relationships. In

²¹ Since Kerby's essay on lying appeared in installments in two different calendar years, I am citing it by volume and number of the *Catholic University Bulletin*, followed by page numbers.

making moral assessments of lying, it is necessary to keep the reciprocity in mind.

If the individual were to hold himself responsible for all of the lies told to him, on account of his sensitiveness and dislike of unpleasant truth, or on account of his impudence and curiosity, or of his craving for praise and flattery, he might gradually make it possible for those who deal with him to be more truthful. (Kerby 14:6, 549)

The key to the problem of lying, as with all moral problems for Kerby, is the encompassing pattern of behavior, not the individual act. The latter is not unimportant, but its importance lies in its being evidence for the former.

Conclusion

William Kerby set the pattern for sociology at Catholic University of America from the end of the nineteenth century into the 1930s. He was directly and indirectly responsible for much that was to come from other key individuals, such as John A. Ryan and the University of Notre Dame sociologist Raymond Murray. His reformist sociology spread through many small Catholic colleges and seminaries whose professors of sociology studied at Catholic University, and that fact no doubt reinforced the general progressive political stance of much of the Catholic hierarchy. Important documents that emerged in the spread of this kind of applied sociology are the "Bishops' Program of Social Reconstruction," which was authored by Ryan and published in 1919 in the name of the American Catholic bishops (see Gearty 1953, 38–39), and the introductory sociology text authored by Raymond Murray (1935). Departures from Kerby's own approach were part of the process, of course. The more radical, even counter-cultural stance of Paul Hanly Furfey was clearly a departure from Kerby's own reformist stance.

Kerby went to Europe seeking a scientific approach to social issues. He acquired a science of society, but issues demand some way to make judgments and decisions. Repeating moral judgments from the past would not do, both because social science provided new information about the present that needs to be taken into account and because moral theology itself, particularly in the person of Thomas Bouquillon, was demanding an updating. Sociology as Kerby came to know it involved making interpretations of what people do by

finding the Simmelian social forms those actions help comprise. It also involved a grasp of empirical research, the kind that Gustav Schmoller promoted. Moral judgments were to be made not only about the deeds for which individual people are responsible but about the social forms that occasion them. Social reform, of course, would be a matter of changing the forms of social organization. Making people conscious of the social forms and contexts, as a natural stage of adult socialization, was essential to social reform.

PART THREE

THE SOCIAL HISTORY OF AMERICAN ORGANIZED SOCIOLOGY

The papers in this section speak of the formal organization of sociology in academic departments, research institutes, and professional associations. These organizations can be conceived of entities in their own right, characterized by organizational dynamics, or centers serving as foci of individuals' efforts. It is the first of these two alternatives that the essays in this section follow.

In Chapter 8, Michael R. Hill provides a preliminary account of the first sociological professional association in the United States, the short-lived National Sociological Society, and of its principal organizer and first president, Jesse Lawson. Lawson and the group of mostly African American sociologists working with him sought to establish a multi-racial professional association; they succeeded for about one year. When the American Sociological Society organized two years later, there were no African American members.

In Chapter 9, Jonathan Dirk VanAntwerpen recounts the decades-long struggle to establish a sociology department at the University of California, Berkeley. That struggle centered in the career of Frederick J. Teggart, who opposed the use of the name *sociology* to describe a discipline. William Graham Sumner similarly objected to that name at Yale, but Teggart appears inadvertently to have helped shape future sociology at Berkeley without being counted among American sociological founders.

In Chapter 10, Mary Jo Deegan, who also contributed Chapter 2, narrates the status of women and African Americans in the American Sociological Association, highlighting patterns of inclusion and exclusion, condensing information from her many published studies. Her focus is on the profession at large in its organizational manifestation, rather than on the significance of one person and department for the profession. While the sweep of her study is broader than some of the others, much for which she provides an account is supported in more detailed studies in this volume having a narrower scope, especially that by Bette J. Dickerson. Chapter 11, by Dickerson,

focuses on two episodes in that same story, the formation of the Caucus of Black Sociologists in the A.S.A. and its change into the Association of Black Sociologists. She captures well the spirit of conflict and suspicion characteristic of the 1960s and 1970s.

In Chapter 12, her second contribution to this volume, Kay Richards Broschart provides a social history of the emergence and organization of sociology in the American South. This is a product of a larger effort on her part to collect and organize information on the discipline in the region. As with her earlier chapter, regionalism plays a role, but rather than as a negative factor contributing to the marginalization of scholars it serves as an opportunity for the study of a once marginal part of the nation.

In Chapter 13, Vicky M. MacLean and Joyce E. Williams recount the establishment of sociology at women's and historically Black colleges and universities. Their strategy is to focus on several case studies for each category. They extend the theme of marginalization beyond the individual level and to the organizational. Moreover, they emphasize variation within the margins, as they reveal contrasting modes of adaptation adopted by different departments.

At the request of the History of Sociology Section of the American Sociological Association, Anthony J. Blasi is establishing a database of early professors of sociology in the United States. Chapter 14 presents tables based on the database as it existed in the summer of 2004. While it is impossible to guarantee representativeness, it adds to data from the early twentieth century on the presence of the profession in academia up to the middle of the last century.

In Chapter 15, Suzanne Vromen gives us an intriguing outsider's view of a well-known early school of American sociology, that of Chicago. Using excerpts from private letters and an article by Durkheim's follower Maurice Halbwachs, she shows us how both the urban and university contexts of Chicago appeared from a French view, as well as relating Halbwachs' evaluation of the sociology done at Chicago in 1930.

CHAPTER EIGHT

JESSE LAWSON AND THE NATIONAL SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF 1903

MICHAEL R. HILL

Introduction

The National Sociological Society, rather than the American Sociological Society (now Association), was apparently the first American organization with national aspirations to place, in 1903, the fateful word “Sociological” in its corporate name.¹ Unfortunately, the recent centennial of the National Sociological Society (NSS) passed unnoticed and uncelebrated. The NSS, convened in 1903, was a short-lived organization of African Americans and whites, Northerners and Southerners, academic men, politicians, clergymen, and others, who vigorously confronted the most pressing conundrum in Jim Crow America: how to solve the race problem. The NSS was championed by Jesse Lawson—an African-American attorney, educator, and sociologist in Washington, D.C.—who became the organization’s first and only president. The remarkable interracial NSS meeting in November, 1903, was a tribute to Lawson’s energy, cooperative vision, and organizational skills. The NSS, with its sharply-focused emphasis on addressing a deeply difficult and divisive social problem, its inclusive embrace of African American and white members, its national reach,

¹ Organizational predecessors to the NSS included the grand vision of international sociology introduced via academic congresses at the Paris Exposition in the summer of 1900, with papers published in the *Annales de l’Institut de Sociologie* in 1901. The Sociological Society of London held an organizational meeting in June, 1903, followed by a General Meeting in November, 1903. Four substantive meetings of the London society were held during the Spring and Summer of 1904, with the papers comprising the first volume of *Sociological Papers* published in 1905 (a year after the proceedings of the NSS appeared). As to formal associations generally, Furner (1975) provides a detailed study of early social science movements in the US. For a brief account of the history of the American Sociological Association, see American Sociological Society (1906a); Rhoades (1981); and, on the birth of the *American Sociological Review*, Lengermann (1979).

and its decidedly political agenda, was born full-grown and died as quickly, but serves us still as a concrete historical instance of a crucial element too often lacking in professional sociological organizations today: corporate mobilization for responsible social change (cf., Feagin 2001; Feagin and Vera 2001; Gilman 2004; Hill 2001).

Our professional failure to acknowledge and celebrate the centennial of the NSS in 2003 reflects an important lesson for disciplinary historians: our collective disciplinary account is fundamentally provisional and is always subject to updating. Disciplinary history is a “working hypothesis” in the pragmatic sense suggested by George Herbert Mead (1899). It is, at any given moment, an hypothesis that can be improved and strengthened over time by iterative revisiting of documents and archival data (Hill 1993) with the dual aims, always, of reducing class bias, racial bigotry, sexual chauvinism, and misinformation generally, while also more carefully and inclusively documenting organizational complexities, interpersonal interconnections, intellectual currents, and the incontrovertible facticity of temporal and spatial reality (Hill 2001b). When it comes to our disciplinary history, we can always do better, and we must forever be ready to learn new things.

The road to disciplinary history is replete with hidden traps for unwary researchers, as this writer has occasionally discovered to his own chagrin. For instance, Monroe Work (1916, 19), writing in the *Negro Yearbook* for 1916–1917, asserted that “the greatest example of whites and Negroes cooperating for social uplift is through the Southern Sociological Congress” and that “the constitution adopted by this organization, in 1911, sets forth as one of its objects ‘The solving of the race question in a spirit of helpfulness to the Negro and of equal justice to both races.’”² What a wonderful historical gem to discover! But, we must read cautiously. In this instance, because Work, who took *immediate* activity as the temporal frame of reference for his periodic *Yearbook*, intended neither to assess nor to document historical *precedent*. The consequences of authorial situation and intent are not only important, but are also largely knowable in many circumstances. It turns out that I initially misapprehended the

² The Southern Sociological Congress, begun in 1911, received short shrift in Simpson’s (1988) otherwise useful narrative of the Southern Sociological Society. For a critical discussion of this omission, see Frey (2001).

temporality of Work's statement, and mistakenly assigned precedence to the Southern Sociological Congress (SSC). In fact, the SSC was neither the first such sociological organization nor was it the only important exemplar of "whites and Negroes cooperating for social uplift." Nearly a decade earlier, in 1903, the National Sociological Society led the way, predating not only the SSC itself but also the 1905 founding of the American Sociological Society. Untangling and updating the contributions of early African-American sociologists to our collective professional history is an important and ongoing project.

As a special problem within the history of sociology, Blasi (2000), Broschart (1991), Deegan (1988b, 1991, 2000a, b, 2002a, b), Feagin (2001), Feagin and Vera (2001), Frey (2001), Hill (1996), Hunter (2000), Johnson (2003), Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley (1998, 2002), and Stanfield (1985, 1993), among others, have usefully illustrated and have often explicated various difficulties involved in drawing balanced, representative portraits of the contributions of African Americans to the discipline of sociology. In a variety of consequential ways, for example, the lingering and still powerful aura of the Chicago School of race relations—with Robert E. Park and his students routinely portrayed as central and heroic figures therein—has largely usurped the field of vision, resulting in a perversely narrow and temporally truncated account of African American activities in American sociology. Venomous bickering and intentional obfuscation between partisan champions of Booker T. Washington, on the one hand, and W.E.B. DuBois, on the other, have also clouded numerous analyses of the historical record. Scholarly dereliction, post-modern banality, rampant scientism, elitist snobbery, bald racism, and regional biases have further disfigured the facts and marred their interpretation.

It is lamentable but not surprising that we as sociologists know little about Jesse Lawson's life and work. His professional career in Washington, D.C., unfolded well outside the exclusive halls of patrician east coast academe and far from the rough-hewn sociological epicenter that was Chicago at the close of the nineteenth century. As a corrective, this chapter updates the cumulative "working hypothesis" that is our disciplinary history. Below, I outline the origins and activities of the NSS and sketch the biography of its energetic architect: the African-American sociologist, Jesse Lawson. Albeit belatedly, let us now acknowledge the centennial of the National Sociological Society.

Jesse Lawson

Jessie Lawson was born on May 8, 1856, at Nanjemoy, Maryland. His parents were Jesse and Charlotte (Price) Lawson. Their son enrolled in Howard University and, subsequently, the Howard Law School, earning the A.B., LL.B., and A.M. degrees in 1881, 1884, and 1885, respectively. Lawson kept current with social issues by attending, from 1901 to 1905, a series of special lectures as a member of the American Academy of Political and Social Science at the University of Pennsylvania. He edited, from 1893 to 1897, the *Colored American*, an African-American newspaper published in Washington, D.C.

Jessie married Rosetta E. Coakley, of Washington, D.C., in 1884, and together they had four children. Rosetta, who entered adulthood as a high school teacher, became a major force in her own right. She received, from Bishop John H. Vincent, her diploma for completing the prescribed course of the Chautauqua Literary and Scientific Circle in 1884. She later took a degree in chiropractic science and subsequently taught anatomy and physiology courses under the auspices of Frelinghuysen University.

In 1895, "at the suggestion of Professor Jesse Lawson," Rosetta Lawson organized for African-American women "the first Congress of Women held in the United States" (Davis 1933, 217). When the National Association of Colored Women emerged in 1896 from the fusion of the National Federation of Afro-American Women and the National League of Colored Women, Rosetta was elected to the Executive Committee (*Woman's Era* 1896). Centrally, she was for thirty years a national organizer for the Women's Christian Temperance Union (WCTU), traveling throughout the US, and eventually to inter-national conferences in Scotland and France, to speak for the goals of the WCTU.³ In 1905 she organized the YWCA in Washington, D.C. She also helped found the Alley Improvement Association, an organization dedicated to better housing for the poorest of the poor in Washington, D.C. Together, Jesse and Rosetta formed a hard-working, activist partnership.⁴

³ See, for examples and documentation of her work, R. Lawson (1903a, b, 1905) and *Colored American* (1904).

⁴ For additional details of Rosetta's life, see Davis (1933) and Lambeth (1996).

Jesse Lawson was, for several years, a legal examiner at the U.S. Bureau of Pensions, starting in 1882. Also serving at the Bureau of Pensions, until about 1887, was S. Laing Williams, the noted husband of sociologist Fannie Barrier Williams (Deegan 2002b). It would beg credulity to assume that these two young, energetic African-American lawyers remained strangers to each other. This presumed link to Williams further locates Lawson in an important network of early Black sociologists. As a known quantity, Lawson (1887) was invited to present a lecture on "The Ethics of the Labor Problem" to the prestigious Bethel Literary and Historical Association. He began his academic career as a Lecturer in Sociology in the Lyceum of the Second Baptist Church in Washington, D.C., and, in 1906, was named President and Professor of Sociology and Ethics of the Bible College and Institute for Civic and Social Betterment (Mather 1915). The latter post positioned Lawson to become President of a novel educational experiment: Frelinghuysen University, in Washington, D.C.

Frelinghuysen University⁵ was created in 1917 by the merger of the Bible Educational Association (of which Howard University's Kelly Miller was president) and the Bible College (of which Lawson was president). According to Chateauvert (1988, 264–65):

The founders [of Frelinghuysen University] created a school that differed remarkably from other post-secondary institutions of the time. Designed for the non-elite population, Frelinghuysen scheduled classes when working people could participate. Long distance commuters that prevented working people from attending traditional campus-based courses were resolved by using a "home college" system with classes meeting at various locations throughout the city. Finally, high tuition rates that prohibited access to Howard University were undercut by setting costs for courses at the lowest possible rate and requiring monthly, instead of semester, payments.

Under Jessie Lawson's leadership, Frelinghuysen attained a degree of prominence during its first two decades of this century. . . . Frelinghuysen emphasized both Booker T. Washington's trade and semi-professional training approach and W.E.B. DuBois' push for professional education. As a result, the school had a broad appeal.

When Jesse Lawson, the first president of Frelinghuysen, opened the doors of the new school, the Lawsons apparently welcomed students

⁵ Named to honor Frederick T. Frelinghuysen, a white U.S. Senator from New Jersey who championed Black rights.

literally into their own home, at 2011 Vermont Avenue, NW, in Washington, D.C. In 1921, Frelinghuysen purchased a house at 1800 Vermont Avenue, NW, for classroom use, and then sold it in 1927 when a larger building was purchased at 601 M Street, NW. The “home grown” approach of Frelinghuysen continued with sociologist Anna Julia Cooper, the second president of Frelinghuysen, who also offered classes in her home, at 201 T Street, NW, during her leadership of the school from 1930 to 1939.⁶

A Republican, Jesse Lawson was a delegate to the Republican National Convention in 1884. He was the founder and president of the National Sociological Society, in 1903, and later joined the Southern Sociological Congress. Other accomplishments included service as president of the National Emancipation Commemorative Society, organized in 1909. Working side by side with his wife, Rosetta, they dedicated their lives to race betterment. Jesse Lawson died on November 8, 1927.

Jesse Lawson’s biographical record is only partially known at present (and clearly deserves more intensive study and research), but sufficient evidence exists to claim him as a bona fide sociologist. Dirk Käsler (1981), in reconstructing the history of German sociology, pragmatically defined a sociologist as anyone who fulfilled at least *one* of the following criteria:

- occupy a chair of sociology and/or teach sociology,
- membership in the German Sociological Society,
- coauthorship of sociological articles or textbooks,
- self-definition as a “sociologist”
- definition by others as a sociologist.

Deegan (1988a) used parallel criteria to demonstrate that Jane Addams, too often and too easily dismissed as *solely* a social worker or social reformer, was in fact a substantial and accomplished sociologist. When Deegan substituted the American Sociological Society for the German Sociological Society, Addams more than met *all* of Käsler’s criteria. Hill (1989) subsequently employed the Käsler/Deegan criteria to classify the well-known American jurist, Roscoe Pound, as a full-fledged sociologist. Deegan (2000) revisited these criteria, inso-

⁶ According to the African American Heritage Trail Database, the university became the Frelinghuysen Group of Schools for Colored Working People in 1940, and lasted into the 1950s, when the institution finally ceased operation.

far as they apply to African-American women in sociology, and concluded that the study of African-American sociologists calls for additional modifications in Käsler's original scheme. So, too, in the case of Jesse Lawson. For example, Lawson organized the National Sociological Society *before* membership in the American Sociological Society was chronologically possible, and Lawson did later join the Southern Sociological Congress. Thus, the Käsler/Deegan criteria are here further amended to include membership in *any* formal sociological society or association, not solely the American Sociological Society/Association.

Given the modified Käsler/Deegan criteria, Jesse Lawson clearly deserves recognition as a sociologist. Specifically: (1) He lectured on sociology in the Lyceum of the Second Baptist Church of Washington, D.C., and was later professor of sociology and ethics at the International Bible College in Washington, D.C.; (2) he was a founder and member of formal sociological societies, including founding the National Sociological Society and membership in the Southern Sociological Congress; (3) he wrote articles and edited a book about the sociological aspects of race relations, *How to Solve the Race Problem*, in 1904; (4) he defined himself primarily as a "sociologist" in information supplied to *Who's Who of the Colored Race* (Mather, 1915: 173); and (5) he was identified as a sociologist by others, including contemporary reportage in the New York *Times* and, more recently, by the editors of Booker T. Washington's personal papers (Harlan, Kaufman, and Smock 1972–1989, III, 570). And, in 1904, when the editors of *World Today* invited several noted African-Americans to write essays for a symposium on the race problem, Lawson (1904b) found himself in the stellar sociological company of W.E.B. DuBois (1904), Kelly Miller (1904), Booker T. Washington (1904a), and Ida B. Wells-Barnett (1904). In sum, Jesse Lawson meets *all* of the Käsler/Deegan criteria as here amended. Undoubtedly the most important of Lawson's sociological accomplishments was his instrumental work as founder and president of the National Sociological Society.

The National Sociological Society of 1903

The dawn of the Twentieth Century witnessed the continuing deterioration of race relations in the United States and the sustained promulgation and perverse implementation of Jim Crow legislation

in the American South (Luker 1991). This problematic setting led Booker T. Washington, in February, 1903, to call for a national conference to address the growing race problem. Recounting his address to the Brooklyn Institute of Arts and Sciences, the *New York Times* (1903a, 7) reported that Washington:

... said that he believed the time had come when representative white men of the North and South should meet with negroes and consider with calmness and business sagacity the whole subject as viewed from every aspect.

Jesse Lawson heeded Washington's call, and in little more than eight months he organized and hosted the National Sociological Society meeting of 1903. Lawson succeed in bringing whites and African Americans together for substantive discussions on the crisis in race relations, and edited the conference proceedings: *How to Solve the Race Problem: The Proceedings of the Washington Conference on the Race Problem in the United States under the auspices of the National Sociological Society* (Lawson 1904c).

Lawson's promotion of the NSS was supported by key figures in the American Negro Academy (ANA), a small, exclusive African-American intellectual society founded in 1897.⁷ The ANA and the National Sociological Society (NSS) were both based in Washington, D.C. Unlike the ANA, however, which restricted membership exclusively to invited African-American men with college degrees, NSS membership was open to "any person of good character" who subscribed to the goals of the organization, subject to approval by the NSS Membership Committee. The NSS charged no fee or assessment for dues.⁸ The partial list of NSS members records the names of 164 persons (Lawson 1904c, 271–78), including men of both races from North and South.⁹

⁷ The full nature of Lawson's links to members of the ANA, such as Kelly Miller, and the ANA itself, remain largely undocumented at this writing (see, for example, Moss 1981, who made no mention of Lawson or the NSS). Miller was not only a founder of the ANA, he authored the first of the ANA's long series of Occasional Papers (Miller 1897). Moore's (1999) promising study of the African American elite in Washington, D.C., from 1880–1920, was unfortunately discovered too late for discussion in this chapter.

⁸ Jesse Lawson to George A. Meyers, December 17, 1903, Box 12, Folder 4, George A. Meyers Papers. According to *The World Today* 6 (Jan. 1904, 15), some 3,000 members joined the NSS.

⁹ Not all NSS members attended the Washington meeting, and Lawson clearly solicited memberships "for publication" well after the conference ended (Lawson to Meyers, December 17, 1903).

The complexity and tensions within the Black community regarding racial issues at this time, are illustrated by the NSS membership of Charles Waddell Chesnutt.¹⁰ Chesnutt, who joined the NSS, had earlier refused membership in the ANA. Moss (1981, 76) recounts:

Chesnutt's polite rejection of the invitation [to join the ANA] was almost certainly related to his disapproval of any stress on the uniquely "Negro" heritage of American blacks and of separatism as a solution to the race issue, both positions legitimately associated with the academy, even though they were not accepted by all members.¹¹

Given Booker T. Washington's advocacy of a national meeting between African Americans and whites, and his subsequent membership in the NSS, it is not surprising that sociologist W.E.B. DuBois (the second president of the ANA) did not participate in the NSS.¹² Nonetheless, as Moss (1981) observed, not all ANA members adopted separatist or elitist positions, and at least nineteen then present or future members of the ANA were also counted in the membership of the NSS.¹³ Importantly, Kelly Miller, one of the original founders of the ANA, served instrumentally as the NSS Corresponding Secretary and as a member of the NSS Permanent Commission on the American Race Problem. Arthur Ulysses Craig was NSS Recording Secretary. Walter H. Brooks and Owen Meredith Waller served on the NSS Executive Committee. John W. Cromwell, another ANA founder, was also an NSS member. Core participants in the ANA were active supporters and members of the NSS leadership. Jesse Lawson's ability to draw key ANA members to public endorsement of the cooperative goals of the NSS was no small accomplishment. It should be noted too that whereas Booker T. Washington was a member of the NSS, and spoke briefly to the 1903 NSS meeting (Washington 1904b), he held no official position within the organization. A final and important note regarding membership in both the ANA and the

¹⁰ Chesnutt was a Cleveland attorney whose short stories were published in the *Atlantic Monthly* (Moss 1981, 75).

¹¹ Moss refers readers interested in Chesnutt to Keller (1973).

¹² For the record, Washington was invited to join the ANA, and initially promised a letter of support, but never followed through with the letter or his dues (Moss 1981, 10 *passim*). DuBois became an early member of the ANA and served as its second president, from 1898 to 1903.

¹³ Specifically: C.E. Bentley, J.W.E. Bowen, W.H. Brooks, R.C. Bruce, G.W. Cook, A.U. Craig, J.W. Cromwell, J.R. Hawkins, W.A. Hawkins, L.M. Hershaw, J. Hurst, C.C. Johnson, J.A. Johnson, K. Miller, J. Mitchell, Jr., L.B. Moore, W.S. Scarborough, W.A. Sinclair, and O.M. Waller.

NSS is that the ANA was rigorously chauvinist as well as racially exclusive, and the NSS recorded no known women's names on its published membership roll. Archival deposits, however, reveal the NSS membership of Eartha M.M. White, a prominent African-American from Jacksonville, Florida.¹⁴ In any event, public sessions of the NSS were, presumably, open to all women and men who wished to attend.¹⁵

The activist, purposeful goals of the NSS were clearly specified in Article II of the organization's constitution and by-laws, here quoted verbatim (Lawson 1904c, 279):

ARTICLE II

OBJECTS

The objects of the organization are:

1. To gather and collate data bearing on the American *Race Problem*.
2. To formulate plans and suggest measures with the patriotic view of bringing about a better understanding between the races in the United States.
3. To study thoroughly, systematically, and scientifically every phase of the *Race Problem* with a view of finding some remedy to relieve a strained situation made possible by the existence of said problem.
4. To find some common ground upon which all of the friends of our common cause may stand, and to adjust the different and divergent views, respecting the solution of the *Race Problem*, into a definite and harmonious proposition.
5. To print and distribute literature containing information considered as data in the solution of the *Race Problem*.
6. To cultivate a spirit of patriotism.
7. To endeavor to bring about a more harmonious relation between the races under the American Government.

Comparisons to the membership and constitution of the American Sociological Society (ASS) are striking and instructive. The ASS, with an initial roster of 115 members, was genuinely open to women, including Jane Addams, Emily Greene Balch, Kate Claghorn, Charlotte Perkins Gilman, Annie Marion MacLean, Mary McDowell, Anna Garlin Spencer, and Marion Talbot, among others (*American Journal of Sociology* 1907). There were, apparently, no African Americans among

¹⁴ Membership card, National Sociological Society, File M3, Number 2446, Eartha M.M. White Collection.

¹⁵ The *Colored American* (1903a, 7) advised that "public meetings will be held at the 19th Street Baptist Church, on Monday evening, Nov. 9th, and on Tuesday evening, Nov. 10th."

the founders of the ASS, and there was no overlap between the membership of the NSS and the ASS. The ASS and the NSS comprised totally separate social nets. The stated objective of the ASS was more amorphous than that of the NSS. Article II ("Constitution of the American Sociological Society" 1907, 735) stated simply:

The objects of this society shall be the encouragement of sociological research and discussion, and the promotion of intercourse between persons engaged in the scientific study of society.

There was thus significant convergence with the NSS, insofar as its constitution called for: (a) the gathering and collation of data, (b) thorough, systematic, and scientific study, and (c) the publication of data.

The ASS and the NSS differed radically, however, in terms of committed social action. Where the founders of the ASS retreated from the world and discouraged the society from passing "any resolution approving or disapproving specific sociological doctrines or specific schemes for social betterment" (Rhoades 1918, 8), the NSS specifically sought to "formulate plans and suggest measures with the patriotic view of bringing about a better understanding between the races in the United States" and to adjust different and divergent scientific views "into a definite and harmonious proposition" with respect to "the solution of the *Race Problem*." It is not just the fact that the NSS and the ASA comprised disjoint social nets, they also adopted antithetical stances on the *use* of the "thorough, systematic, and scientific study" of data for the express purpose of "social betterment."

The hard work of organizing the first and major meeting of the National Sociological Society began in earnest on October 1, 1903, with the wide distribution of a circular letter printed on the official letterhead of the National Sociological Society, and issued from the office of Kelly Miller, Corresponding Secretary, Howard University. The letter opened:

Dear Sir:

Believing that the situation brought about by the race problem in the United States, can be relieved only by the best efforts of the people of both races, North and South, and feeling assured that there is sufficient wisdom, patriotism and love of fair play among the American people to enable them to cope with any situation, however grave, it has been decided by the National Sociological Society—an organization for the study of the condition of the colored people of the United States, and to suggest plans for the improvement of that condition—

to call a conference to be held at Washington, D.C., November 9–11, 1903—at the time for the assembling of Congress in extraordinary session—to deliberate on the most serious phases of the race question, and to formulate plans for the relief of a strained situation.¹⁶

The resulting large meeting, expanded to four days and thus extended through November 12, was spread over three venues in Washington, D.C.: the Lincoln Temple Congregational Church, the Nineteenth Street Baptist Church, and the Metropolitan A.M.E. Church.

Discussions and presentations during the four-day NSS meeting were organized under five specific headings (Lawson 1904c, 22):

1. The nature and cause of race prejudice
2. Factors in the solution of the problem
 - A. Education
 - B. Statesmanship
 - C. Religion
 - D. Philanthropy
3. Proposed solutions
 - A. Race segregation
 - B. Distribution among the States
 - C. Colonization
 - D. Race harmony
4. Special problems
 - A. The City Negro
 - B. Rape and lynching
 - C. The Negro as an industrial factor
 - D. The Negro as a patriot
5. The necessity for a Commission to consider the various phases of the race problem

The details of the conference are best understood by careful perusal of the full published *Proceedings* (Lawson 1904c).¹⁷

Overall, the conferees affirmed the equal citizenship of all Americans, as guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States. Specifically, they concluded (Lawson 1904c, 3):

That under our form of government there can be no recognition of a master class and a subject class or of a master race and a subject race, but all classes and races must be treated as equals in the eyes

¹⁶ National Sociological Society to [unknown], October 1, 1903, Box 12, Folder 3, George A. Myers Papers.

¹⁷ This task is made somewhat easier by the republication of the *Proceedings* by the Afro-Am Press, of Chicago, in 1969. A desultory summary of the meeting is provided by Luker (1991, 227–30) who failed, perhaps understandably, to approach the event with a sociological imagination.

of the law. Every statute should apply to the whole people without distinction of class or race.

They went on record deploring mob violence as well as the crime of rape, asserting that “crime of any character is most effectually prevented or punished by the regular processes of the law” (Lawson 1904c, 5).

With regard to solving the race problem *per se*, the Conference unequivocally found that: “As solutions to the race problem we regard colonization, expatriation and segregation as unworthy of further consideration” (Lawson 1904c, 5). It is thus unpardonable that, more than a half century later, in remarks to the American Sociological Association, former ASA President Charles P. Loomis proposed building a “second Israel” for Negroes in the Andes mountains of South America (Leo 1968c, 18).¹⁸ The 1903 Conference encouraged a variety of cooperative solutions to the race problem that utilized the social institutions of education, religion,¹⁹ economy, and government. And finally, the NSS endorsed appointment of a federal-level, bi-racial Commission on the race problem.

In a subsequent article, Lawson (1904a, 577) stressed that the work of the proposed Commission must be guided by sound social research procedures, specifically:

[T]here must be a practical handing of the subject by scientific methods; that the facts must be ascertained through induction, and that the scope of the investigation, while well-defined and specific, must be broad and comprehensive enough to includes all elements that enter as factors into the solution of the problem.

Here was a clear-cut proposal for systematic, multi-factor analyses of a major social issue, and it deserves a place in the historical litany of important studies of Black-white relations that followed eventually, if not directly, in its wake.

Media reactions to the 1903 NSS meeting were mixed. The New York *Times* (1903b) gave positive notice and provided a detailed list of speakers when the NSS conference was announced. Likewise, the same paper (New York *Times* 1903c, d) also reported in detail on the NSS endorsement of a federal commission on the race problem.

¹⁸ For further discussion, see Mary Jo Deegan’s chapter on “Women, African Americans, and the ASA, 1905–2005,” elsewhere in this volume.

¹⁹ Lawson, a Baptist, later expanded on the potential role of the Catholic Church in working for improvements in race relations (Cleveland *Journal* 1906).

Reportage in the Black press was more problematic. The Chicago *Broadaxe* (1903) ignored the conference entirely, choosing instead to lambast an earlier speech given by Booker T. Washington in North Carolina as an “oratorical failure.” The Washington *Bee* (1903a, b, c) praised the NSS address made by H.B.F. Macfarland, President of the Board of Commissions of the District of Columbia, while somewhat gleefully noting that Booker T. Washington was not wholeheartedly welcomed at the NSS conference, and later sniping that Washington’s followers were comparable to “sheep.” As expected, the *Colored American* (1903a, b, c, d), published in Washington, DC, and for which Jesse Lawson was a former editor, gave enthusiastic support to the NSS meetings and reported the conference in a highly favorable light. Elsewhere, the Indianapolis *Freeman* (1903a, b) also provided positive, sympathetic coverage. The disparate reporting, represented by the *Broadaxe* and the *Bee*, on the one hand, and the *Colored American* and the *Freeman*, on the other, reflected serious divisions between contentious factions within the African-American community itself.

Conclusion

The National Sociological Society meeting in 1903 was an early, organized effort that brought thoughtful people, African and white Americans, from across the country, to fashion a formal, cooperative, social scientific approach to solving racial injustice in America. Subsequent meetings of the NSS were planned for 1905, but the precise fate of this anticipated conference is not yet documented.²⁰ The NSS was short lived, but it provides today a concrete, alternative model of sociological networks, organization, and constructive action for social betterment. In providing an early alternative to racism and apolitical practice, the NSS is part the long and venerable history of liberation sociology. The willingness of the NSS to tackle a serious social issue flies boldly in the face of the ASA’s long-standing tradition of side-stepping so-called “political” issues such as peace and war, gay rights, and social equity generally. The time has come to enroll Jesse Lawson and the National Sociological Society in the annals of our disciplinary history.

²⁰ Jesse Lawson to George A. Meyers, September 3, 1904, Box 13, Folder 2, George A. Myers Papers.

CHAPTER NINE

RESISTING SOCIOLOGY'S SEDUCTIVE NAME: FREDERICK J. TEGGART AND SOCIOLOGY AT BERKELEY

JONATHAN VANANTWERPEN

A regularly recurring theme within the history of sociology has been the discipline's quest for distinction.¹ From the programs of its earliest practitioners to the projects of its contemporary ones, sociologists have sought to set their academic field apart from others, and to constitute sociology as an enterprise with a method and purpose all its own. Indeed, the constitution and construction of sociology as an intellectual enterprise cannot be understood apart from the "struggles over classification" inherent in such a quest.² While this effort and the classificatory struggles that attend it have taken various forms, attempts to institute a legitimate sociological vision have perhaps been most apparent during periods of disciplinary "crisis" and intellectual confusion. In the history of American sociology, the interwar years constituted such a period, during which sociological theories proliferated as the discipline underwent a so-called "crisis" of identity.

In this essay, I consider the question of American sociology's quest for academic distinction from the perspective of Frederick J. Teggart, a figure situated at the margins of the discipline during the interwar years, and a professor at the University of California, Berkeley. As a "stranger" to American sociology, a liminal figure within its history, Teggart both resisted and reproduced the discipline's seemingly elemental concern to distinguish itself as science. While his opposition to sociology was in large part a response to the rigidity of the discipline's defined academic boundaries, his theory of history developed a definition of historical science with striking similarities

¹ For comments on earlier versions of this chapter, thanks to Victoria Bonnell, Michael Burawoy, Craig Calhoun, Christopher Chase-Dunn, Daniel Geary, Amy Hanser, Kerwin Klein, Isaac Martin, Lynn May Rivas, Teresa Sharpe, and Barrie Thorne.

² On the sociological importance of such "struggles over classification, see Bourdieu (1991).

to the intellectual impulses behind sociology's attempted disciplinary distinction.

American sociology's attempt to set itself apart from history was not an entirely unprecedented phenomenon. When Max Weber (1971) defined "sociology" in *Economy and Society*, he noted that the word was "highly ambiguous." Weber, ambivalent as to the relative merits of "history" and "sociology," distinguished sociological investigation from the practices of the historian. He argued that while sociology concerned itself with conceptual types and generalizations, history sought the explanation of individual actions and events. Weber's articulation of a specifically sociological research program came in the wake of extended reflections on historical methodology, essays on method inspired by debates over the relationship between the natural and the social sciences.³

Although many American sociologists now consider Weber a foundational figure, his conception of sociology was not influential in the United States until well after his death, when Talcott Parsons inserted it into a new theoretical canon. Nonetheless, the multiple meanings of "sociology" in the United States during the early decades of its disciplinary development, especially during the interwar years, might profitably be understood in light of the *Methodenstreit* that set the stage for Weber's own methodological critique. The differences, however, between the turn-of-the-century battles over method in Germany and the interwar interaction of "history" and "science" in the United States are also instructive. If Weber distinguished sociology from history, the distinction concerned different kinds of science, and Weber was arguably a practitioner of both. Out of a dialectic that engaged Dilthey, Rickert, Ranke, and Windelband, among others, Weber wrought his own uneasy synthesis, in theory and in practice; in the process he articulated his unique conceptions of sociological and historical science. Significantly, for Weber and for many of his prominent interlocutors, there were important differences between natural and social science, and both history and sociology exemplified the latter. Weber's methodological essays were thus preoccupied with articulating the nature and basis of those differences, and with distinguishing his account of social and historical science from the accounts of others.

³ On Weber and his historical context, see Giddens (1971) and Manicas (1987).

American sociologists of the interwar period, on the other hand, when they considered history at all, assimilated it within the practice of "sociology," a discipline increasingly modeled after the natural sciences. American sociologists such as Robert E. Park and W.I. Thomas naturalized history and in the process transformed its study into something called "sociology." Indeed, Park and Thomas were the forerunners of an American sociology that, throughout the interwar years, increasingly conceptualized itself as a natural science.⁴ Rather than conceive of a specifically social science, such as those that flowered during an earlier period in Germany, sociologists in the United States participated in the rise of a scientism that set "mere history" apart from "sociology," distinguishing the two disciplinary markers as part of a larger American antinomy between "history" and "science." In this sense, American sociology, with a tendency towards naturalism and an early emphasis on evolutionary theory, played out a different sort of *Methodenstreit*. In the late 1930s, when Parsons was pondering the nature and cause of the death of Spencerian sociology, the ghost of Comte, in the form of a pervasive naturalism, continued to haunt American sociology.⁵

This naturalist vision of sociology was not without detractors on the American scene. One often overlooked and largely forgotten critic of sociology as natural science was Frederick Teggart, a professor of "Social Institutions" at the University of California and founder of the Berkeley department known today by the name "Sociology." A sociological critic of sociology, and one of the most sophisticated theorists and practitioners of comparative historical sociology during the interwar period, Teggart maintained a complicated and ambivalent

⁴ On the place of Park and Thomas in defining sociology with regular reference to natural science, see Ross (1991), who shows that early American sociology developed a conception of social science alongside other prominent fields such as economics and political science, leading to a significantly naturalistic emphasis within each of these different disciplines. Robert Bannister (1987), offers a similar reading of the same phenomenon. However, the rise of objectivism was not a monolithic "triumph," but rather part of a more complicated "crystallization of opposing perspectives." See M. Smith (1994, 10–11, 7).

⁵ Parsons (1937, 3). While his main reference points were outside the American sociological tradition, Parsons' own perspective arguably continued to promote a naturalistic paradigm for American sociology, even as he broke with naturalism's evolutionary origins. See, for instance, his discussion of Weber on natural and social science (1937, 591–601). Camic (1987, 434) has argued that Parsons' preferred Pareto to Weber precisely because the latter erred in separating the social from the natural sciences.

relationship to sociology throughout his academic career. He ultimately opposed the discipline's introduction at Berkeley, even as he proposed and practiced a distinctly sociological form of historical inquiry. Solidly established at the margins of the discipline, Teggart nevertheless managed to leave his intellectual mark on American sociology through a tradition of criticism that was further elaborated by his students Kenneth Bock and Robert Nisbet, and later by the Berkeley-trained sociologist Stanford Lyman. Even more significant was his institutional impact, as the department he founded and shaped was recognized as a leading center in the field in the decades following his retirement and death.

The history of Teggart's department, which would become the department of Goffman, Blumer, Lipset, Bendix, Selznick, and Smelser, among many others, has been, like Teggart's own sociological trajectory, left largely unconsidered in the growing body of literature on the history of American sociology.⁶ If a history of Berkeley sociology were to be written, however, a consideration of Teggart would be the most logical place to begin. Yet a concern with the history of his department is not the only reason to attend to Teggart's place among the American sociologists of the era. As a self-imposed outsider to the discipline who nonetheless championed a distinctly sociological form of comparative history, Teggart's relationship to sociology was a complicated one: in his relationship to sociology he was, to borrow a phrase from Simmel (1971a, 148), "both near and far at the same time." Like the relation of Simmel's stranger to the group, Teggart's attitude towards sociology might be described as a combination of "remoteness and nearness, involvement and indifference." While Teggart did not achieve, as Simmel (1971a, 145) claimed the stranger could, a particularly "objective" attitude toward the disciplinary discourse and practice of sociology, he did develop his own critical perspective on the field, in addition to elaborating an alternative approach to social science.

At the end of his academic career, Teggart mounted a scathing and bitter critique of sociology, as he and his supporters resisted the introduction of a sociological presence at Berkeley. The word "soci-

⁶ While he provides a fascinating account of the relationship between the growing academic discipline of American sociology and discourse of public sociology, for instance, Haney (1998) overlooks Berkeley's institutional importance in the post-war period.

ology" was, Teggart claimed, a disciplinary label that attempted unsuccessfully to unify an already suspect science. Representing a supposedly scientific agenda, sociology's aim was in reality hopelessly undefined and even, at times, morally illicit. Teggart would trace his disparagement of sociology back to his critique of Auguste Comte, suggesting that Comte's influence on American sociology had given the U.S. discipline an unhealthy evolutionist edge and resulted in an unhelpful analogy between sociology and natural science.

While many sociologists followed Robert Park in seeking "natural laws and generalizations" that would hold "irrespective of time and place," Teggart promoted instead his comparative method, looking for history's underlying substance in its concrete and specific circumstances. An opponent of attempts to abstract "timeless" generalizations from history's plural processes, he was just as critical of a progressive evolutionism that deemed the methods of natural science suitable for historical inquiry. Thus, as Teggart disparaged the discipline and resisted its introduction at Berkeley, he paradoxically mobilized the mark of "sociology" as an inoculation against criticism of his own very similar work.

Given his critical stance, Teggart's presence on the margins of interwar American sociology might be interpreted as the manifestation of an "alternative impulse" within American sociology, an "historical countercurrent" in a field otherwise dominated by research strategies and theoretical assumptions that subordinated "history" to a generalizing social science replete with the rhetoric of "nature" (Ross 1991, 473). And while the basic contours of these dominant scientific visions have received significant historical scrutiny, the dynamics involved in counterposing them as alternatives have thus far warranted relatively less attention. A fuller consideration of Teggart's relationship to sociology may thus appear to right the balance, providing access to a relatively unheeded scientific alternative, and recalling the academic marginality of a disciplinary critic. But Teggart should not be understood simply as the marginal man of American sociology. Critical of a division between social science and history that would naturalize the first while trivializing the second, Teggart replaced that split with a binary of his own, worked out within the confines of "history" itself. Contrasting "narrative" with "scientific" forms of historical writing, Teggart reproduced in a different idiom the disciplinary division of labor he elsewhere rejected. Thus, Teggart's program of comparative history must be seen as

continuous with, and not merely an exception to, interwar sociology's project of disciplinary distinction. Both Teggart and the sociologists sought a "science" that would provide the possibility of law-like generalizations. The differences were in the details, details that nonetheless distinguished the discourse and defined the discipline of American sociology.⁷

Teggart's confrontation with the discipline was not the first of his academic battles at Berkeley. By most accounts a difficult and demanding personality—"when he changed his mind," wrote Teggart's student Robert Nisbet, "the earth shook"—Teggart's resistance to sociology was situated within a history with the University stretching back over forty contentious years (see Nisbet 1978/79, 79, and Murray 1980). These were decades punctuated by repeated attempts to address the issue of Teggart's academic classification and to find for him a suitable disciplinary domain.

Neither at home with the historians nor satisfied with the sociologists, Teggart's first position at Berkeley was in the University's new Bancroft Library. Having emigrated from Ireland at the age of nineteen, Teggart earned an undergraduate degree from Stanford, and served as the Librarian for San Francisco's Mercantile Library. He was chosen in 1905 to administrate the newly purchased Bancroft collection (Conmy 1977, 12). A few years later he was named an "Associate Professor of Pacific Coast History," and he began to teach seminars on that topic in the Department of History (Dangberg 1983, 43). Henry F. May would later call Benjamin Ide Wheeler's decision to include Teggart on the Berkeley faculty one of the UC President's "appointments with considerable claim to one kind or another of gigantism," classifying Teggart with other Berkeley "giants" such as Herbert E. Bolton, Bernard Moses, and A.L. Kroeber. But Teggart's addition to the Department apparently made for one giant too many, and within a few years he stepped down as curator of the Bancroft (May 1993, 26).

If Arthur W. Ryder (quoted in May 1993, 26) had dubbed Henry Morse Stephens a "fake giant surrounded by real pygmies," there was apparently not enough room in History for Stephens, Bolton, and Teggart too. In May 1917, Stephens wrote to Wheeler regarding

⁷ Other considerations of Teggart include Carnes 1994, Gemorah 1969, and Hodgen 1968.

the problems in the department, and requested that Teggart be given a leave of absence.

I should be very glad if you could see your way to grant this request, as it would be an exceedingly good thing, both for Professor Teggart and for the Department of History if he could be permitted to go East this fall to visit Eastern universities. I have arranged that he shall lecture upon his theory of history at various Eastern universities.⁸

Wheeler approved, and Teggart went east, where he worked with both the philosopher Arthur O. Lovejoy and the geographer Isaiah Bowman, in addition to holding a position with the newly created American Association of University Professors. By 1919, the possibility of Teggart's return to the University of California was apparently uncertain. He wrote to a Berkeley dean regarding his situation, referring explicitly to his prior conflicts with the faculty in History: "I should be most unhappy to be the occasion of reviving old differences, but I cannot, as I think you will see, accept dismissal from the University without cause and without expressed reason." Later that year, Teggart did return to Berkeley, and in 1923, after failing to successfully attach himself to any other Berkeley department, he was given a department of his own, named "Social Institutions." From this academic location he would attempt to carry out, in the nearly two decades that followed, the work "of the highest significance" that he had pleaded it was his duty and desire to pursue.⁹

Diverse as it was, the central aim of that work involved a new vision for historical writing. Throughout the course of his life, Teggart published a wide variety of material, from early works on Pacific Coast history to an ambitious attempt at comparative world history, finished late in his career. His essays and reviews appeared in the journals of disciplines across the social sciences and humanities, from *Social Forces* to the *Journal of the History of Ideas*, from the *Journal of Philosophy* to the *American Historical Review*. But almost all of his writing, including his four major works of history and historiography—

⁸ All correspondence, unless otherwise indicated, is located in the papers of the Office of the President, UC Berkeley Archives, Bancroft Library.

⁹ "I have served the University faithfully," Teggart wrote. "My life has been spent in California, I am now fifty, and have no desire to start over in some other place. I have work to do which is of the highest significance, and which can best be carried out in accustomed surroundings . . . what is of the greatest importance for me is to continue the work which I have been doing at California" (Teggart to Jones, 21 July 1919).

Prolegomena to History (1916), *The Processes of History* (1918), *Theory of History* (1925), and *Rome and China* (1939)—revolved around what came to be an enduring theme. Teggart's social theory was preoccupied with the shortcomings of academic historians and concerned with evaluating the possibilities of, and articulating a vision for, a new and scientific approach to the study of history.¹⁰

Such advocacy of scientific history, combined with an historical approach to social theory, was a common theme during the interwar years. Prior to the postwar dominance of a sociological agenda that seemingly downplayed various dimensions of theory's historicity, an agenda set by Talcott Parsons at Harvard and Robert Merton at Columbia, the most common theoretical approach to sociology involved constructing and evaluating histories of social thought. While Merton would approvingly cite Alfred North Whitehead's statement that "a science which forgets its founders is lost," interwar sociologists such as Harry Elmer Barnes, Howard P. Becker, Charles Ellwood, and Floyd House pursued their scientific aims with explicit and important reference to sociology's historical antecedents.¹¹ Teggart's sig-

¹⁰ All references to the books of 1918 and 1925 refer to a volume in which they were jointly reprinted, under the title *Theory and Processes of History* (Berkeley, 1941).

¹¹ Whitehead's statement served as epigraph for Merton (1949). Levine (1995, 62) has claimed that in seemingly following Whitehead's injunction, sociologists were in fact "ignoring both the context of the quote and Merton's own practice contradicting it." While Parsons (1937) tried to synthesize the work of Marshall, Pareto, Durkheim, and Weber, and thus arguably engage historically significant works of social theory, Turner and Turner (1990, 118–28) have argued that both Parsons and Merton "were comfortable in regarding whole ranges of past social thought as pointless and erroneous drivel and dismissing them accordingly." This was in sharp contrast to the approaches to theory by interwar sociologists such as Harry Elmer Barnes and Howard Becker, who had an explicit institutional venue for their historical approach to social thought after the founding of the *American Sociological Review* in the mid-1930s. On the *ASR*, see Lengermann (1979), Kuklick (1973, 3–22); and Bannister (1987, 188–230). Finally, another contrast between the theoretical approaches of interwar sociology and that represented by Parsons comes from the author of *Structure* himself, who contrasted his approach to that of his Harvard colleague Pitirim Sorokin in a 1968 "Introduction to the Paperback Edition." Whereas Sorokin considered competing sociological theories in the "plural," Parsons sought instead the underlying unity of "a coherent *body* of theoretical thinking" (ix). Thus Parsons put forward what Levine (1995, 22–26, 35–48) has called a "synthetic narrative," while Sorokin spun out a sociological story of the "pluralist" variety (see Sorokin 1928). While Parsons' *Structure* was published less than a decade later in 1937, it was "little heeded by the sociological community for a decade or so after it appeared," rising dramatically in importance only during the postwar period (Levine 1995, 35). On Parsons and *The Structure of Social Action*, see Camic (1987, 421–39; 1989, 38–107; 1991, ix–lxix).

nature course at Berkeley, *The Idea of Progress*, was thus representative of an approach to theory he shared with his sociological peers, and his emphasis on the history of social theory and theories of history drew a significantly receptive audience of sociologists that included—in addition to Barnes (1937), Becker (1941) and House (1926)—Robert Park (1928, 882, 887; 1936, 174–75; 1941, 562) and Pitirim Sorokin (1940). His historical approach to social theory was set in the context of a developing alliance between scholars in the fields of history and sociology. Like the work of Harry Elmer Barnes (1937, 378), who praised Teggart as “unquestionably the foremost writer in this country, if not the world, on the theoretical basis of the new history as a science of social change,” Teggart’s theorizing was significantly impacted by his early career as an “historian.”¹² While Barnes was a product of the influential “Columbia school,” and became the self-appointed champion of the New History promoted by his teacher James Harvey Robinson, Teggart would be as much a critic of the New History as he was of something called “sociology.”

The interwar period witnessed a good number of American historians and social theorists seeking to establish a new relationship between the changing discipline of history and the increasingly important social sciences. When North Carolina sociologist Howard W. Odum (1927) celebrated the “American Masters of Social Science,” he placed the intellectual biographies of such historians as Frederick Jackson Turner and James Harvey Robinson next to those of Albion Small and Franklin Giddings. At the same time, Harry Elmer Barnes (1925) proclaimed the New History’s “fundamental dependence upon the social sciences,” even as he attempted to reconstruct a grand tradition of “historical sociology.” Professional historians, meanwhile, debated the question of “objectivity” at the prodding of Charles Beard and Carl Becker, both students of Robinson and proponents

¹² Barnes, never prone to understatement, was undeterred even by Teggart’s (1926) sharply critical *AHR* review of his *The New History and the Social Studies*. This book, Teggart wrote, was “not an exposition of results arrived at by independent inquiry, but an indoctrination of views derived from courses of instruction under admired teachers.” Barnes, Teggart was claiming, was little more than a cheerleader for James Harvey Robinson. Furthermore, he claimed, Barnes was something of an unscholarly name-dropper: “Dr. Barnes has cultivated a marked predilection for lists of surnames, without adopting the precaution of accompanying his references with the dates of publication.”

of a more socially-engaged approach to historical work. Robinson's *The New History*, a manifesto for this more engaged practice, had included the sociologist in his consideration of "the new allies of history," concluding that there was

more risk in thinking too little than too much, and the kind of thought suggested by the new allies of history should serve, if judiciously practiced, greatly to strengthen and deepen the whole range of historical study and render its results far more valuable than they have hitherto been. (1912, 100)¹³

Robinson's call for a new alliance between history and sociology was, as Peter Novick has shown, set against the backdrop of a suspicion of "sociology" on the part of American historians. Invoking and, as Novick argues, misinterpreting the legacy of Ranke's vision of history written to represent the past *wie es eigentlich gewesen*, American historians resisted calls for historical generalization and suggested that theorizing about history was a hindrance to the true vocation of the historian. "Under the seductive name of sociology," Ephraim Emerton (quoted in Novick 1988, 89) had worried in 1903, "we are meeting once more the ghost of our ancient enemy, the philosophy of history." Nonetheless, at least certain sociologists were open to the alliance that Robinson suggested. In 1909, W.I. Thomas quoted Robinson's "brilliant essay on *History*" at length in the "Introductory" section to his *Source Book for Social Origins* (1909, 5–12). And by the end of World War I, after Robinson had paid Thomas back with a few citations of his own, and as Teggart entered his most philosophically productive period, the alliance between historians and social scientists represented a significant alternative to Emerton's view.¹⁴ Yet the historian's desire to narrate history "as it really was" continued to provide the basis for Teggart's early critique of the discipline. The historical profession was, he wrote, "still opposed on principle to generalizations," and continued "to prefer the circumstance to the substance of history" (1910, 709–10).

¹³ While *The New History* was published in 1912, Peter Novick (1988, 86–108, 250–78) has argued that the most significant influence of "the New/Progressive History" was felt by the American historical profession in later decades. On history and sociology in the inter-war period see also M. Smith (1994) Ross (1991), and Bannister (1987).

¹⁴ For a discussion of Thomas, see Ross (1991, 347–57).

Like Robinson, who envisioned a different relationship between “past” and “present,” Teggart promoted purposeful historical inquiry, chastising historians and social scientists for failing to examine the historical record with “the aim of elucidating ‘how things have come to be as they are’ today in various parts of the world” (1941, vi). While historians had, Teggart (1942, 11) suggested, “stood aloof from the urgencies of life” and “declaimed against any aim for their subject beyond the ‘objective’ statement of facts,” their own rhetorical practice violated that norm. Such claims to objectivity had hidden, he claimed, “much unconscious or unacknowledged theorizing” (1910, 710). Running from the philosophy of history would not do.

Critical of naïve empiricism, Teggart seemed to have no more patience for those historians who embraced philosophy and historiography, or attempted to offer generalizations regarding historical processes. While he argued that Croce’s *History: Its Theory and Practice* asked historians to engage with “the fundamental methodological problems” of their subject, and to push forward an otherwise neglected “critical examination of the presuppositions and implications of historiography,” Teggart (1923, 288 and 290) concluded that the book represented little more than an unscientific “mystical idealism.” His review (1926) of Harry Elmer Barnes’ *The New History and the Social Studies* voiced a similar sentiment. Teggart warned that a dissatisfaction with traditional historical practice, as manifested in the criticisms of New Historians like Barnes, was leading to “renewed assaults of what Professor Emerton not improperly described as the ‘ancient enemy.’” Finally, James Harvey Robinson himself came in for criticism, as Teggart took issue with Robinson’s political progressivism. Mistakenly equating “the recommendations of political and social ‘radicals’” with “the conclusions of scientific investigators,” Robinson and other advocates of the New History, Teggart argued (1941, 199–204), had held to a problematic “idea of progress.” He had furthermore remained in the realm of historiography and narrative, rather than pushing for an historical methodology that would achieve genuinely scientific results.

Critical of the New Historians, Teggart kept his distance from the sociologists as well. Many in sociology seem to have repaid the favor. A sociologist sympathetic to his agenda took the 1941 re-publication of Teggart’s two most important theoretical works as an occasion to remind sociologists of Teggart’s academic existence and intellectual

project. "Why is it," asked Howard P. Becker in a review of Teggart's *Theory and Processes of History*,

that, with a few distinguished exceptions such as Park, sociologists have paid little attention to Teggart's hypotheses, concepts, and evidence? Is it because we are so parochial that we recognize nothing as having sociological import unless it bears the sociological label? (Becker 1941, 734)

From his perspective, a fuller consideration of Teggart by sociologists was long overdue. Becker and Barnes (1938: 997) had classified Teggart and Sorokin as "among the few workers in historical sociology" on the American scene during the late 1930s. Yet Teggart had actively resisted the application of the label "sociologist." This seemed to irk Becker, who complained in his review that Teggart had "never been very cordial to sociologists, and some of us may have sensed that fact." Teggart was "a man who has rarely used the words 'sociology' or 'sociologist' in other than disparaging senses" (Becker 1941, 734–35).

If Teggart was, in Becker's terms, an "historical sociologist" who unfortunately refused, to the detriment of his possible influence within the field, to accept his proper title, the resistance to "sociology" in his Department of Social Institutions had only led to his further isolation:

Teggart's steadfast refusal to apply a label more definite than 'social institutions' to his department at Berkeley seems a bit lone-wolfish. Always an isolated figure among historians, most of whom appreciated neither his methodological finesse and erudition nor his assault on their cherished foibles, he deprived himself of valuable allies among sociologists. (1941, 735)

While Becker obviously considered himself one such potential ally—his praise of Teggart was, like that from Barnes, elaborate and effusive—he waffled when it came to Teggart's inclusion within the discursive and disciplinary universe of sociology. In a letter to his friend John D. Hicks at the University of California, written a few years after his *ASR* review of Teggart's work, Becker inquired about the establishment of a department of sociology at Berkeley. "As you know," he told Hicks, "you don't really have one." Teggart had officially retired from the University in 1940, and "the old Teggart department," Becker suggested, simply did not "fit the bill" where sociology was concerned. Worrying that Wisconsin, his sociological

home for many years, was entering a "twilight of the gods" period, Becker was clearly angling for a position at Berkeley.¹⁵ Within a year Berkeley would expand its Department of Social Institutions, renaming it the "Department of Sociology and Social Institutions." The University would then actively recruit such sociologists as Seymour Martin Lipset, Reinhard Bendix, Philip Selznick, and Herbert Blumer, the last of whom was made department chair in 1952. With new faculty appointments in almost every year in the 1950s, Blumer would increase both the quantity and quality of the department's faculty, so that by the mid-1960s the Berkeley department had risen to rank among the best in the nation and world.¹⁶

If Berkeley sociology was on the rise in the postwar period, it would not be unreasonable to suggest, in terms at least of its attempts to develop greater departmental girth, that it was rushing to catch up with the rest of the discipline. By the late 1930s, when "sociology" became a prominent source of debate on the Berkeley campus, the lateness of its possible institutional inclusion was well recognized, both within the University of California and nationally (Ross 1991;

¹⁵ Becker to Hicks, 21 March 1945. Forwarding the letter to UC President Robert G. Sproul (Hicks to Sproul, 4 April 1945), Hicks, a newly appointed Dean of the Graduate Division, promised that his friend was worthy of consideration, "an excellent man as sociologists go." "The matter of establishing a Department of Sociology at the University of California," Hicks continued, "must be to you an old familiar friend. At the moment I have no ideas on the subject." Quite likely, by the spring of 1945, when Sproul received a copy of Becker's letter along with this short introduction from Hicks, the question of Sociology on the Berkeley campus was, if not "an old familiar friend," certainly an issue on which Sproul had been well briefed. Indeed, he was probably rather pleased that Hicks had "no ideas on the subject," because—or so it must have seemed—just about everyone else did.

¹⁶ By 1961–62, the faculty included, in addition to Bendix, Lipset, Selznick, and Blumer: John Clausen, Kingsley Davis, Wolfram Eberhard, Charles Glock, Leo Lowenthal, Margaret Hodgen, Kenneth Bock, Erving Goffman, William Kornhauser, William Petersen, Franz Schurmann, Hanan Selvin, Neil Smelser, David Matza, and Martin Trow. In the decade that followed, these faculty were joined by Harold Wilensky, Nathan Glazer, Robert Blauner, Jerome Skolnick, Robert Bellah, Philippe Nonet, Arthur Stinchcombe, Arlie Hochschild, Troy Duster, Guy Swanson, and Harry Edwards, among others. As Alvin Gouldner wrote (1970, 22): "In the view of many American sociologists, during the 1960's the dominant American center had moved . . . to the University of California at Berkeley." More recently Collins (1998, 298) has claimed that the Berkeley Sociologists "set so much of the new direction of research, and trained so many of the leading sociologists of the next generation"; he compared Berkeley in the 1950s and 60s to earlier "great" departments at Chicago and Columbia, and to Harvard in the era of Sorokin, Parsons, Homans, and Riesman.

Bannister 1987; M. Smith 1994). The establishment of a department of sociology at Berkeley had been, as one sociologist wrote in 1939, “long-deferred.”¹⁷ Surveying the state of sociology in the United States one year earlier, Becker and Barnes (1938, 982–83) found a growing academic discipline, the result of forward movement in twentieth-century American social science. Here was a tale of progress, advancement, and expansion, a story of “the spread of sociology.” “The last quarter of a century,” they wrote, “has witnessed the real establishment of sociology as an important university and college subject in the United States.” While historians of this period have generally emphasized the dominance of university departments and academic figures at Chicago and Columbia, and rightly so, Becker and Barnes found reason to suggest that “the configuration represented by the old Columbia-Chicago struggle for intellectual supremacy in sociology may eventually become polygonal.” By 1938 there were several centers of sociological ferment. In addition to Chicago and Columbia, Becker and Barnes noted the existence of substantial departments at Wisconsin, Michigan, Brown, Yale, Pennsylvania, Minnesota, North Carolina, and Northwestern. And beyond these “important university centers” lay the expansion of sociology into the state universities of the Midwest, and even into high school curricula. Finally, they noted triumphantly (1938, 987–88), “one of the few remaining strongholds of opposition capitulated” in 1930 when Harvard opened its doors to a Department of Sociology, headed by Pitirim Sorokin.¹⁸

The tone of the story shifted slightly, however, when the authors reached their discussion of the Pacific Coast. The progressive march of sociology had yet to complete its westward expansion, the West representing an as-yet-unconquered academic frontier. Thus, while Becker and Barnes noted that “excellent sociological instruction” was available at a small handful of West Coast colleges and universities, they claimed that only two actual departments were “flourishing,” at the University of Southern California and the University of Washington. Notably, the University of California system seemed to have remained untouched by sociology’s recent institutional expan-

¹⁷ Arthur J. Todd to Monroe Deutsch, 14 January 1939.

¹⁸ On the question of what Becker and Barnes called the “struggle for intellectual supremacy,” some accounts suggest that by the 1940s and 1950s the discipline was being dominated by departments at Columbia and Harvard, with Chicago’s influence waning. See Haney (1998).

sion. The authors singled out the situation at Berkeley as particular cause for lament. "One of the opportunities for a truly great graduate department of sociology on the Pacific Coast," they opined, "namely, at the University of California in Berkeley, has been frustrated through the opposition of vested interests in the Berkeley faculty." All was not lost at Berkeley, however, since "this deficiency is in part offset by the sociological interests of the brilliant California ethnologists, Lowie and Kroeber, and the sociological orientation of the ablest historical methodologist in the United States, F.J. Teggart" (Becker and Barnes 1938, 989–90).

Interestingly, and perhaps not surprisingly, these "vested interests," attached as they were to what Robert Nisbet would many years later call the "fiefs" of the Berkeley campus, seem to have belonged precisely to the individuals whose work bore the strongest family resemblance to that being carried out under the disciplinary banner of sociology. Thus, Becker and Barnes noted the "sociological interests" of Lowie and Kroeber, both of whom were in Berkeley's Department of Anthropology, established with Kroeber as its chair in 1901, and the "sociological orientation" of Frederick Teggart, who had been teaching in the Department of Social Institutions. Yet, according to Nisbet, reflecting on the situation some forty years later, the opposition to sociology at Berkeley had come from just these "old titans," in addition to others like them, such as Jessica Peixotto in Economics and Carl Sauer in Geography. Berkeley's opportunity for sociological greatness had been "frustrated" by an opposition to its institutional introduction on the part of the University's most "sociological" faculty.¹⁹

During the 1930s, a period of expansion and increasing "scientism" within the academic discipline of American sociology, "sociologist" seems to have been a label which no one on the Berkeley campus wished to claim. In the fall of 1932, after President Sproul requested that she respond to an *AJS* inquiry from the University

¹⁹ Robert A. Nisbet to Stephen Murray, 9 March 1977. In a series of letters, Murray had prodded Nisbet to reflect on the opposition to sociology at Berkeley. Murray would follow Nisbet in regarding "the social science fiefs" as "aligned against the introduction of vacuous sociology," and his article on the "resistance to sociology" drew on interviews and archival sources, including a particularly contentious compilation of documents archived by Teggart's former colleague Margaret Hodgen in 1971; see Murray (1980, 63; details on the collection in footnote 21 below).

of Chicago sociologist and American Sociological Society president Louis Wirth, Jessica Peixotto sent back a curt reply:

I deeply regret I have no special knowledge concerning the Personnel Exchange Section of the American Journal Sociology. May I recommend that you send your letter on to Miss Hodgen, who is in the department of sociology, called Social Institutions here. You know I am not a sociologist but an economist.²⁰

This short note not only distinguished Peixotto's academic activities from the still suspect "sociology"; it also suggested, without mentioning him by name, that Teggart's department was the most appropriate one to which that name could be attached. Yet Teggart would most certainly have bristled at the classification of his respective academic "fief" as a department of sociology. Both Teggart and Hodgen would be dogged foes of sociology's departmental establishment at Berkeley during the 1940s.²¹ Entering University discourse during the 1930s and 1940s as a "classificatory epithet," the sociological label was resisted in the midst of struggles over the symbolic order among Berkeley social scientists.²² Distrust of the label and the academic

²⁰ Jessica B. Peixotto to President Robert G. Sproul, 19 October 1932. While she later resisted classification as a sociologist, Peixotto was in fact Berkeley's first named assistant professor of sociology, so far as I can tell, receiving that title in 1907, while situated in the Department of Economics. By 1912, Peixotto had shrugged off that label, becoming a professor of "social economics" (Hatfield 1935; Cookingham 1987; Nerad 1999).

²¹ Teggart offered his most precise articulation of the difference between "sociology" and "social institutions" in a letter to Dean George P. Adams (20 June 1945). For Hodgen's views on "sociology," see her account of the battles between "sociology" and "social institutions," Hodgen, Margaret T. 1971. *The Department of Social Institutions of the University of California (Berkeley), 1919–1946*. Unpublished compilation, University Archives, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.

²² The notion of a "classificatory epithet" is Pierre Bourdieu's. It appears, in a slightly different guise, in *Homo Academicus* (1988, 14–15). Although the classification of "sociologist" seems to have been for many years a label to be avoided at Berkeley, this has not deterred the retrospective reconstruction of a sociological tradition at the University whose roots are taken to precede even Teggart. Indeed, the informal historiography of sociology at Berkeley, small though it may be, indicates the previous presence of a number of significantly "sociological" professors. Stanford Lyman has traced sociology's origins on the Berkeley campus all the way back to the University's beginnings. "The teaching of sociological theory at Berkeley began in 1868 with the appointment of that university's first professor, Joseph Le Conte." Lyman has traced "a Berkeley Dialogue on Sociology, Social Change and Symbolic Interaction" that included, in addition to Le Conte, Teggart, and Blumer, Josiah Royce, whose "philosophical sociology contributed indirectly but significantly to the development of the discipline at Berkeley." Royce's indirect influence on Berkeley Sociology was worked, according to Lyman, through his teaching at Harvard, "where

practices associated with it was not universal, however. Although past opposition had come from various academic "titans" scattered across the University, by the end of the 1930s administrators concerned with the formation of a Department of Sociology realized that the biggest obstacle to achieving their institutional goal was resistance from faculty in Social Institutions.²³

Given his ties to the discourse and discipline of sociology, in addition to the small size of his Department of Social Institutions, it is perhaps not surprising that renewed discussion of sociology's establishment at Berkeley coincided with Teggart's plans to retire. If, however, the reality of Teggart's imminent departure seemed to signal that the time for sociology's "long-deferred" introduction might finally have come, the department he would leave behind presented something of a problem. Establishing a new department of sociology, the administration worried, "would raise fundamental questions of organization" for Teggart's old department.

Recalling the ensuing feuds over such "fundamental questions," Margaret T. Hodgen collected a series of administrative and departmental documents intended to mark Teggart's singular achievements and to substantiate her story of "the invasion of sociology" on the Berkeley campus.²⁴ In 1940, Hodgen claimed, an effort was made to "obtain a foothold" for sociology by establishing a higher degree in its name. This was an institutional change that occurred in the context of an expanding interest in sociology on the part of students, and as the result of advocacy for a more systematic curriculum by economist Paul Schuster Taylor and sociologist Dorothy Swaine Thomas. Thomas, already prominent within sociological circles, had been brought to Berkeley—Robert Nisbet would claim many years

he influenced a generation of students among whom was George Herbert Mead, the principal intellectual influence on Herbert Blumer" (Lyman 1988, 127, 129).

²³ "While the Department of Economics did many years ago under the influence of Miss Peixotto and Dr. Plehn object to the creation of a separate department in this field," wrote Dean Calkins to President Sproul, "the opposition to such a department has come in recent years not from the Department of Economics, but from the Department of Social Institutions" (20 February 1939). Although Teggart's department had been in existence for nearly two decades by the time of his retirement in 1940—an event that coincided with the on-campus activism of an increasingly vocal pro-sociology contingent—the department had remained quite small and still included only two other faculty members, Margaret Hodgen and Robert Nisbet, both former students of Teggart and among his most ardent disciples.

²⁴ See footnote 21.

later—under the specific assumption that she would eventually be made chair of a new Department of Sociology (see Murray 1980). Instead, upon her arrival at the University, Thomas found herself in seemingly constant conflict with Hodgen, who would become her chief academic rival at Berkeley. When, in Hodgen's second stage of sociological invasion, "a hybrid department entitled Sociology and Social Institutions" was established in the ashes of Teggart's academic outpost, Thomas was left out of the new dispensation altogether. She would leave Berkeley two years later, in disappointment and disgust, going on to a distinguished career at the University of Pennsylvania and to eventual service as the President of the American Sociological Society (Roscoe 1991).

The University of California established its "Department of Sociology and Social Institutions" in 1946, and the philosopher Edward Strong was appointed chair, as faculty and administrators continued to debate the emphasis and orientation of this "hybrid" department. Six years later, after Strong failed to convince Everett Hughes that California was preferable to Chicago, Herbert Blumer made his mythic journey westward from American sociology's center to chair the Berkeley Department.²⁵ The additional "and Social Institutions" was not officially dropped from the departmental masthead until 1960, thus completing the transition from "Social Institutions" to "Sociology." By that time the change was seen as little more than a matter of semantics. Not even Kenneth Bock, a Teggart protégé who had stayed on during the years of transition, would remember, when asked about it decades later, that the final change of name had taken so many years.²⁶ This was a situation quite different from that of the early 1940s, when participants in the debates over "sociology" acted as though classification was all.

²⁵ With Blumer's arrival, Edward Strong returned to the department of philosophy. During the early 1960s, Strong would serve as Berkeley's Chancellor, a role thanks to which he is often remembered as that frightened looking figure behind the bullhorn, being jeered at by the students that occupied Sproul Hall in the midst of a Free Speech Movement demonstration. On Berkeley's failed bid for Hughes, see Strong's oral history, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley. For a fascinating discussion of the year preceding Blumer's move to Berkeley, and the struggle for the reins of the "Chicago School" tradition, see Abbott (1999).

²⁶ While Bock remained in the department for many years, Robert Nisbet departed for UC-Riverside in 1953, and Margaret Hodgen never really returned to Berkeley after her significant involvement in the University's loyalty oath controversy. See Nisbet (1992).

In a recent memoir of his years in Berkeley, Teggart's student and colleague Robert Nisbet has claimed that it was Teggart's Social Institutions that first brought sociology to Berkeley, "*de facto, if not de jure or de nomine.*" "Berkeley's department of social institutions," Nisbet wrote, "was substantively and operationally sociology" (1992, 155–56). But Teggart apparently resisted the label. And while he read and appreciated the work of certain well-known American sociologists and schooled his Social Institutions students in these very same texts, he refused to recognize the academic researchers he approved of as "sociologists." "Teggart was a great admirer of W.I. Thomas and Albion Small," Kenneth Bock recalled. "These people and Sorokin were standard fare in the department of social institutions. They may have called themselves 'sociologists,' but they were viewed as being mistaken" (quoted in Murray 1980, 65). Nonetheless, in the year after his retirement, Teggart's short article on "War and Civilization in the Future" appeared in the *American Journal of Sociology*. The journal had only recently been replaced by the *American Sociological Review* as the American Sociological Association's official organ of publication, and was still controlled by prominent sociologists in the powerful Chicago department (Lengermann 1979). Teggart's major works of historiography and comparative history—*Theory of History* and *Rome and China*—had by that time been mentioned positively by Robert Park and reviewed by Chicago's Floyd N. House, Harvard's Pitirim Sorokin, and Wisconsin's Howard Becker. In 1925, sociologist Frank H. Hankins (1925) had included Teggart's work in his assessment of contemporary developments within the fields of sociology, classifying him amidst a Byzantine barrage of sociological names and theoretical categories. Becker and Barnes, as we have seen, sang Teggart's praises and included him in their consideration of "historical sociology." And L.L. Bernard's *The Fields and Methods of Sociology* (1934, 24, 27), dedicated to the members of the American Sociological Society, put Teggart in the field of historical sociology as well, comparing him with Tönnies, Durkheim, Shotwell, and Robinson.

Indeed, near the end of his career, Teggart went on to become a member of the sociologists' professional association, by then known as the A.S.A. Furthermore, while Teggart's own contacts with professional sociologists and historians—and ultimately, Robert Nisbet later suggested, just about everyone else—seem to have been rather limited, Berkeley graduate students earning their Ph.D.s under Teggart successfully found jobs in departments of sociology at other U.S.

universities.²⁷ And, in the summer months of the late 1930s, Berkeley's Department of Social Institutions finally began to welcome visiting sociologists such as L.L. Bernard, Floyd House, Frank Hankins and Harry Elmer Barnes.²⁸ Thus, despite his well-known antipathy toward sociology, by the end of his career Teggart's name and work had been appearing in markedly sociological venues for some time.

But Teggart's academic identity cannot be resolved as simply as Nisbet would suggest. Teggart was a critic of "sociology's scientific path," as Ross wrote, but "the trick was" that Teggart's own commitments were to the development of scientific comparative history (1991, 446–48). During the interwar years, Teggart's critical attitude toward "sociology" consistently confounded attempts to classify his otherwise quite "sociological" work. Reviewing *Theory of History* in the *American Journal of Sociology*, for instance, Floyd House split his time between parsing and placing Teggart. His review opened with the latter:

Professor Teggart occupies the chair of "Social Institutions" at the University of California. He was once considered a historian, but historians refused to own him because of the unorthodoxy of some of his ideas about historical method. On the other hand, he has a personal antipathy to the label "sociologist."

After quickly summarizing Teggart's position, and suggesting that what the book seemed "actually to prove" amounted to a position

²⁷ Teggart to Deutsch, 8 December 1939; Nisbet to Murray, 22 November 1977 (courtesy Murray); Nisbet (1992, 155–56). Asked to reflect in the late 1960s on his own sociological self-image, Robert Nisbet noted, as he would increasingly in the years to come, the early, yet lasting influence of Teggart. Referring to his former teacher as "a great and in many ways original mind," Nisbet nonetheless complained that Teggart "could be monumentally one-sided." Teggart's failure to fully confront a stream of sociological classics was largely the result, he argued, of an intellectual isolation from the great men who had made the field of sociology, those "titans of the sociological tradition." (Nisbet in Horowitz 1969, 200–01). Elsewhere, Nisbet (1978, 36) remembered his mentor as "a recluse by nature, almost never attending scholarly meetings and conferences, and, to my knowledge, never paying any living scholar a written compliment." Finding cause for lament in Teggart's academic isolation, Nisbet suggested that Teggart's "generally dismissive attitude toward the work of others in the scholarly world was set in a personal reclusiveness that became more and more complete" during the years of the 1930s (1978–79, 79.) While Nisbet would in his memoir identify Teggart as "the finest scholarly mind I have known in my life," he nevertheless read Teggart's reclusiveness as intellectual weakness, a failing that had adversely affected the scope of the teaching in *Social Institutions*: "I never once heard him refer to Durkheim, Simmel, Weber, Tönnies, Cooley, Thomas, Mead, Tocqueville" (1992, 145).

²⁸ Nisbet to Murray, 16 October 1977; Nisbet (1999, 155–56).

closer to his own, House returned to Teggart's relationship to sociologists. While Teggart had found such characters "scarcely worth mention," perhaps that was at least in part the result of ignorance. "It may be remarked," House wrote, "that some work has been accomplished by sociologists of which, apparently, Professor Teggart is not informed." House wondered aloud, for instance, whether Teggart had even read Thomas and Znaniecki's *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America*, a book that had been footnoted in *Theory of History*. Like [Thomas,] Park, and Miller's *Old World Traits Transplanted*, *The Polish Peasant* seemed to House to be a study "of exactly the sort which [Teggart] desires to see made" (House 1926). How, in short, could Teggart criticize sociology's limitations without a fuller consideration of such works?

The complaint behind this query was a common one, even among those who admired Teggart's work enough to positively review and cite it. Celebrating "the triumph of scientific method in historical sociology," Barnes, as late as 1948, was still calling Teggart's work "one of the most important contributions to the theory of cultural change and social evolution." Still Barnes called readers' attention to the fact that Teggart's writing "came not from the pen of a sociologist but from an historian." He concluded, "Teggart's main weakness was his lack of command of up-to-date sociology" (Barnes 1948, 70–71).²⁹ Similarly, while praising Teggart's "hard-headed empiricism" and his "theoretical acumen," Becker noted that *Theory of History* had treated "sociology" as if nothing had happened in that field since the publication of Teggart's *Prolegomena of History* seven years earlier. Yet when *Theory of History* appeared, Becker claimed, "sociology had been manifesting a remarkable burst of activity and attested results all over the world." Teggart's failure to consider the elements of such work seemed to Becker to demonstrate "little goodwill toward sociology"—an attitude, like Teggart's repeated "unfairness to social

²⁹ Had he still been alive at the time of this book's publication, Teggart would have been dismayed, to say the least, at Barnes' characterization of his work as an attempt to "combine the accuracy of the documentary, narrative historians with the evolutionary sweep of the sociologists." Not only was Barnes' summary of Teggart a vast oversimplification of the alternative to both narrative history and sociology that Teggart had proposed, but the suggestion that Teggart wished to draw on "the evolutionary sweep of the sociologists"—seeking, as Barnes put it in another unfortunate phrase, "to discover the constants and determinants in historical sequences and cultural evolution"—came very close to misrepresenting Teggart's position on evolutionism.

scientists,” which seemed to vex Becker, even as he urged the importance of Teggart’s theoretical accomplishments (Becker 1941).

Theory of History was a sustained critique of several different approaches to the study of historical events and Teggart’s introduction to own his proposed scientific alternative. The book opened with Teggart’s critique of the historians whose academic activity consisted, as he had already argued, in the study of concrete events and in their presentation through the creation of a narrative. The composition of such narratives maintained a tradition of historiography that had, despite the modern historians’ claims to the contrary, continued to limit and define the writing of academic history. History writing was thus, rather than the science it pretended to be, an ancient art form and an “important instrument of propaganda” (1941, 36). Yet Teggart was not entirely critical of the historian’s art. He praised it both in *Theory of History* and in a related unpublished article, “A Plea for the Study of History as a Type of Literature” (in Dangberg 1983, 338–44). But as the title of his article suggested, historical writing was to be seen as a type of literature rather than a form of science. It involved the imposition of philosophical ideas upon historical facts, narrative “design” being less the result of worldly substance than historical creation (Teggart 1941, 54).

Turning from the historians and their study of events to the evolutionary theory that had laid the foundations of American social science, Teggart faced his lifelong nemesis, the idea of *progress*, and one of its most influential representatives, Auguste Comte. While historians had attended only to the study of “events,” the evolutionary theorists had sought only the study of “change,” leaving behind the world of actual historical events in the process. But an abstract commitment to “progress,” Teggart argued, not only stood in the way of the advancement of historical science, it also involved a practical, political difficulty.

To believe in progress, is to adopt a supine attitude toward existence; is to cultivate an enthusiasm for whatever chance may bring; is to assume that perfection and happiness lie ahead, whatever may be the course of human action in the present (1941, 220).

Thus, social scientists generally and sociologists in particular were doubly misled, confused by their quest for the a-historical and the “timeless,” and caught up in a problematic presupposition regarding the progressive course of historical development (Teggart 1941, 82–91; 1929).

If the substance of Teggart's theorizing set him apart from sociologists, however, his most significant attempt to put his methodological principles into practice, *Rome and China: A Study of Correlations in Historical Events* (1939), engaged in markedly "sociological" generalization about history. Completed just as Teggart was preparing to retire, *Rome and China* represented the culmination of years of historical inquiry. While his earlier books had articulated his theory of history and set it apart from others, his final work was an effort to practice the sort of historical science he had been promoting. Following the assumption that historical events needed to be classed or categorized in order for a comparative, scientific history to be carried forward, Teggart isolated in "the recurrent barbarian invasions of the Roman empire" a grouping of historical processes that would suit his analytical purposes. He then proceeded to argue, through a careful reconstruction of events, that a comparison across cases yielded valid generalizations regarding the sources of the invasions he was considering. Wars in Asia, he suggested, and a consequent interruption of communications and commerce, had invariably preceded the resulting invasions into Europe. "And no occasion is known," he wrote, "on which the results appeared except in succession to the antecedents." Likewise, Teggart claimed (1939, 239-40), the antecedent wars had always been followed by "barbarian invasions." Teggart argued that he had located significant historical correlations, a set of "invariable uniformities." His book, he concluded, had not only "demonstrated beyond the possibility of doubt that in the affairs of nations causes have effects, and that a given cause will produce a characteristic effect;" the analysis had also suggested that causes in one context might yield eventual effects in another, and that this process occurred, in at least some cases, in a regular, "invariable," manner. A scientific history therefore could not draw its boundaries at the borders of nations (Teggart 1939, 243-44; 1919).

By the method of comparison across cases and national contexts, Teggart hoped to achieve an approach to history that did not separate the study of events from the study of change in time, thus bringing together the concerns of both historians and social scientists. Yet his ambitious approach to history, which set him apart from other "new" historians, also distinguished him from current social scientists. While sociologists worked to identify the unchanging laws of history by abstracting from its concrete realities, Teggart attempted to locate identifiable regularities in history's concrete

specificity. Aiming to articulate the “substance” embedded in history’s “circumstances,” he thus sought to generalize about history and to outline its underlying “processes,” without naturalizing those processes and without treating them as the inevitable outcome of a-historical social or political laws (Teggart 1941, 156–67, 293–314). “What we are given in experience,” he wrote, “is not one history, but a great number of histories. History is not unitary, but pluralistic.” The challenge for the scientist was not simply to narrate one particular history or another, but to compare multiple histories, recognizing that such comparison required the classification of similar events. The barbarian invasions of the Roman Empire were only one such class of events. If historians would only make the attempt, they were sure to recognize others.³⁰

Although it provided a distinctive approach to comparative history, Teggart’s method failed to carry his own philosophical impulse to its logical conclusion. If the narratives of traditional historiography were bound to be artful and scientifically arbitrary recapitulations selected from “an infinite number of occurrences at different times and in different places” (1942, 6), how was his own selection of a class of historical events any different? The classification of events was itself, as Teggart realized, an act of the historian. But he assumed that accurate classification could involve a scientific recognition of real similarities, underlying the vagaries of seeming historical accident. Teggart thus appeared to assume that his pluralistic histories were actual instantiations of a more basic historical substance.

Yet how was the validity of Teggart’s supposed historical similarity to be assessed? Reviewing *Rome and China* for the *American Journal of Sociology*, Sorokin questioned the accuracy of Teggart’s historical claims and took issue with his “highly artificial hypothesis,” arguing that Teggart’s specification of causal events was at best disputable. Because “the beginning and end of each war or uprising is unknown,” he wrote, the uniform sequence Teggart had emplotted was suspiciously arbitrary. While Sorokin went on to disagree with Teggart’s account on empirical grounds—there was, he claimed, “no convincing

³⁰ “Historians who may concern themselves,” Teggart told an audience at the American Historical Association, “with the events of the twentieth century will always be forced to give attention to the rise of dictators, a class of events. You, I think, will admit it to be a matter of urgency that we should leave no means untried to enlarge our understanding of this menacing phenomenon” (Teggart 1942, 6–7).

evidence" behind *Rome and China's* chosen historical sequencing—his criticisms pointed toward a more basic philosophical problem for the work of comparative history: How could comparable events be selected and identified in a manner that would not yield on-going historical dispute? How was the comparing historian to ensure the recognition of their fundamental similarity (Sorokin 1940, 387–90)?³¹

While contending that Teggart's argument was less than convincing, Sorokin also found reason to praise the work. Here was, he wrote, "a valuable sociological study," which despite its shortcomings remained "an important contribution to the field of history and sociology" (1940, 387, 390). As he never formally responded to Sorokin's review, we can only guess at what Teggart might have made of this assessment of his work. But he no doubt would have taken issue with the suggestion that *Rome and China* was a contribution to a field called "sociology." By the early 1940s, when Sorokin's review appeared, Teggart was already engaged in the battle over sociology at the University of California, his comments on the subject ranging from mildly acerbic to bitter and biting, consistently denying sociology the status of a coherent historical science. The scientific coherence of "sociology," Teggart implied in a 1945 letter to Berkeley philosopher George P. Adams, depended upon a recognized and legitimate definition of the field. Yet sociologists, he noted, had not provided one.³²

While the 1940s brought battles over sociology to Berkeley, the field had received Teggart's attention for the many years that he had warned of its excesses and ambitions. In 1910, he cautioned historians that "the attempt to protect history from generalizations" was leading to "desertions" as well as "usurpations of its territory," not least on behalf of the spreading new social sciences. "The sociologist," Teggart declared (1910, 71–11), "has established for himself a new imperium, and history is the scullion in the house of political science." By 1939, as Teggart was publishing his reflections on ancient barbarian invasions and another world war was looming in Europe, the barbarians of sociology were storming Sather Gate, seeking to battle their way into his Department of Social Institutions

³¹ Committed to historical science as an inductive practice whose generalizations were "always subject to revision," Teggart could likely have lived with the possibility of on-going classificatory dispute (see Teggart 1929).

³² Teggart to Adams, 20 June 1945.

and to extend the range of their expanding academic empire. "In one place only in the world," he told President Sproul in 1945,

has there been a patient effort to explore the path by which the knowledge so much needed might be gained—in one department of the University of California . . . And now, as I am given to understand, the administrative machinery is in operation to put an end to these endeavors for the common welfare.³³

Thus, throughout the debates of the 1940s Teggart and his colleagues worried that the coming of the sociological empire might mean the end of the reign of Social Institutions.

If Teggart lamented the domestication of history by the grand projects of social science and worried about the future of his little department at Berkeley, others marveled at sociology's many wonders, celebrating its diversity and profusion even as they debated its form and content. The rising discourse of professionalizing sociologists, contested as it was, provided the field with a degree of disciplinary coherence as the 1930s wore on. But sociology was not, during the period of Teggart's theoretically innovative work, an entirely well-defined and delimited academic discipline. As Hankins wrote in the same year that Teggart's *Theory of History* was published:

As one leaves the founders and approaches the highly complicated but still amorphous body of writings which constitute the literature of sociology today, he is rather bewildered by its luxuriance and variety and appalled by its mass. (1925)

Teggart, who agreed with Hankins that "sociology" was a label applied to a significantly diverse set of academic writings and intellectual projects, consistently presented himself as more appalled than bewildered.

"Sociology," Teggart suggested—his letters rarely failing to put that word in scare quotes—was a subject without a coherent subject matter, a signifier without a definable signified, and thus a label which could be attached willy-nilly to various academic projects, turned to whatever ends its increasingly numerous users pleased. In a letter to Berkeley Provost Monroe Deutsch, he adopted Luther Bernard's notion of "schools of sociology" in order to explain why sociologists had not yet successfully made their discipline a "science":

³³ Teggart to Sproul, 1 May 1945.

"In the absence of a definite scientific objective," he wrote, "there have come into existence as many 'schools' of Sociology in the United States as there are large departments with this designation." The label of "Sociology," he concluded, was "a name which can be stretched to include any current topic of discussion."³⁴ "Sociology," he insisted to President Sproul, "has not a high reputation for scholarship anywhere." "It is the name," he told Adams, "the thought on analogy concerned with 'laws,' that has proved captivating, and not the content of the subject." Sociology's scientific failures had made it, in his eyes, an academic embarrassment, and he considered it "the least respected of the social sciences."³⁵

But the disciplinary umbrella of "sociology" was not only a venue of suspect and shoddy scholarship; it was also an arena through which negative moral influences might enter academic discourse and university life. "Everywhere the exponents of Sociology have shown themselves aggressive and intolerant," he wrote to Sproul, "and in more than one institution have not hesitated to bring outside influence to bear upon the university authorities." Sending the UC President a recent copy of the *American Journal of Sociology*, and warning ominously of the dangers presented by its trendy subject matter and proselytizing zeal, Teggart referred with disdain to "the recent vogue of Sociology." The enclosed article ought to demonstrate, he claimed, how "under the apparently innocuous caption of the 'Family' the discussion of Sex has reached down to almost unimaginable levels in university instruction."³⁶

In another letter to Sproul, Teggart connected sociology's amorphous subject matter with its potentially dangerous political advocacy. Sociology was,

a subject that has no defined content, no recognized conceptual framework, no established procedure, and no positive aim beyond the advocacy of "social control"—a control for the enforcement of which, its advocates say, "the employment of force will perhaps always continue to have a legitimate place."³⁷

³⁴ Bernard, "Schools of Sociology," in Bernard 1934, 3–17; Teggart to Deutsch, 8 Dec. 1939.

³⁵ Teggart to Sproul, 8 April 1941; Teggart to Adams, 20 June 1945, Teggart to Sproul, 7 March 1946.

³⁶ Teggart to Sproul, 8 April 1941.

³⁷ Teggart to Sproul, 7 March 1946.

Thus, Teggart's more vitriolic critiques of sociology flirted with potential inconsistency. Did sociology have a *telos*, or did it not? As his rhetoric grew richer, Teggart seemed to imply that it did, that sociology's underlying agenda made inappropriate matters the subject of university discourse, and that its articulated aims included the advocacy of forceful political agendas. Yet these criticisms of such advocacy during the years of the Department of Social Institutions' most vigorous and vehement resistance to sociology's introduction at Berkeley were not incompatible with his earlier worries about sociology's supposedly absent agenda. In the absence of an authentic scientific agenda, sociologists had simply fallen prey to the recommendations of radicals. As Teggart's criticisms of the "New History" had already made clear, there was no room for political progressivism in his vision of a scientific field (Teggart 1941, 199–204). Nonetheless, even during the 1940s Teggart's critique generally emphasized that no unilateral goal was operative within contemporary sociology. The discipline's most significant problem was an absent agenda rather than a dangerously illicit one.

If Teggart's view of his sociological contemporaries was bound up in his critique of sociology's absent scientific agenda, this may have been due to an unwillingness to identify with any sociological perspective other than his own. At times, the individualism of Teggart's perspective bordered on absurdity, identifying the Social Institutions approach as unique the world over.³⁸ Yet his own engagement with specific sociological perspectives marked these viewpoints as worthy of critique and suggested that the discipline's absent agenda was most of all the result of imperfect attempts to constitute sociology as science. Not unreasonably, Teggart's academic peers often interpreted these criticisms of the discipline as contributions to the discourse of sociology, even as they recognized his pretension to stand above the fray. Teggart's critical efforts as much as his constructive attempts at historical science—what Becker and Barnes would call "historical sociology"—were seen as contributions to the project of sociological theory, a project that continued to constitute itself with reference to its historical antecedents.

Teggart's sustained critique of the sociological enterprise was finally and fundamentally historical in analytic scope, tracing twentieth cen-

³⁸ Teggart to Sproul, 1 May 1945.

tury disciplinary confusions to the deeds and distinctions of sociology's nineteenth century past. In particular, as his treatment of sociology in *Theory of History* made clear, his assault on the discipline was intimately bound up with his understanding of the work of Auguste Comte. Teggart's distaste for a social science modeled on physics led him to criticize Comte's comparative and historical method and to lament Comte's influence within both sociology and anthropology. The word "Sociology," as Teggart was fond of reminding his correspondents, had been invented by Comte, who saw the new discipline as a sort of "social physics," an attempt to bring the rigor of the natural sciences to the study of human societies.³⁹ That attempt, Teggart argued, had failed. Locating the scientific shortcomings of Comte and other early sociologists in their use of a "pseudo-biological symbolism" inappropriate to the study of social life, Teggart regarded analogies between the human body and the body politic as dubious and misguided. His sustained criticism of dominant theories of "progress," both in his writing and in one of his most popular Social Institutions lecture courses, gave Teggart's dismissal of Comtean social evolutionism a sharper edge.⁴⁰

If Comte's work carried a burdensome analogy between natural and social or historical science, not all American sociologists had elected to bear its weight. Thus, Teggart (1941, 105–06) praised Albion Small, a founder of sociology at the University of Chicago, for freeing himself from the "verbal entanglements" associated with the Comtean paradigm. But he remained skeptical as to whether, even without Comte's "misleading analogies," American sociologists had the resources necessary to carry on what Small (1905, ix) had called the "real analysis of social processes."⁴¹ Yet another clue to Teggart's wide-reaching dismissal of American sociology was located in his treatment of Comte's distinction between "history" and "science." Genuinely historical inquiry would require the study of "events," and concrete events were, for Comte, "essentially insignificant" to

³⁹ On Comte's introduction of the term "sociology"—"that horrible hybrid," in the words of Robert Merton, "that has ever since designated the science of society"—see Levine (1995, 14).

⁴⁰ Teggart to Deutsch, 8 Dec. 1939; Teggart (1941, 99–109; 1949).

⁴¹ Here as elsewhere, the precise basis for Teggart's thoroughgoing criticisms of American sociology remained a bit unclear, as he pulled up short just after releasing his most dismissive rhetorical gesture.

the working of science. Since Comte's historical method was borrowed almost wholly from natural science, it followed that historical science and history as the study of events were two distinct endeavors, separated by their relationship to abstract idealization—an academic act sanctioned and required by the first, and logically incoherent in the case of the second.

This critique of the distinction between "history" and "science," which became, in this context, a critique of Comte's illegitimate bifurcation of "history" from "sociology," marked one of Teggart's enduring themes. Having already argued that a distinction between the "study of events" and the "study of change," between history and science, had been accepted by philosophers and historians alike, Teggart now accused sociologists of making the same unjustified separation. Thus, if the practices of academic historians were vigorously attacked in *Theory of History*—"narrative" history could never be more than a creative art form and was therefore an insufficient basis for a substantially scientific history—those practicing something called "Sociology" did not fare much better. By instituting a problematic split between sociological science and the study of historical events, sociologists had failed to overcome the centuries old "separation between the study of events and the study of change in the course of time." As a misguided attempt at social science, sociology remained fixated on an analysis of social change that required abstraction from the concrete flow of events in time. "Both historians and sociologists," he concluded, "have been willing to concur in this judgment," effectively distinguishing the abstract and generalizing science of sociology from the specific and concrete narratives of history (1941, 108–09). A prime example in current American social thought, he noted—tracing the ghost of Comte into the distinctions of contemporary sociology—was the classic by Robert E. Park and Ernest W. Burgess, *Introduction to the Science of Sociology* (1921).

The Park and Burgess text was clearly intended as a unifying discursive force, a volume that would narrate sociology's past, mark its present boundaries, and set its future course. As Dorothy Ross has noted, this book was by far the most successful of its kind, becoming "the dominant text in the field for the next twenty years" (Ross 1991, 395; see also Levine 1995, 16–18). Preceded by notable texts such as W.I. Thomas' *Source Book for Social Origins*, and followed in subsequent years by a series of discipline-building anthologies edited by Odum, Barnes, Becker, Bernard and others, the Park and Burgess

platform for American sociology's advance nonetheless stood out among inter-war sociology texts, retaining a place in the discipline's institutional memory long after others were forgotten. Its influence on sociology's self-conception, including its discipline-defining split between sociology and history, was both significant and lasting.

While Park, who was responsible for the text's important introductory chapter, upheld "the intimate relations which exist between history, politics, and sociology," he also found cause to emphasize their particularity. "The important thing," Park wrote, "is not the identities but the distinctions." Park thus sought to distinguish sociology from history, to show how the two academic practices importantly differed:

As far as history and sociology are concerned the differences may be summed up in a word. Both history and sociology are concerned with the life of man as man. History, however, seeks to reproduce and interpret concrete events as they actually occurred in time and space. Sociology, on the other hand, seeks to arrive at natural laws and generalizations in regard to human nature and society, irrespective of time and of place. . . . In other words, history seeks to find out what actually happened and how it all came about. Sociology, on the other hand, seeks to explain, on the basis of a study of other instances, the nature of the process involved. (Park and Burgess 1921, 11)

Teggart, no doubt, would have found much to criticize in this passage, from its invocation of "nature" to its rhetoric of timeless "laws." In an evaluation of House's approach to sociology, Teggart opposed the position that "in the nature of things science can render concrete phenomena intelligible only by abstracting from them those factors and processes which may be taken as universal and timeless" (House 1926). Explaining his disagreement in *Social Forces*, Teggart found House's invocation of the "timeless" premature and fundamentally at odds with good, inductive science. "The results of scientific work," he wrote, "are always subject to revision." House's position was misguided in large part due to his "aspiration to imitate the procedure of the 'natural' sciences," a goal that had "dominated the activities of social scientists from the time of Plato and Aristotle down to the present." Opposed to this aspiration, Teggart insisted instead that while the natural sciences were generally concerned with "the investigation of the way things work, under controlled conditions, i.e., when they are not interfered with," the project which stood before humanists and historians was, and indeed had to be, different.

"As students of man and of society," he wrote, "we are compelled to face an historical world, a world in which every fact has reference to a specific time and place." Notions of a timeless sociology were thus misleading barriers to an adequate historical science. While he disputed House's invocation of the "timeless," however, Teggart approved of his search for the underlying "processes" of history and social life, provided that the search was conducted through the comparison of "actual societies, *and their histories*" (Teggart 1929).

Given this emphasis on actual histories, Teggart would likely have recoiled at Park's rough distinction between the practices of history and sociology and at the way *Introduction to the Science of Sociology* moved rhetorically from supposed academic description to normative classificatory vision. History and sociology did in fact conceive of their academic purposes differently, Teggart claimed, but this was a problem in need of solution, rather than, as Park suggested, the legitimate basis for disciplinary distinction. Thus, while Park was concerned with defining the boundaries between the developing disciplines and claimed that this was "necessary for the sake of clear thinking," Teggart was more concerned with breaking those boundaries down, and suggested that concrete histories could provide the basis for a rigorous historical science.⁴²

Whatever its merits, Teggart's vision of historical scholarship as a comparative science not bound by the logic of disciplinary development was not widely influential among either sociologists or historians, as the debates of the 1930s and 1940s demonstrated. While promoters of disciplinary dialogue such as Barnes would continue to harangue their colleagues in the historical profession regarding the benefits of a more social scientific history, their pleas for a different form of historical writing were largely ignored, even as debates over historical objectivity continued unabated (Novick 1988, 168–80). American sociologists, for their part, largely followed a path "from Park to Parsons," continuing to insist on an important difference

⁴² It is thus a signal of the complications involved in classifying Teggart that Ross would write: "Robert Park appropriately found sustenance in Teggart's separation of science and history" (1991, 447). The intellectual relationship between Teggart and Park appears to have been more complicated than that would suggest. While Park most certainly drew inspiration from Teggart's *Theory of History*, on the question of science and history the two seem to have disagreed. A critic, as Ross notes, of "history as it was traditionally practiced," Teggart nonetheless took issue with Park's suggestion that sociology (as science) be separated from history.

between historical practices and sociological theorizing (see D. Smith 1988, 134–52; Matthews 1977, 179–93; and Kuklick 1973).

Although he arguably helped to inaugurate a new paradigm for the practice of American sociology, Harvard sociologist Talcott Parsons agreed with Robert Park regarding the necessity of distinguishing sociology from history. “There is a great deal of current protest,” he wrote, “against attempts to set up boundaries between the sciences, to divide them into neat compartments” (1937, 759). Like Park, Parsons pleaded sympathy with such protests and then argued that distinctions between the various sciences were nonetheless “essential” if “clear thinking” was to prevail (1937, 771). Thus *The Structure of Social Action*, Parsons’ “charter” for the status-hungry discipline of sociology (Camic 1989), elaborated “a systematic classification of the empirical sciences,” defining sociology as an “analytical science” aimed at developing a general theory of action (1937, 759, 760, 768). This definition of sociology distinguished the discipline from history, which Parsons classed with a set of “historical sciences” whose goal was the understanding of “concrete historical individuals” (1937, 760). While the historical sciences might seek “theoretical aid” from the analytical sciences and sciences such as sociology would harbor concepts “applicable to” to the inquiries carried out under the name of history, Parsons suggested that the aims of each be understood as fundamentally different. Sociology would take its place as a “theoretical” science, alongside physics, chemistry, biology and economics, while history concerned itself, like anthropology and geology, with “particular concrete phenomena” (1937, 598).

In distinguishing between the historical and the analytical sciences and insisting on sociology’s inclusion with the latter, Parsons arguably sought greater scientific legitimacy for his own academic department and field. As Camic (1987, 421, 434) has shown, Parsons borrowed this classificatory logic from his mentors in the “high status” field of economics, ultimately endorsing “the neoclassicist practice of endowing history and theory with separate missions.” In doing so, Parsons made the case that sociology—still a scientifically suspect field at Harvard, just as it was at Berkeley—deserved a more established place in “the disciplinary pecking order” (Camic 1991, xxxviii). Further towards that end, Parsons concluded the second volume of *Structure* by taking issue with his Harvard colleague Sorokin (1928) and others who, like Teggart, contributed to “a strong current of pessimism” regarding the possibilities of a unified sociological theory. In place

of the chaos of competing schools of sociology, Parsons offered his synthesis of Marshall, Pareto, Durkheim, and Weber as evidence of “a great deep stream of the movement of scientific thought,” a movement that had achieved “notable scientific progress” (Parsons 1937, 775; see Parsons 1968; Bernard, “Schools of Sociology,” in Bernard 1934; Levine 1995, 35–36). What stood in the way of further scientific progress, Parsons claimed, was precisely the assumption that sociology had no “common basis,” no shared theoretical system. This assumption encouraged two “dangerous tendencies” within the discipline: first, the view that the only good social scientific work involved “detailed factual study, without the benefit of theory;” and second, the “dangerous irrationalism” that considered sociology an art rather than a rigorous empirical science (Parsons 1937, 774).

Parsons’ references to such dangerous tendencies in sociology can be read as reminiscent of Teggart’s criticisms of “narrative” and the New History. Indeed, they suggest once again that sociology was for Teggart an academic competitor as much as an intellectual culprit. Parsons and Teggart shared the same scientific impulse. Unsatisfied with history “as a type of literature,” Teggart saw dangerous tendencies in academic history, as well as in sociology’s attempt to overcome history’s literary limitations. What was needed, he argued, was a rigorous, comparative analysis that would put to rest worries that writers of history could never do more than narrate scientifically arbitrary sequences of historical events. History had to be scientific. While Teggart’s historical inclinations ultimately turned him away from “sociology” and towards a perhaps quixotic attempt to articulate his own version of historical science, Parsons drew on economic theory in an attempt to reconstitute sociology as a more rigorous and respectable analytical science. Thus, although Parsons’ attempt to distinguish sociology from history followed a pattern that Teggart rejected and resisted, we can identify in the latter’s program of historical science the reproduction—albeit in a different idiom—of a guiding scientific distinction of interwar American sociology.

Nonetheless, these interesting similarities do not obviate an important recognition of the many significant differences between Teggart and Parsons, the most obvious of which is probably one of immediate intellectual and disciplinary influence. While the theoretical paradigm suggested by *Structure* took a few years to take hold in sociology, the general historical consensus seems to be that once it did, it did so with a vengeance. Parsonian “structural-functionalism” is often

said to have been *the* theoretical model of sociology in postwar America. Teggart's agenda, it seems, largely disappeared from view during precisely the same period. As one historian suggests, "Teggart's was a road not taken by American sociology, but it wound through the same territory" (Ross 1991, 448). Notwithstanding his marginality, I am not convinced that Teggart's project is best described as "a road not taken" by American sociology. Yet Ross' evocative image of Teggart's place among the sociologists certainly does capture something of the way in which his project was entangled with yet disengaged from the mainstream of sociological thought in the years following World War I. And although Teggart was not to be enticed by sociology's supposedly "seductive" name, those who followed in his institutional wake at Berkeley would show a great deal less restraint regarding the allure of a more securely established, institutionally recognized academic social science. Just as Teggart's adamantly historical approach to social science remained an alternative strain within the discourse of American sociology, his institutional influence was both subdued and transformed by Berkeley's influx of sociologists in the postwar period.

It would not be unreasonable to see a continuity between Teggart's vision of historical science and the generalizing concerns and theoretical preoccupations of the historical sociologists who succeeded him at Berkeley and elsewhere. The builders of Berkeley's new departmental dispensation were perhaps eager to break free of the academic and disciplinary isolation that Teggart's methodology and mindset had imposed.⁴³ Yet they counted among their numbers a significant group of important historical sociologists, part of a developing departmental orientation that arguably owed a good deal to Teggart's continuing institutional influence. Through their resistance to sociology at Berkeley, Teggart and his supporters had managed to impact the structure and standpoint of the newly defined department, ensuring that the project of "Social Institutions" would live on within, even as it was quickly subordinated to, the disciplinary domain of "Sociology." In retrospect, the Berkeley department's ensuing emphasis on both theory and history would be perhaps the most pronounced and distinctive "effect" of this dynamic. By the 1950s, as American sociology experienced a new "resurgence" of historical sociology, a

⁴³ Martin Trow, in conversation.

sizable number of prominent historical sociologists had already come to Berkeley. And as the preoccupations of the postwar period inaugurated a new attention to history on the part of discipline-defining American sociologists, Teggart's old department was in large part leading the way, through the work of such sociologists as Reinhard Bendix, Seymour Martin Lipset, and Neil Smelser (see D. Smith 1991, 1–40).

By the 1970s and early 1980s the field of historical sociology saw a “new and controversial” rise during a period that both Calhoun and Collins have celebrated as “the ‘golden age’ of historical sociology.” While Collins (1994, 108) later noted the continued impact of this renewed sociological attention to history, Calhoun (1996, 305–37) would outline the extent to which the early intellectual force of the movement fell prey to a consequent disciplinary “domestication.” Indeed in recent years, as major debates regarding historical sociology's scientific character have made their way into the at times a-historical pages of the *American Journal of Sociology*, the usually upbeat Calhoun has struck a surprisingly fatalistic note regarding the field's methodological muddles. “Sociologists seemed doomed,” he worries, “to fight the *methodenstreit* again and again. For every practitioner of intelligent division of labor or multidimensional research, there are a dozen advocates of one against the other” (Calhoun 1998, 846). Likewise, historian Terrence McDonald, while welcoming a “historic turn in the human sciences,” has nevertheless lamented the still significant gap between the field of sociology and the practices of history: “For almost fifty years, sociology has lived in an eternal present, free until quite recently from both its own ‘history’ and from many practitioners of historical sociology” (McDonald 1998, 113).

American Sociology has, of course, as McDonald recognizes, never really been “free” from its own history. Yet perhaps it has, as he suggests, avoided a full-fledged confrontation with that history and with the importantly historical dimensions of sociology's own intellectual practice. Yet the disciplinary and discursive formation of “sociology” has not been spared entirely the reverberations that attend regularly shifting and endemically contested academic boundaries. And the classificatory categories of “historian” and “sociologist” are, one might argue, less clear at the beginning of a new century than they have been for some time. Moreover, as historians and sociologists proceed to further define and delimit new forms of social and cultural history, their disciplines will continue to be confronted by

the intellectual challenges of the linguistic, historic and cultural turns within the humanities and social sciences. Historical sociology, as a potentially multidisciplinary academic field, could be one important venue in which to engage such challenges critically. This engagement might involve, among other things, a rethinking of arbitrarily instituted academic borders and a renewed interest in fruitful interchange between history and sociology.

Thus, while it is doubtless still true that “the social sciences routinely plaster historical figures over antihistorical foundations,” (Klein 1997, 298) histories of sociology and the other American social sciences can teach us that this need not necessarily be so because it was not *necessarily* so in the past. In the words of Zygmunt Bauman, such histories can re-conceive the past and re-configure our sense of possibilities in an “act of rebellion against historical necessity” (1993, 51). Sociology as we know it today is the product of a multitude of contingent, historical forces, the result of classifications made and resisted, of academic categories constructed and continually re-worked. If one version of American sociology involves the repression of and resistance to “history,” yet another perhaps more mediated sociological strain suggests sociology’s important historicity, implying that our future forms of inquiry might reasonably embody a multi-disciplinary imagination that is at once sociological and historical (McDonald 1998; Bonnell and Hunt 1999).

CHAPTER TEN

WOMEN, AFRICAN AMERICANS, AND THE ASA, 1905–2005

MARY JO DEEGAN

Women, both African American and white, and African American men have been limited systematically over the past century in their participation in the American Sociological Association (ASA). At the same time, the profession and its disciplinary organizations empowered these same people, because sociology helps people discover and de-mystify such patterns of discrimination. I have written a series of books and articles documenting in considerable detail this professional process, especially in Chicago, that I summarize here.

From 1892 to 1930 white male sociologists from the University of Chicago established major precedents in the discipline. They established the first graduate Department of Sociology in 1892; they founded the most important journal, the *American Journal of Sociology* (AJS), in 1895; they helped form and lead the major professional organization, the American Sociological Society (later, American Sociological Association) since 1905; and they reputedly trained over half of all sociologists in the world by 1930 (and it continues to graduate large cohorts, although in a much more diversified and international arena). This large group of scholars fundamentally shaped the discipline through its faculty and their doctorally-trained students, who produced thousands of books and articles (See Kurtz 1984) and held a disproportionate number of offices and policy-making positions in the ASA.

In this paper I examine first the gendered eras at the University of Chicago, and then discuss the contributions of women in the ASA over the course of the century. Next, I examine the patterns of participation for African Americans, first for men and then for women, for this same organization and period of time.

Women's Gendered Eras

Women in sociology experienced three different periods of professional work and expectations. I describe characteristics of each era in this section and then explore the relations between the gendered eras and the ASA in a following section.

The Golden Era of Women in Sociology, 1890–1920

As I document in considerable detail elsewhere (e.g. 1978, 1987b, 1988a, 1988b; ed. 1991, 2002a), a notable and energetic cohort of female sociologists flourished from 1892 to 1920 in what I call “the golden era” for women in sociology. For the men at the University of Chicago this was an illustrious age, but this first era for men has been “unnamed.” I call it the “early Chicago school of sociology”—ECSS (Deegan 2002a) and include both men and women in it.

Sociology was attractive to women in the nineteenth century because of their concern with “the woman question.” Women played formative roles in the development of the social sciences between 1870 and 1890 (Deegan and Rynbrandt 2000). They continued this attraction to the study of society as part of a “first wave” of feminist activity. This occurred within the Victorian idea of the “Doctrine of the Separate Spheres,” which allocated different tasks, values, emotions, and worldviews to each gender. This gender-segregating ideology, although restrictive in some domains, allowed for the growth of a separate female network in sociology. These women emphasized the study of the home, women, children, and the family. Because women were assumed to have higher “emotional and cultural sensitivity” than men, the women were deemed ideal professionals to improve society and make it more humane. The men’s network pursued more abstract, intellectual, and academic work (Deegan 1978, 1981, 1988a, 1988b, 1995). Early women in sociology developed ideas and practices that differed radically from those of their male counterparts. The women worked outside the academy in social settlements, with Hull-House in Chicago as the most stellar; women’s organizations; and women’s colleges, while the men in sociology worked primarily within the white academy.

During the golden era of women in sociology, a fruitful, applied sociology emerged with an elaborate theory of society: feminist pragmatism. This American theory unites liberal values and a belief in

a rational public with a cooperative, nurturing, and liberating model of the self, the other, and the community (Deegan 1996a). Feminist pragmatism emphasizes education and democracy as significant mechanisms to organize and improve society, and formulated working hypotheses to test their programs for action and create new opportunities for social justice.¹ This sociological theory was developed by dozens of women associated with the Department of Sociology at the University of Chicago and with Hull-House. Their writings resulted in thousands of books and articles (Deegan ed. 1991). For example, Jane Addams, a leader in this enterprise and co-founder of Hull-House, published over 500 items (Farrell 1967, 221–41), and Charlotte Perkins Gilman wrote almost as much (Scharnhorst 1974). Using their testable, applied theory, the feminist pragmatists initiated numerous structural changes resulting in what I call the “feminist pragmatist welfare state,” with particular success in creating programs and opportunities for women and children. The feminist pragmatists helped their neighbors and people around the world to obtain civil rights and citizenship in more democratic societies.

Two generations of women entered sociology during the golden era. The first generation, born generally between 1855–1870, were “pioneers” who established a place for “women’s sociological work” in a society with distinct spheres for each sex. The second generation of women, born between 1870 and 1890, consisted of “professionals” who obtained male credentials in the academy. Sometimes they chose, and sometimes they were forced, to operate in the distinct women’s world within sociology (Deegan ed. 1991; 1995).

The pioneers in the golden era strove for women’s right to higher education, suffrage, and work outside the home. They used sociology to document women’s restricted lives and opportunities. The professionals combined the role established by the pioneers with formal training in the academy. This second generation was often mentored by the female pioneers and by sympathetic male sociologists such as George H. Mead and W.I. Thomas (Deegan 1988a, ed. 1991, 1999, 2001). Female students were not accepted, however, as equal faculty members in the male academy. The women thus struggled on the margins of sociology departments (Deegan 1978, 1995).

¹ My thanks to Janet Duitsman Cornelius (2004) for ideas to improve my definition of feminist pragmatism.

This established an early pattern of female students being encouraged to perform at their peak, but being discriminated against by their professional colleagues.

Powerful “founding sisters”—doctorally trained, prolific writers, and active in the ASA—virtually disappeared from male academies in sociology departments after 1920. Male sociologists erased their ties to these founding sisters and began a new era—the dark era of patriarchal ascendancy (Deegan ed. 1991, 1995, 1996a). The founding sisters lived in a world shaped by a color line, but they allied with African American sociologists much more frequently than did their male counterparts. This racial divide interacted with gender in the following way: African American women were colleagues with African American men and white women in sociology, but not with white men. (See further discussion on this distinct network and vision in a later section.)

The Dark Era of Patriarchal Ascendancy, 1920–1965

The next era, between 1920 and 1965, saw the birth of international recognition of the “Chicago school of sociology” (CSS) characterized by ethnographic studies and an intellectual emphasis on human ecology, the city, crime and delinquency, and immigration (Deegan 2001; Kurtz 1984). By 1930 the CSS exercised hegemonic control over the discipline, and male scholars called it the “first era” or “the golden era” of Chicago sociology (Fish 1991). Most scholars of the CSS refer primarily to white men, include African American graduates, and generally exclude white female faculty and graduates. A very small cohort of scholars include the white women.

Many earlier, notable female scholars documented and analyzed women as second-class citizens, but subsequent men of the Chicago school ignored their work (Deegan 1988a, ed. 1991). In 1952, Simone deBeauvoir’s penetrating text on women as “other” was published in English; that text helped explain the men’s behavior. Women’s otherness permeated society and its mirror, sociology. It is the foundation for social interactions, knowledge, and professional expectations. Women are the “second sex.” “She is the incidental, the inessential as opposed to the essential. He is the Subject, he is the Absolute—she is the Other” (1952, xvi). The intellectual woman, moreover, is doubly doomed by her failure to be blind to her situation and by her desire to speak about it (de Beauvoir 1952, 132 and 685).

The Contemporary Era, 1965–2005

By the mid-1960s the women's movement re-emerged in a second wave of feminism. Betty Friedan (1963)—a housewife who was not trained as a sociologist—rocked a complacent society by noting that women were dissatisfied with their traditional roles in the home and family. She called this challenge to sexism “a problem that has no name.” Thus a woman outside sociology claimed the power to identify sexism as a fundamental social problem: a task within the professional domain of sociologists who could not—and often cannot—see it as a problem (Deegan 1995).

Female sociologists became more critical of their profession after the second wave, and they instituted a number of changes. In 1969 a caucus initiated new demands about disciplinary practices legitimated during the dark era. As in the wider society, some of these expectations were fulfilled and some were not. Each era corresponded to a typical pattern in female participation in the ASA.

The Golden Era of Women in Sociology and the ASA

White women comprised a little over ten per cent of the founding members of the ASA. Their small niche in the early organization revolved around “women's work” in the discipline, especially applied sociology, social settlements, marriage and the family, and women. Applied sociology covered almost every topic now considered a “social problem,” such as low wages, children's well-being, the sociology of law, and housing. Women, especially the Chicago women, played roles as members of the executive committee and in the section on marriage and the family. Women were more frequently discussants than presenters of major papers; they did not hold the major offices in the ASA. These leadership roles were filled by white men, usually affiliated in some way with the University of Chicago (Deegan 1981). Women tended to be discussants for each other or on their “special topics” within the gendered division of labor. A particularly interesting example of such labor was the massive project led by Lucille Eaves on applied sociology and “co-operative research,” which coordinated numerous studies by different researchers throughout the United States (Deegan ed. 1991, 140–47).

Jane Addams and Charlotte Perkins Gilman were the two most illustrious early women who participated in the ASA. Both were

charter members of the organization and remained members for the next thirty years. (In a remarkable coincidence, they were both born in 1860 and died in 1935.) They were friends, colleagues, and feminist pragmatists. Gilman lived in Chicago as a resident in a social settlement for almost a year, and this period was a major influence on her ideas and life choices. She worked intimately with the women's sociological network in Chicago and championed many of their ideas for the rest of her life. This remarkable community of women lived many of the communal goals she espoused in her writings (Deegan 1997).

Jane Addams and the ASA, 1905–1935

Jane Addams stood in the first rank of sociologists. She linked both sexes to the heart of the women's Chicago-based network, a passionate intellectual group that I (Deegan 1996a) call "the Chicago female world of love and ritual." This world was at the core of the feminist pragmatist welfare state. Addams worked closely with the ECSS, both through the eight white men who played significant roles in the ASA (Deegan 1988a) and the five white women who taught in the ECSS (Deegan 1978, ed. 1991, 2002a). One of her close friends was Albion Small, a founder of the ASA, serving as president in 1912–1913, and the founding editor of *AJS*. He was also a frequent visitor at Hull-House, invited Addams to submit her work to *AJS*, offered her a position in the department of sociology, and unsuccessfully supported her receiving an honorary doctorate from the University of Chicago in 1915 (Deegan 1988a, 80–83, 175–76).

Addams published five analyses in *AJS*; she had presented two of them as speeches and a third as a comment on an address by John R. Commons at the ASA. She was one of the most frequent female speakers at the association during the golden era (Deegan ed. 1991, 37–44), and she continued to serve on committees until the mid-1920s. Gilman addressed the ASA seven times, five times as a commentator and twice as a major presenter. Gilman was intellectually close to the first ASA president, Lester F. Ward (1906–1907), and the fifth ASA president, Edward A. Ross (1914–1915). She did not take an active role in the ASA after 1909, but she continued to maintain her membership.

Addams, Gilman, and the Men's Sociological Network

Addams' and Gilman's friends in the male academic network were intellectual pioneers who wove ideas from history, politics, biology, economics, religion, and other sources into the newly emerging discipline of sociology. They were not trained initially in sociology. As Ellador—a protagonist in a Gilman novel who was modeled after both Addams and Gilman (Deegan 1997)—might have put it: "How could they? There were no schools that offered majors in sociology." These early men became sociologists, as did Addams and Gilman, through self-directed study, imagination, and the will to make a better world through rational thought, careful research, and intelligent social action.

Gilman's introduction to the male academic network took place not in Chicago—the emerging center of academic sociology—but in California during the years just prior to her departure for Hull-House in 1895. On the West Coast, she read Lester Ward's works and met Ross at Leland Stanford Jr. University. Ward and Ross "gave her a sense of belonging to an elite vanguard of intellectuals, leading the way to a socialist, nonsexist world. . . . They encouraged her to believe that creating a comprehensive moral system, established on the foundation of scientific sociology and expressed in plain language, was the most important work she could undertake" (Allen 1988: 43–44). Because of the greater power of the ECSS in comparison to the Stanford sociologist network, however, Addams played a more central role in the ASA than did Gilman.

Ross and Ward were founders of the discipline, but their sociological work, like that of Addams and Gilman, was devalued systematically during and after the 1920s by a new cohort of competitive white male sociologists at the University of Chicago, who with considerable success purged academic sociology of its applied social relevance and progressive critical edge (Deegan 1988a). Recent scholars, however, are recovering this lost sociological heritage (Feagin and Vera 2001).

Emily Greene Balch and the ASA, 1915

An important albeit backstage battle at the ASA involving a woman, Emily Green Balch, occurred in 1915. At this time, World War I was raging in Europe, and her opposition to war represented the major position held by white women in sociology but not by men.

Consequently, the white male ASA organizers had a hard time finding a discussant for her paper on pacifism. In 1946 Balch's stellar work for peace was internationally recognized with the Nobel Peace Prize (her friend Addams was the first American woman to be awarded one, in 1931),² but in 1915 many white men in the ASA did not wish to confront her. In 1919 Balch lost her position at Wellesley College because of her controversial work for world peace. She spent the rest of her life representing the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF) before the League of Nations (later reorganized as the United Nations; Deegan 1983; ed. 1991, 55–62; 1996a).

Lewis Coser, a German-Jewish immigrant who was president of the ASA in 1975, wrote me a chiding letter after my article on this topic was published. He noted that I had misidentified Balch as associated with the United Nations when she had been associated with the League of Nations. He warned me that radical research was subject to special scrutiny and that my error hurt other radicals. Obviously Balch was associated with both organizations and I should have listed both names, but I was struck by the harshness of Coser's response and his lack of "radical collegiality," a "typical" (Schutz 1967) response for powerful men associated with the ASA.

The Dark Era of Patriarchal Ascendancy and the ASA, 1920–1965

During the dark era female sociologists lost their separate sphere and assumed an even lesser status. Women's new, and in some ways greater, marginality to intellectual work appeared in myriad ways during the next era. To white men, women embodied neither authority nor the legitimated creators of knowledge. "Women's work" was restricted increasingly to invisible clerical labor, library research, and data collection. Women taught undergraduates but not graduate students; correspondence students, or graded examinations. This invisible work needed for the production of sociological knowledge is "professional shaddowwork" (Deegan 1995), a counterpart to their "shadowwork" in the home and family. Such shaddowwork, moreover, took a particular historical form in sociology: female sociologists often

² Harriet Alonso (1995) sees Addams and Balch as having different politics, but I strongly disagree with her interpretation. See Deegan 1996, 2003.

married male sociologists and reproduced the “triple shadowwork” of home and profession in an emotional and legal bond to their colleagueal husbands (see Table 10.1).

The life of Helen MacGill Hughes (Ph.D. from the University of Chicago, 1937) illustrates the complexity of “triple shadowwork.” She was one of the few women actively mentored by men during the dark era. She fondly recalled William F. Ogburn (ASA president, 1929), and Robert E. Park (ASA president 1925), although this mentoring was highly limiting for her but expansive for her husband. She held neither the faculty status nor ASA presidency that her husband, Everett Cherington Hughes (ASA president 1963) enjoyed. H.M. Hughes wrote of these complex patterns in her excruciatingly honest self-analysis as “Maid of All Work or Departmental Sister-in-Law” (1973). From 1944 to 1961 she was the doctorally-trained, editorial assistant at *AJS*, a position held previously only by graduate students. Her life embodied a series of contradictory statuses. “I was a graduate of the department and a fellow student, though junior to them, of three of the editors, Blumer, Wirth, and Hughes; a student of a fourth, Burgess; and as if that were not enough to upset the customary relationships in the office, wife of one of them” (Hughes 1973, 9). Her reflections on this state are like echoing pools of “mirrored images” where her wit and actions were bounded by gendered parameters. H.M. Hughes (1975) wrote a similarly powerful expose of the life and career of Caroline Rose who also followed her husband Arnold M. Rose (ASA president 1969) in a series of positions, including the presidency of the Midwest Sociological Society, but always years after her husband. This pattern of being both constrained and advanced in one’s career was gendered in men’s favor during most of the past century.

In the 1940s and 1950s, two academies trained a number of women in sociology: the University of Chicago and Columbia University in New York City. Columbia gained more power over the training of women in sociology in the 1940s compared to Chicago. Robert Merton (ASA president in 1957), Robert Lynd, and C. Wright Mills, among others, established a relatively open context for female sociologists at Columbia. Dorothy Swaine Thomas, an undergraduate at Columbia mentored by Ogburn, became the first woman elected to the ASA presidency in 1952, after her husband W.I. Thomas held it before her in 1927. She was the only woman to hold this position between 1905 and 1973.

Women who married powerful male sociologists, or occasionally were their close associates without marriage, gained some visibility for their triple shadowwork. White male ASA Presidents who had able and outstanding wives who were sociologists are listed in Table 10.1. Women's "professional shadowwork" characterized the dark era, however. After the second wave, able wives of prestigious sociologists increasingly assumed more visibility in the ASA.

The Contemporary Era and the ASA, 1965–2005

The "second wave" of feminism noted by Friedan in 1963 hit sociology in 1969. This was the year a woman's caucus founded "Sociologists for Women in Society" (SWS). The remarkable writings of H.M. Hughes (1973, 1975) noted above, for example, were written after the second wave, but she was too exploited during the dark era to be a characteristically critical second wave spokesperson. Individual women in generally prestigious professions have gained considerable access to the ASA as a result of women organizing, but the relationship between SWS and women in non-prestigious positions, especially in community colleges where the overwhelming number of women work, is unimpressive. The relationship between SWS and women *en masse* in society is similarly unimpressive. Female sociologists are not leaders in social justice, the media, or as presidential advisers.

Women's election to the ASA presidency improved (see Table 10.2), although twenty-one years elapsed between the election of the first woman (1952) and the second (1973). Three of the eight white women to hold the ASA presidency during the course of the century—Alice S. Rossi, Mirra Komarovsky, and Thomas—received major portions of their sociological training at Columbia (Deegan 1995). Only one Chicago woman (Maureen Hallinan, 1996) has become president, while approximately half of all ASA presidents are men trained at or on the staff of the University of Chicago.

After 1965 the "marital pattern for ASA presidents" was maintained, although the gender of the person holding the office changed. Three contemporary era couples reversed the marital/professional ASA relationship (see Table 10.1). The process of being part of a professional couple is a common pattern for women but not for men who become presidents of the ASA. After 1965 the "marital pattern

for sociologists” was augmented greatly, moreover, if less prestigious yet powerful professional positions are considered. This portion of the paper completes the analysis of gendered patterns for white sociologists. I now turn to first the analysis of racial patterns for African Americans and then the intersection of race and gender for African American women.

African American Men and the Veil of Sociology

While sociology was being established in the 1890s, racism flourished within America. From the 1880s until at least the late 1960s, a large part of the United States was sundered by legally separate worlds for black³ and white people. These “Jim Crow” practices were reflected in segregated institutions, e.g. in education, housing, transportation, restaurants, and medicine. The great sociologist W.E.B. DuBois (1903) referred to this external, structural pattern of racism as “the color line.” It generated an entire lifeworld (Schutz 1967) surrounding black people that DuBois called “the Veil.” Life within the Veil divided the self into a double consciousness with a sense of “twoness” corresponding to the divisions emergent from the color line (DuBois 1903). This American apartheid was incorporated in private patterns of interaction leading to the genesis of the self (Mead 1934).

African American sociologists suffered specific, even greater divisions within their “selves” than other African Americans. As sociologists, they were empowered to analyze racism through their formal knowledge about race relations and the social construction of inequality. Simultaneously, they lived within multiple layers of discrimination as African Americans and sociologists in a white-defined, hegemonic discipline (Ladner 1973) and lifeworld. The professional self (Deegan and Hill 1991a) of African American sociologists generated a particular reality and experience that rarely informed the everyday practice and theoretical knowledge of “white sociology” (Ladner 1973). I (Deegan 2002a) call this especially liberating and oppressing practice of American sociologists “the Veil of sociology,” referring to the different power, marginality, and legitimacy of white and black sociologists within this structure of knowledge and higher education. African American sociologists created a network of African

³ I use the terms “African American” and “black” interchangeably here.

American scholars who worked within the Veil in the larger society and in the profession. Until the civil rights movement altered Jim Crow society after 1965, African American men in sociology typically found employment within activist social agencies or the black academy (Blackwell and Janowitz, 1974), but few African American women worked in these academies or held high position in social agencies or civil rights organizations.

W.E.B. DuBois and the ASA, 1905–1963

The Veil surrounded the career of DuBois, who did not attend ASA meetings, hold offices in the organization, or edit its associated journals. He was personally ostracized from profession-wide recognition due to the personal and ideological opposition of Robert E. Park to his work (Deegan 2002a). The prolific DuBois published only one brief comment in one article in *AJS*. Despite this color line in the ASA, he led his own department at Atlanta University (1899–1909; 1936–1940); edited several important yet short-lived journals, e.g. *Horizon*; and founded two of the most important African American journals in the history of black thought: *Crisis*, the massively popular organ of the NAACP, and *Phylon*, one of the most prestigious journals in African American and social science studies. Both of the latter journals continue to have a much wider readership composed of academics, a literate public, and policy makers than either *AJS* or *ASR*. (Even most sociologists do not read the latter two journals, a problem deeply denied by the ASA leaders but documented by the small number of subscriptions.)

I link DuBois's concept of the Veil and the color line to the Meadian model of the genesis of the self and the Hull-Hull school of race relations (HHSRR), based in feminist pragmatism and established during the golden era of women in sociology. Most early African American sociologists, including DuBois; E. Franklin Frazier; the Haynes family—George Edmund, Elizabeth Ross, and Birdye—Ida B. Wells-Barnett; and Fannie Barrier Williams, were part of the HHSRR (Deegan 2002a, 2002b).

Professional Life behind the Veil of the ASA: E. Franklin Frazier on "My Most Humiliating Jim Crow Experience"

Chicago symbolic interactionists, including members of the white (or Parkian) Chicago school of race relations (PCSRR), are notable for

their analysis of the genesis of the self. George H. Mead's perspective of the self as a social structure that emerges from human meaning and embodied interaction is central to this sociological theory (Deegan 1999, 2002a). A large number of other prominent sociologists examine the process of creating the community and self, including William James, a mentor to Mead, Park, and DuBois (DuBois 1968, 1903). DuBois' work, however, is rarely considered by scholars working on Mead, Park, and James (for notable exceptions, see Deegan 1988b, 2002a; Feagin and Vera 2001, Feagin, Vera and Batur 2001; C. West 1989). Although the African American scholar E. Franklin Frazier is often acknowledged as a significant figure in the PCSRR, DuBois is not. Frazier was a colleague and friend of DuBois, as well as to (Park and to the latter's close colleague Ernest W. Burgess; ASA president 1934). Frazier included both men in his work (note the dedication to both men opening Frazier's book, 1957). DuBois, nonetheless, was a more militant scholar than either Park or Frazier.

Frazier became the first African American ASA president in 1948. He, like all of his contemporaries (Schutz 1967) who were African American sociologists, worked behind the Veil. He did not accept these restrictions easily, and in the late 1930s he wrote an amazing document on his professional life behind the Veil. Here, Frazier illustrates how he was empowered by sociological ideas and his professional self to challenge the color line that limited his full participation in professional work. He fought the almost insurmountable racist barriers that made public transportation, accommodations, and professional meetings into situations fraught with humiliations and even physical danger. Frazier, unlike the sociologically marginal DuBois, was very active in the profession of sociology and in the ASA.

In 1923 Frazier attended the annual ASA meeting in Washington, D.C. He tried to take the elevator to the top floor where the conference was being held. An elevator operator insisted that Frazier had to take the freight, not the passenger, elevator, but Frazier "paid him no mind." Park came over to Frazier and "evidently in order to avoid an unpleasant incident" Park introduced him to his classmate Charles S. Johnson. Then they rode the elevator together. Frazier tried to return to the first floor, but when the operator noticed Frazier was on the elevator, the operator returned Frazier to his original floor. The employee then went for the police to remove Frazier. Frazier turned to Burgess, as an ASA officer and his mentor,

to help, but Burgess was ineffectual. Frazier was threatened physically by white men on the passenger elevator and finally, accompanied by the police, forced into the freight elevator. Other blacks including "Kelly Miller, Monroe Work and some colored women of Washington had come up on the freight elevator and had made no protest." No changes occurred at the meetings, and Frazier left the conference (See a thorough discussion of this incident and differing accounts in Deegan 2002a, 137–43).

The ASA event left Frazier angry, isolated, frightened, and betrayed. He could not rely on his white mentors, his African American peers, or his professional association. The state, represented by the police officer, was corrupt; he could not turn to the one agency legitimated to defend him against his fellow citizens when they threatened him. In fact, the police enforced white racism. He was surrounded by degradation, ignorance, and physical danger. In 1945 he published a short account of this event under the graphic title of "My Most Humiliating Jim Crow Experience."⁴ Although Frazier's professional life was filled with many triumphs, including his ASA presidency, it was 40 years before another African American man was elected to this position (William Julius Wilson).⁵

The Veil of Sociology, the ASA, and Other Professional Associations

Very little research has been done on professional associations in sociology and racism. James E. Blackwell (1974) noted in one of the few articles on this topic that the color line restricted the work of black sociologists even when the ASA did not meet in the South. In addition, because many African Americans taught in the South, the Jim Crow restrictions on travel from that region made all travel hazardous. They also experienced financial constraints on travel, thereby generating another mechanism to limit African Americans' participation in the ASA. The more covert forms of Northern prejudice, moreover, were not structurally prevented.

⁴ This was the title for a series in which different people described the worse experience of Jim Crow they had had.

⁵ In 1998, Cora Bagley Marrett became the first African American woman elected to the vice-president position, the highest position held by an African American woman in the organization. This reflects the greater resistance to women's accomplishments behind the Gendered Veil than men experience behind the Veil.

According to Blackwell, informal patterns excluding African Americans from participation at sessions, social gatherings, and offices led to the development of “parallel” separate organizations (Goffman 1977), such as the Association for Social and Behavioral Sciences. Thus, when the white sociologists were dining at the hotel restaurant or holding reunions in facilities that were open to them, black sociologists held their sessions in black establishments in the black community (Blackwell 1974, 345). This white racism has remained largely undocumented for a number of reasons—notably continuing racism, face-saving by a white-dominated organization, the powerful myths about the “liberal and open” policies of the PCSRR, and lack of research—but it is vital for our understanding of our past and present functioning as professionals to document and eradicate these patterns.

Irene Diggs and Butler Jones and Professional Associations in the 1940s and 1950s

Frazier’s experience at the ASA was “typical” rather than isolated, although considerable documentation of this statement is needed. The late Irene Diggs, for example, experienced extreme professional ostracism at ASA meetings in the 1940s and 1950s when she would often sit alone surrounded by empty seats at paper sessions. This racist behavior emerged from her social location as an African American, a woman, a student of the politically controversial DuBois, and a graduate from a university outside the U.S.A. (Diggs interview with author, 8 January 1989, cited in Deegan 2002a). Furthermore, she did not participate in any “parallel” organizations, and she felt ostracized from interactions with most of the African American men in sociology. Frazier was one of her few real colleagues in the ASA. Diggs’ relations to the ASA and the “parallel” African American organizations controlled by men and often affiliated with the PCSRR suggests a complex pattern of professional marginality and the Gendered Veil of sociology, discussed more below, that needs further study and research. Similarly, the late Butler Jones, the respected African American sociologist, did not remember an alternate structure either. He wanted to know where I had heard about it! (interview with author, 4 April 1989, cited in Deegan 2002a, 142–43).

African American Women and the Gendered Veil of Sociology

African American women have a rich tradition of struggle and a unique standpoint on themselves, families, communities, and race relations. Starting in the 1970s, black women's scholarship has grown and snowballed to such an extent that a considerable literature is widely distributed through books, articles, and journals. This flood of knowledge, however, remains a relatively small trickle within sociology (see review of literature in Deegan 2000b, 2002b). The reason for this intellectual barrier lies in the racial/gender structure of the discipline.

The White Malestream

Sociology has been conceptualized as the enterprise of white men in the United States and Europe. As noted earlier, they quickly gained control over the academy and then defined such control as essential to doing sociology. Simultaneously, they dominated the granting of credentials within higher education and the generation of professional organizations, literature, and networks. In the United States, a hegemonic pattern emerged through the institutionalization of the ECSS and the CSS that was supported by its students who established academic departments throughout this country and others throughout the world, especially in Japan, China, Central America, and Latin America.

Sociology has always been broader than these patriarchal and racist boundaries. Sociologists on the margin, in this case African Americans and white women, have always been aware of both studying a problem and embodying that problem—a paraphrase of W.E.B. DuBois' insightful socio-autobiographical style of writing (1903, 1–2). As he pithily explained, “being a problem is a strange experience” (1903, 2). This experience was deepened by sexism within the Veil of Sociology as well as in the white malestream.

Women's Separate Sphere Within the Veil of Sociology: The Golden Era for African American Women in Sociology

African American women in sociology experienced a more restricted access to professional opportunities and networks, compared to white men, African American men, and white women. African American women survived and triumphed over these deep discriminations,

nonetheless, drawn to the powerful opportunities of the sociological imagination and voice. This resulted in a “golden era for African American women in sociology” with a unique network, opportunities, intellectual work, and professional praxis. It was characterized by a theory and practice oriented toward: 1) the standpoint of the oppressed, especially African Americans and African American women; 2) an analysis of the interaction between race and power; 3) an analysis of the interaction between gender and power; 4) an analysis structured by history, ideology, material resources, manners, and emotion; 5) an active cooperative model with an emphasis on fighting for civil and cultural rights; and 6) feminist pragmatism.

In 2000 I documented the lives of eight African American women who were “founding sisters” (see Deegan ed. 1991) during the classical era of sociology, from 1890 to 1920, although none of them are recognized in sociology textbooks or were members of the ASA. I published this analysis in *Sociological Origins*, founded and edited by Michael R. Hill to provide a resource for this “alternative” history of the profession. My manuscript was rejected by one journal where the “liberal” editor and his reviewers would not accept my claims of these women’s collegial status based on standard professional criteria by which white men are accepted as “sociologists.” Because most of these African American women are not considered sociologists by white male sociologists, I developed criteria identifying sociologists that emerged from the work of Dirk Käsler (1981) that I then modified to fit the situations facing white and black women in America (Deegan 2000b).

Eight African American female sociologists met two or more of these criteria (one is sufficient for defining a sociologist): They all wrote on the sociology of race relations and taught this theory and praxis to others, primarily to other African American women. These women are Janie Porter Barrett; Anna Julia Cooper; Loraine Richardson Green; Elizabeth Ross Haynes; Mary Church Terrell; Ida B. Wells-Barnett; Fannie Barrier Williams; and Margaret Murray Washington. Since I first published my analysis, I have added two more women: Lugenia Burns Hope and Mary McLeod Bethune. In addition to meeting two of Käsler’s criteria, seven of the ten women—Bethune, Cooper, Green, Haynes, Hope, Washington, and Williams—were self-identified as sociologists. Cooper, Williams, Green, Haynes and Wells-Barnett met a fourth criterion: they have been identified as sociologists by sociologists (other than myself—see Deegan 2000, 2002b).

In addition to the cohort's professional patterns, several generational configurations are similar to those of white founding sisters and several are distinct. Thus all the women entered the profession and made life-choices as a function of the gendered eras in which they were born.

The African American Female Pioneers

The pioneers in this group, like the white women, were born before 1870. The pioneers include: Barrett (1865–1948); Cooper (1858–1964); Terrell (1863–1954); Wells-Barnett (1862–1931); Williams (1855–1944); and Washington (ca. 1865–1925). Unlike the white female pioneers, the year 1865⁶ was a crucial end of an era for African American women. This was the year when the Civil War concluded and slavery was over throughout the newly re-united nation. Among the pioneers, only Wells-Barnett clearly identified herself as born into slavery. Cooper, however, is not clearly identified as either slave or free at birth; her mother was a slave and her father was a white master. Washington's birth date is unclear but occurred probably sometime between 1861 and 1865. Like Cooper, her status relative to slavery is ambiguous. Her mother was a "washerwoman" who might have been free and her father was an Irish immigrant. Williams was born into a "free Negro" family in New York. Terrell and Barrett were born after 1865, when slavery was over. Whatever each woman's status as free or slave at birth, slavery was in the living memory of the majority of people in the African American community when the pioneers were born.

These women as a group were prominent in the nation and in their communities. They were often prolific writers, especially Wells-Barnett and Williams. They organized African American women through club work and joined African American male sociologists and white female sociologists in civil rights struggles. They joined white women in sociology as allies, in a pattern distinct from the general hostility and barriers between these groups (see Deegan 1988b). I have been unable to document any collegial contacts

⁶ The legal elimination of slavery occurred in 1863 with the Emancipation Proclamation, but many slaves were freed literally by Union soldiers at the end of the Civil War in 1865.

between the African American female pioneers and white male sociologists, however.

The African American female pioneers differed radically from the white female sociologists in their choices of marriage and motherhood. The black women were generally wives and mothers who blended home, family, and high profile work in race relations. The white women rarely married and usually lived with other women who shared their values and career interests (Deegan 1996a). Marriage limited some of the African American women's choices. Barrett and Cooper, for example, became more independent of traditional women's roles and more active in the community after they became widows. Terrell, who had blended both home and public life for decades, became significantly more militant after her husband died relatively late in her life. Washington looked dubiously at the threat to her intellectual and career commitments when she married Booker T. Washington and became a wife and step-mother. She was able to manage many of these obligations during her marriage, but she, too, became more publicly and politically active after being widowed in 1915.

These couples often shared commitments outside the home, usually oriented toward the black community. These husbands, especially in comparison to other African American men in sociology, were unique for their era. Most African American male sociologists married women who filled traditional roles as wives and mothers. DuBois's (1903) first wife, for example, played a highly traditional female role, and their marriage lasted almost half a century.

The married, African American, female pioneers created a "golden era for African American women in sociology." They were articulate, powerful professionals and dedicated wives and mothers. Although they lived behind the Gendered Veil, their lives were characterized by vivacity, strength, and resistance to oppression.

The African American Female Professionals

Ironically, two of the African American female professionals, Loraine Richardson Green (1889–1997) and Elizabeth Ross Haynes (1883–1953), who were formally trained as sociologists and self-identified with the profession, lived primarily as wives outside the marketplace and professional networks. Their careers differed from the earlier generation of African American female pioneers and from their white

female counterparts. The other two African American female professionals, Lugenia Burns Hope (1871–1947) and Mary McLeod Bethune (1875–1955), led lives that were very similar to those of the pioneers. I discuss the distinct patterns of Green and Haynes first.

This small cohort's life choices partially reflect their class status within the African American community, as the wives of prominent black men, and partially reflect the power of the "dark era of patriarchal ascendancy in sociology." They worked and lived behind a Gendered Veil of sociology that created dense barriers to women's work in sociology and praised women who worked in women's work at home and in unpaid, volunteer positions. They also both worked to support and enhance the careers of their husbands, E.R. Haynes for her sociologist husband, G.E. Haynes, and Green for her lawyer/judge husband, Wendell E. Green.

Bethune and Hope were the children of ex-slaves, and some of their siblings were born into slavery. Both women married and had a son. Bethune divorced her husband in 1918, but Hope was married to the eminent leader in higher education, John Hope, for decades. Bethune founded the Daytona Education and Industrial Institution in Florida in 1904 (later named the Bethune-Cookman School), and L.B. Hope founded the Neighborhood Union and the Atlanta University School of Social Work in the early 1920s. Both were deeply involved in African American women's clubs and wrote on African American life, especially for women in that community.

All four female professionals worked with white women in sociology, especially women in the HHSRR. E.R. Haynes apparently met these women when she was a graduate student at the University of Chicago in the summers of 1906, 1907 and 1908. Green worked with them in the Chicago Urban League, the League of Women Voters, and WILPF throughout the 1920s and 1930s (Pridmore 1991; Green interviews with author, see Deegan 2002a, 32, 67). As a late adolescent in Chicago, L.G. Hope (née Burns) worked for a Mrs. Warne who ran cafeterias in Chicago's Loop. Warne spent one day a week at Hull-House, probably in the early 1890s, and Hope accompanied her during these visits. Hope described this alliance and work at Hull-House as a rich experience that positively influenced her later community leadership and social reform efforts in Atlanta, Georgia. As the wife of John Hope, who first became President of Atlanta Baptist College (later renamed Morehouse College) and then

President of Atlanta University, L.B. Hope had a major role as a campus and community figure.

L.B. Hope was influenced, moreover, by the sociological tradition reflected in the conferences at Atlanta University organized by DuBois. He invited her to speak at one of his conferences in 1899 or 1900 because he "knew of Lugenia's social reform work in Chicago" (Rouse 1989, 28). Addams was probably not a direct friend of the young assistant in the 1890s, but Hull-House and Addams were nonetheless major influences on the young woman (See Rouse 1989, especially 2, 17, 133, 139, n. 13). In fact, L.B. Hope probably attended Addams' speech at the Atlanta University conference in mid-May of 1908 and discussed with Addams her interest in starting similar work in Atlanta. Immediately after this conference, on 3 June 1908, Addams sent Hope a "Bibliography of Settlements" helpful for beginning settlement work. Addams also advised Hope to write the School of Philanthropy at Columbia University in New York City for more information. Addams wished her success in her new venture (Addams to Hope, 3 June 1908, JAM, 5, 0468, Atlanta University, Neighborhood Union Collection). Five days later, on 8 July 1908, Hope "called a meeting of her neighbors to discuss 'whether those assembled thought it needful to have settlement work in the community, and to solicit their cooperation'" (Rouse 1989, 65). Addams must be seen as part of the initial energy for establishing the Neighborhood Union, one of the most important black settlements in the region. The Neighborhood Union blended social settlement work with an African American women's network similar to clubwork, as well. This work brought her national prominence and influence.

Mary McLeod Bethune also knew Addams, although few details of their relationship remain. One indication of their acquaintance is found on a postcard Bethune wrote to Addams while visiting Florence, Italy (13 July 1927, reel 19, frame 209, SCPC, Addams papers, series 1, supplement). Her message included the following collegial note: "I think of you often. Remember you are to visit me in Fla. next winter. Think of some plan to help me with Bethune-Cookman." Addams did visit Bethune in Florida, but few other details of their shared commitments remain.

Numerous common ties and differences structured the careers and life choices of African American women in sociology that can be compared to those of white women and black men. Although white

women could be racist and black men could be sexist, they shared a world of struggle, vision, and celebration that allowed them to use sociology to speak from the margin and create new centers.

Few white men in sociology joined this enterprise. White men controlled the academy, journals, networks, jobs, recommendations, and definition of the discipline. All the African American women were barred from the sociological world of expertise by a Gendered Veil so thick it could be more accurately compared to an iron curtain than a fabric allowing light and blurred images to be seen. This iron curtain originated in a tragic location—with Robert E. Park, who intended to open up the sociological study of race relations in America.

The Gendered Veil of Sociology and the ASA, 1905–1920

One of the most striking indications of a Gendered Veil in sociology is that while most white founding sisters in the United States were members of the ASA, none of the black founding sisters were. During the first fifteen years of the ASA, African American men and women did not present any papers or serve as discussants. Two African American men—Monroe Work and George Edmond Haynes—were members (Deegan 2002a, 114). Of the African American founding sisters Barrett, Washington, Cooper, Hope, and Bethune were members of a sociological organization, the Southern Sociological Congress (SSC) (see Southern Sociological Congress 1913, 1915, 1916–1918). The SSC was more open to accepting different forms of sociological labor and to a wider range of professionals than was the ASA. Thus the SSC welcomed ministers, politicians, activists, and policy makers as well as academic sociologists. The Gendered Veil in sociology is clearly reflected in the virtual absence of African American women in most other professional associations starting in the early 1900s and continuing until at least the 1950s.

Many African American women were part of the HHSRR, and this points to an alternative, gendered structure of scholars, activists, friends, and social movement organizations that help make sociology a “liberating” profession that existed almost entirely outside of the official ASA umbrella of organizations, offices, journals, networks, and opportunities (Deegan 2002a).

The Gendered Veil of Sociology and Park's Patriarchal Legacy in an Accommodationist Drama in the ASA, 1920–1960

Although there is a vast literature praising the liberal positions of Park on the sociology of race relations after 1920 (see literature reviews in Deegan 1988a, 2002a), Park represented Washington's position of racial accommodation to oppression and opposed the towering scholarship and activism of DuBois. Most African American men who trained in sociology between 1920 and 1940, moreover, supported the ideas of Washington (often as they were interpreted by Park). Most African American women in sociology, in contrast, supported both Washington and DuBois. This became a barrier to the women's acceptance in Park's circle and within the field of sociology. Park was extremely patriarchal as well, holding an ambivalent position that mocked applied sociology and social reform while he engaged in it. He was a powerful white male who labored to eject women's work from professional definitions of the discipline (Deegan 1988a; 2002a 93–111). His accommodationist position on race relations and sexism combined to create an extremely hostile environment for African American women in sociology. This Gendered Veil and its legacy after 1920 is reflected in the fact that, as far as I can determine, Wilmoth A. Carter became the first "fully credentialed" African American woman to graduate from the University of Chicago in sociology when she earned a Ph.D. in 1959. This was 28 years after Frazier had become the first African American man to earn a doctorate there. The gap between black men and women earning master's degrees there was smaller: Work was the first African American man to earn a master's there, in 1903, and Green the first African American woman to earn a master's there in 1919. These dates are strikingly later than that of the first white male to graduate with a master's degree (1895) and a doctorate (1895) and the first white woman to graduate with a master's degree (1897) and a doctorate (1900) (Deegan 2002a, 114).

The Gendered Veil, woven by white men in sociology and personally reinforced by Park, was partially irrelevant to the powerful sociological labor and ideas of African American women who ignored it. They transcended the Gendered Veil through their writings, activism, and alliance with white women and black men in sociology. White men intended to keep African American women out of sociology—often believing the self-serving myth that no African

American women wanted to be sociologists,⁷ but sociology is an incredibly flexible discipline. Its canon is contested and changeable. Although it has taken over a century to recognize the African American founding sisters, their work, lives, and ideas can now be included within the annals of sociology.

The Veil of Sociology and the Explosive ASA Meeting in 1968

Whitney Young, executive director of the National Urban League, was invited to address the ASA meeting during the height of the civil rights protests. He relentlessly and accurately skewered the profession. John Leo (citing Young, 1968a) reported that “American sociology has impeded the Negro’s struggle by asking the wrong questions, by not recruiting Negro scholars, and by portraying the black family ‘as a pathological entity.’” White sociologists used “sterile questionnaires developed and designed by and for white people.” Although most black families were stable and resisting racism, Young called for sociologists to “shift their focus to ‘the inherent racism of the white family’ and ‘the pathology of white society.’” Thus Young astutely pointed to sociological processes now called “white racism” (e.g., Feagin and Vera, 2001), “the Veil of sociology” (Deegan 1992), and “white sociology” (Ladner 1973) long before sociologists named them. Like female sociologists and Friedan, African American sociologists followed the leader of a broad social movement. Leo (1968b) reported that thirty-five African American sociologists “filed a bitter complaint” after this speech was delivered, and the Black Caucus was born.

The Black Caucus, 1968

In 1968 the Black Caucus formed in Boston under the leadership of Tillman Cothran of Atlanta University to redress the long marginalization of African Americans in the Association. They resolved to be represented in council, on standing and ad hoc committees, and as participants as presenters, organizers, reviewers, and discussants.

⁷ Several people in the audience of a paper I gave at the University of Chicago in 1992 confidently told me this myth, and several graduates from the department have repeated it during the course of my work over the past thirty years, too.

The 1968 ASA president, Philip Hauser, responded that these were legitimate grievances (Leo 1968b). He tempered his response, however, by adding: "Many blacks have had to go to smaller schools of lesser quality, where they may have received training that hasn't measured up to that of whites" (Hauser cited by Leo 1968b). Wilbert E. Moore (ASA president 1966) took a tougher line. He opposed any quotas for inclusion and "Like many here, he said, he 'can't see any evidence' that articles have been rejected by sociological journals because the authors are black'" (Moore cited by Leo 1968b).

In 1969 more militant demands were formulated. It was asked, What did the ASA plan to do to ensure equality in opportunity; to criticize injustice in society, especially in the War in Viet Nam; to criticize capitalism and the unjust treatment of specific black men? In 1970 specific steps were taken to appoint thirteen black men and two black women to various positions on committees and a board. In addition the Black Caucus demanded that it become a committee of the ASA with funding, office space, and services. They wanted support in conducting a research survey of black members in the ASA to document their needs and attitudes. Finally, they called for a DuBois-Johnson-Frazier award following criteria set by the caucus. In 1971 the award was established and in 1972 many more African American participants were listed on the program (Blackwell 1974, 341-67).

These gains, while significant, need to be continually monitored, and they did not address the specific problems of the Gendered Veil. The Association of Black Sociologists (ABS) was formed to address the issues surrounding research, participation, and networking. The ABS annually meets immediately before and during the ASA meetings.

Martin Luther King, Jr. on the Veil of Sociology at the ASA in 1968

Martin Luther King, Jr., the renowned civil rights leader, was also shocked by the ASA meeting of 1968. King publicly denounced the white racism of Charles P. Loomis, the 1967 ASA President. King, speaking just months before his death, was delivering an Invited Distinguished Address to the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues of the American Psychological Association on the role of behavioral scientists to help or hinder the civil rights movement. King, not invited to address the ASA on such a central topic, pointed directly to the racism of the ASA President and indirectly to the

sociologists who elected him. King (1969, 184) had read in the *New York Times* of 31 August 1968 (see Leo 1968b) that Loomis at the annual meeting said: "that Negroes should be given a chance to find an all Negro community in South America: that the valleys of the Andes Mountains would be an ideal place for American Negroes to build a second Israel . . . the United States Government should negotiate for a remote but fertile land in Ecuador, Peru, or Bolivia for this relocation." King (1969, 184) commented on this imbecility: "I feel that it is rather absurd and appalling that a leading social scientist today would suggest to black people, that after all these years of suffering and exploitation as well as investment in the American dream, that we should turn around and run at this point in history. I say that we will not run!"

The Effects of the Women's and Civil Rights Movement on the ASA

The civil rights and women's movements changed the study of women, African Americans, and their professional recognition, but women and blacks remain significantly underrepresented in offices, presentations, publications, graduate training centers, promotions, and income. African American men have increasingly appeared in positions with such opportunities, but they remain under-represented and African American women still experience the Gendered Veil. An even more significant shift has occurred in the proportion of male to female graduates. Although women were generally 10–20% of the profession during the first seventy-five years of the ASA, approximately half of all doctorates in sociology over the past twenty-five years were earned by women.

In 2005 we still find that only three African American men have been president of the ASA, only eight white women, and no black woman has held this office. If the proportion of women graduates were reflected in the statistics, instead of eight women during the last thirty-five years, there would have been twelve to eighteen, with some of them African American women. Instead, we see some changes but not enough. These gains, moreover, may continue, reverse, or cease. In other words, no clear pattern of greater equality is evident.

More subtle, but perhaps more significant, indicators of continuing inequality are the treatment of women founders, the lack of change in the body of sociological knowledge, and the failure to

include more women and African Americans in the planning, execution, and celebration of the official ASA centennial. For example, extensive documentation and analysis of the stellar work of the first female sociological, Harriet Martineau, continues to be ignored, trivialized, and denied (see Deegan 2003b). Addams, Gilman, and DuBois are increasingly mentioned in the short section on the history of the profession in introductory textbooks, but their ideas do not order the contents of these books. And, of course, the chapter you are reading is part of the “alternative” analysis of a century of work in the American sociology.

Another indicator of continuing problems occurred with the 1999–2000 professional controversy about selecting the editor and criteria for papers for the *American Sociological Review*. The wresting of professional authority away from the original ASA committee, the rejection of their recommendations for the new editor—Walter Allen, who is an African American male—and many letters to the editor of *Footnotes* point to the broad disciplinary context that underlies white racism and patriarchy. Allen would have been the first African American to be appointed to this mainstream, ASA-sponsored journal. Two white women who graduated from the University of Chicago, Rita Simon (1978–1980) and Paula England (1994–1996), are the only female editors since its founding in 1936. Meanwhile the *AJS* has had only one female editor, the Hispanic Marta Tienda, since its founding in 1895, and no African Americans.

Joe R. Feagin (ASA president in 2000) and Hernan Vera (2001) document the century of liberation sociology that sustains the most creative and critical sociologists. Despite this achievement, liberation sociology remains outside of the major journals sponsored by the ASA and the sociological knowledge generated within its annals.

Conclusion

African Americans and women have made substantial contributions to the ASA over the past century, despite patterns of discrimination and exclusion. Their productive and creative work and networks transcended these limits and created a viable, alternative pattern of opportunity and critical thinking to help everyday people receive more social justice, equality, and freedom. The patterns of inclusion and exclusion have varied, however, with more opportunities for

white women in the first fifteen years than in the ensuing half a century. White women have slowly increased their visibility and recognition in the last third of the twentieth century.

African American men have also inched forward in representation and liberation within the formal structure, but the Veil of sociology continues to slow this progress and recognition. The Gendered Veil remains next to impossible to penetrate. The inspiring leaders of the golden era of African American women in sociology continue to be beacons of hope and inspiration, remaining at the forefront of human possibility and achievement.

African American women played a vital role in sociology through their lives of resistance, writings on women and race relations, organization of women's clubs, and their embodiment of women's ability to blend family and social claims. Although their work has been obscured by a Gendered Veil, two generations of African American women made substantial contributions to sociology, their families, communities, and the wider society. The pioneers created a golden era of African American women and generated a noble tradition that is virtually unexplored in sociology. The more modest lives of the professionally trained women who followed them are even less recognized or understood. Scholarship on African Americans men and white women in sociology can help us understand these unique and vital African American women. We need to understand both their similarities with and differences from other sociologists, within the United States and around the world. This is an exciting heritage awaiting exploration and further research.

Table 10.1. ASA President and Eminent Spouse

| ASA MALE PRESIDENT AND EMINENT FEMALE SPOUSE |
|---|
| W.I. Thomas (1927) and Dorothy Swaine Thomas (1952) Luther L. Bernard (1932) and Jessie Bernard Everett C. Hughes (1963) and Helen MacGill Hughes (v-p, 1980) Arnold M. Rose (1969) and Caroline Rose Lewis A. Coser (1975) and Rose Coser Alfred McClung Lee (1976) and Elizabeth Bryant Lee Peter H. Rossi (1980) and Alice S. Rossi (1983) |
| ASA FEMALE PRESIDENT AND EMINENT MALE SPOUSE |
| John W. Riley, Jr. and Matilda White Riley (1986) William H. Form and Joan Huber (1989) Lowell Hargens and Barbara F. Reskin (2002) |

Table 10.2. Names and Years of Office of White Female Presidents of the ASA

| NAMES | YEAR OF OFFICE |
|-----------------------|----------------|
| Dorothy Swaine Thomas | 1952 |
| Mirra Komarovsky | 1973 |
| Alice S. Rossi | 1983 |
| Matilda White Riley | 1986 |
| Joan Huber | 1989 |
| Maureen T. Hallinan | 1996 |
| Jill Quadagno | 1998 |
| Barbara F. Reskin | 2002 |

Table 10.3. The Names and Years of Office of African American Male Presidents of the ASA

| NAMES | YEAR OF OFFICE |
|-----------------------|----------------|
| E. Franklin Frazier | 1948 |
| William Julius Wilson | 1990 |
| Troy Duster | 2005 |

CHAPTER ELEVEN

“BLOOMING IN THE NOISE OF THE WHIRLWIND” THE ROOTS OF THE ASSOCIATION OF BLACK SOCIOLOGISTS¹

BETTE J. DICKERSON

Prologue

In this great future, we can't forget the past.
Bob Marley²

This is not intended to be the definitive history of the Association of Black Sociologists though, when that definitive history is written, I hope this contribution will be of help to that future publication. As an active member and a past president of the ABS, I have participated fully in the organization for years and have been privileged to become acquainted with many of its members and to share concerns about professional experiences. In this account, *who* is not as important as *what*, even though that means leaving out the names of a number of people deserving of recognition for the uncountable amounts of time and effort they voluntarily gave to the CBS, ABS and the ASA. It is they who have made this writing possible and I thank them. They were trailblazers who were not afraid to speak out, stand up, and challenge the status quo. Their actions were important and inherently powerful. They did their work well and created a place for later volunteers. Their passionate scholar-activism led to and inspired change. It provides a driving force for the rest of us.

The invitation to contribute to this anthology at the occasion of the ASA Centenary provided a prime opportunity for investigating the conditions surrounding the founding of the Association of Black

¹ *Black Sociologists: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives*, edited by James E. Blackwell and Morris Janowitz, and the meeting minutes in the ASA national office were invaluable in understanding the early history of the Association of Black Sociologists. The research assistance provided by Renee Hamer was a great help (Thanks Renee!).

² Quoted in Marley, Rita with Hettie Jones. 2004, 208.

Sociologists (ABS). Though most are aware of the ABS, there is a widely held assumption that it just passively came into existence. Few know of its predecessor, the Caucus of Black Sociologists (CBS), or of the role of the CBS as an agent of change in the restructuring of the American Sociological Association (ASA) through policies specifically aimed at the equal inclusion of African American sociologists during some tumultuous times in the not so distant past. The more I delved into the subject the more I found out just how much has been forgotten. A reason for the impaired memory of the older scenarios is that some of the entities and individuals that produced them are gone and there is a paucity of published information.

A few points need to be made before proceeding. The first is that there is a prevailing collective amnesia about the beginnings of the ABS and the early relationship with the ASA. If it is thought of at all it is in relation to what it and its members are doing today. The sense of what is important is often distorted by the glitter of the current, the trendy, and the new; but I want you, the reader, to think about the longer processes that have shaped the ABS and in which it is deeply rooted.

Second, whether collective memory is limited or not is sometimes determined by intentional decisions and other times by structural impediments. African American history in America, in particular, is replete with examples of fabulous explosions that left little or no detectable trace, or whose documentary and artifactual remains were never systematically assembled or adequately conserved. There are periods in which conditions have favored an abundant proliferation and preservation of African American knowledge while conditions dictate the destruction of knowledge about other eras. During periods of abundance it is up to succeeding generations to ensure that such knowledge is identified, catalogued, and utilized to produce new knowledge.

Third, historical knowledge is often lost, buried, and forgotten because of the lack of adequate organizational mechanisms to secure the reliable transfer of both qualitative and quantitative information. More needs to be done to overcome the deficiencies that constrict access to and appreciation of older knowledge. We must continue to develop organizational structures that guarantee the conservation, transmission, and development of historical knowledge. Such information must continue to be uncovered, analyzed, and stored.

The following narrative relates what is past. The rebellions, refor-

mations, and upheavals brought refreshment and renewal but also forced the rethinking of premises and assumptions. But all that seems solid can vanish in a heartbeat because those who fail to secure the transmission of their histories are doomed to forget them.

The Environmental Context

If we are to extract solutions from the lessons of the slaves' survival, and our own, we must first face squarely the unbearable landscape and climate of that survival.

Derrick Bell³

CBS/ABS came into existence toward the end of the larger societal struggle for Black inclusion and social justice known as the Civil Rights movement. The Supreme Court had issued its monumental verdict in the 1954 *Brown v. Board of Education* case that segregation in the public schools was unconstitutional; and Congress had passed the Civil Rights Act of 1964. These monumental events were meant to reflect important changes in the persistent racism in the American psyche, but the Supreme Court could not have predicted just how resistant to integration many white Americans were. Most African Americans were encouraged by the legal decisions and believed that, along with school segregation, other forms of inequality would end. Their hopes and beliefs were soon dashed when faced with the massive resistance (e.g., attempted assassination of James Meredith and confrontations in Montgomery, Birmingham) to the Court rulings (Wexler 1993).

The Justices had delivered an integration mandate, but it would take much more to turn the judicial words into the constructive actions necessary to speed up the pace of integration and equal rights. There were intense debates over the merits of reinventing the social structure to accommodate non-normative individuals, or absorbing individuals into already existing and static social structures. African Americans fought to have the rules of society changed. They fought the politics of the rule structure, the social positioning of the rule makers, and representations that reinforced the control and dominance of the rule makers. Lower class African Americans continued

³ Quote from Fleming, Robert. 1996. *The Wisdom of the Elders*. New York: One World, p. 262.

struggling for equal access to the basic necessities of life, like employment and housing, while middle class African Americans fought for the unimpeded opportunity to enter and advance in the professional mainstream. Grievances were communicated almost entirely through the leadership of churches and voluntary organizations. In many voluntary organizations, however, the status quo was maintained. There was a huge gap between what was and what should have been.

As the civil rights period was drawing to a close, the United States faced a challenge from a new breed of social activism, one demanding an immediate end to the oppression of African Americans. A speech by Stokely Carmichael, Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) chairman, illustrated the increasing impatience with the slow pace of change. Carmichael urged African Americans to "get together" in their own behalf and rejected the Horatio Alger view that one could get ahead through individual ambition and hard work. What was needed was "Black Power," which became the rallying cry for a generation of African Americans desperate for a sense of empowerment and validation. The increasing willingness of African Americans to demand an immediate end to inequalities ushered in a new phase of race relations (Wexler 1993).

Within the field of sociology it was a time of rigid theoretical frameworks that neglected the perspectives of "the other" and focused primarily on the interests and structures that maintained the dominant group, whites. Sociology had been involved in the study of race relations and race stratification since the 1920s (Kinloch 1985). In general, the growth of the discipline in the United States was directly related to its theory building and research methodologies in the study of race-minority and ethnic group problems on the domestic front, particularly the struggles over the disenfranchised status of African Americans. The lived experiences and professional competence of African American sociologists would seem to have been indispensable to the sound interpretation of research and theory related to their community, but for the practice of sociology in academia, as in other spheres of life in the U.S., constraints of various types inhibited the development of a genuinely inclusive professional mandate.

Before the 1960s, African American scholars were forced to practice their "trade" in an unequal and segregated social order. They were not allowed to enter most professional schools for training, and when the few "exceptional" persons were admitted, subsequent opportunity structures and mobility avenues were blocked. Few of the pre-

dominantly white institutions had any African American faculty members in their academic departments, including sociology. In fact, in 1941, when the esteemed Charles S. Johnson was President of the Southern Sociological Society (SSS), neither he nor other African American attendees of the SSS annual meeting could purchase meals or rent rooms in the conference hotel, though that didn't prevent the Society from proceeding with its meeting. It wasn't until 1960, after protests by African American sociologists, that the SSS decided to meet only at sites that offered integrated meals and lodging (Smith and Killian 1974). African American sociologists, both by choice and circumstances, were concerned about their narrowly defined roles and statuses. They were forced to consider, whether explicitly or implicitly, options for reform, protest, and change.

The integrative restructuring in the '60s and '70s led to the emergence of African American professional organizations in every major field, including sociology. As the wider society addressed the new equity expectations and demands resulting from the policy of integration, many professional organizations experienced more competition, polarization, and conflict. As African American members, prominent in their own right, became less invisible, there were growing demands for inclusion, for "a place at the table." In 1969, African American members revolted in a number of voluntary professional organizations (e.g., American Sociological Association, American Psychological Association, American Political Science Association). Significant efforts to gain greater inclusion within the predominantly white professional organizations led to a greater proliferation of Black professional organizations (Smith and Killian 1974).

The social conditions heightened the "racial group common fate identification" that bound African Americans together in the United States. Racism and segregation locked them physically, bonded them socially, and reinforced the strong communal solidarity necessary to fight off the external forces of disintegration. From the categorical group treatment and social mobility constraints of a segregated caste group, unrecognized as equal citizens with equal rights and living in one pole of a polarized world, African Americans developed an even greater solidarity and commonality of beliefs. Individuals made conscious decisions to identify with the group with which they shared a common history, kinship, and destiny (Dickerson 1994). This belief in racial group common fate, and the in-groupness that flowed from the related patterns of association, created conditions ripe for

mobilization and collective effort toward bringing about social justice and change.

Within the sociological enterprise, African American sociologists were expected to achieve acceptable professional goals but were denied access to the opportunities to obtain them. Despite professional rank, they still found themselves "in the same boat," thus reinforcing their racial group common fate identification. The collective efforts stemming from a personal identity inseparable from that of the larger race community⁴ tended to be effective in bringing about social change. Empowerment became possible through the group actions and victories that enabled individual members to feel they had gained some degree of control over what happened in their professional lives.

The Centrality of Voluntary Organizations

... service is the rent we pay for living.
Marian Wright Edelman⁵

This study is about voluntary organizations, social groups that develop out of the shared interests and concerns of the individuals and that organize for the purpose of reaching one or more goals through cooperative, normatively integrated activity. Historically, they have been a primary source of advocacy, action, and justice on race-related issues for African Americans. They have also been vital formal mechanisms for leadership development and professional growth by providing opportunities for social intercourse, mentoring, learning the "how to" skills needed for occupational survival (Dickerson 1986).

When voluntary organizations support, impart, and reinforce the societal ideas and values undergirding the dominant social order, they are socializing agents holding society together. Their functions include (1) socialization, the transmission of basic values and behav-

⁴ *Community* refers to a group of people with a common historical and cultural heritage who "... share common interests and values. They have accepted sets of definitions of situations, life experiences, or other conditions that give them a uniqueness apart from others whose views, values, and experiences are dissimilar." (Blackwell 1975, 16)

⁵ Quote from Jewell, Terri L. 1993. *The Black Woman's Gumbo Ya-Ya: Quotations by Black Women*. Freedom, CA: The Crossing Press, p. 19.

ioral patterns to the individual members; (2) social control, the structural arrangement for influencing members toward behavioral conformity; (3) social participation, those structures that facilitate incorporation into the organization by virtue of opportunities for participation in its life; and (4) mutual support, the process of care and exchange for help among the members of a group, especially in times of stress (Dickerson 1986).

Voluntary organization leadership is not innate. It must be identified, encouraged, nurtured, and sustained. In particular, the mentoring and sponsorship necessary for those with little or no background in an organization's leadership processes are not widely available. The social networks that play a big role in the accumulation of cultural capital and in the reduction of marginalization are not widely available. Mentoring, sponsorship, and social networks are vital to securing employment, promotions, collaborative research, service recognition, and other essential elements of the professional life course. Conversely, lack of access to these can lead to problems of various kinds, including lack of support in the tenure process and professional isolation.

The American Sociological Association

It is enough to know that these things are so, the causes we care little about. Those we have been examining, complaining about . . . all our life time. This we are weary of.

Martin R. Delany⁶

At the time, ASA suffered from ". . . structural discrimination in general, denial of access to the major values of the association (controlled participation), social isolation, slights, self-consciousness among black members, role ambiguities, and uncertainties among many members black and white . . ." (Blackwell 1974, 341). This situation presented the opportunity to think not only about participation but also to think about the rules that had excluded people from participation. It spurred many to ask, What is the nature of those rules, who has constructed them, and whose interests have they served?

The internal and external structures of the ASA reflected a relationship between whites and African Americans in the U.S., one of

⁶ Quote from Fleming, Robert. 1996. *The Wisdom of the Elders*. New York: One World, p. 316.

dominance and subordination. The making of decisions about eligibility for membership and the acceptability of roles that were assigned or achieved by members was almost always controlled by white men (Blackwell 1974). Members were expected to strive for success measured against *universalistic criteria* that included “scholarly standing in the field of sociology (professional visibility) as measured by the quantity of publications, that is, the number of articles published in prestigious or “refereed” journals . . . these criteria extended to participation in the annual program of the association . . . All such criteria supposedly attest to the national reputation of an individual among his peers which theoretically enhances the opportunity for peers to confer higher recognition on him by electing him to a leadership position with the American Sociological Association” (Blackwell 1974, 342).

Meeting these universalistic criteria did not enhance Black sociologists’ participation and subsequent election or appointment into leadership positions in the ASA but, rather, proved to be impediments. Articles submitted for publication by African American sociologists to the mainstream professional journals (e.g., *American Sociological Review*, *American Journal of Sociology*) were seldom accepted, and a persistent belief grew, whether true or not, that articles written by those working at historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs), where 99% of them worked, were not even read because of the stereotypical view of HCBU faculty as inferior (Blackwell 1974).

In a time when some thought that race issues were a thing of the past and many white ASA members voiced the liberal ideals of inclusion and acceptance, there was something contradictory about limiting the involvement of African American sociologists who found themselves measured by a framework that negated their ideas and theoretical assumptions and, more tellingly, that prevented full inclusion and participation in the core professional organization. African American ASA members had engaged in the behaviors required to meet the universalistic criteria believing that the behaviors would produce desirable outcomes in the ASA, but they were not privy to the necessary resources or opportunities to fully perform the membership behaviors or to gain the expected outcomes. Fortunately, their self-efficacy and self-standards were high, given the absence of the usual motivating external rewards.

Though Black sociologists had been in the ASA for decades they were largely “outsiders within.” According to Blackwell,

during the early period when the ASA was itself a loosely organized body, no significant steps were taken by the organization to either increase the number of black members or incorporate its few black members into its structure or to enable them to play leadership roles. (Blackwell 1974, 344)

True, the distinguished E. Franklin Frazier had held the most significant leadership position, serving as President in 1948, but from 1965 to 1968 only eight African American sociologists were among the eight hundred eleven ASA members serving on elected and appointed committees. During this same time period, there was never an African American chairperson over any one of the over one hundred thirty standing, constitutional, and ad hoc committees (Blackwell and Janowitz 1974). The 1967 ASA election slate had no African American sociologists, though one was appointed to the Committee on Nominations. In 1969, two African American sociologists were on the 1969 ASA election slate, but neither was elected (Smith and Killian 1974). If ever there was a case of "taxation without representation" this was certainly it.

The pioneer African American sociologists, whatever their individual achievements, were labeled "tokens" and worse by some (Blackwell and Janowitz 1974). Despite attempts to de-value their professional cultural capital, the early African American members of the ASA were models of tenacity, determination, and survival against all odds, providing some hope for success in the reduction of race-related cleavages and conflicts in the organization. Yet, as race-minority membership grew, they remained a relatively under-utilized resource in the continuing struggle to overcome structural obstacles emerging from organizational discrimination.

For African American sociologists, it was time to replace the uncertainty and unpredictability of the purportedly universalistic criteria with consistency. They sought evidence that steadfast adherence to shared professional values with common, cooperative activity would result in rewards realized by all. Minus the consistent application of the universalistic criteria, they had three options: to go along with the inconsistent, exclusionary practices, to work within the existing organization to elicit change, or to create their own organization. The final outcome for many was a combination of the last two options, as evident in the CBS work within the ASA and the subsequent establishment of the Association of Black Sociologists.

The Caucus of Black Sociologists

It is better to protest than to accept injustice.
 Rosa Parks⁷

CBS grew from an organized protest for organizational reform that subsequently helped to democratize the sociological enterprise. The CBS movement was so determined that it impacted multiple aspects of the ASA, forcing it to change with the times to become more inclusive with regard to African American sociologists. For the African American sociologists involved in the CBS, it was the empowering force representing their "racial group common fate" interests in the inclusion movement aimed at ASA.

In the late 1960s, some African American sociologists, having had enough of not having full access to the benefits accrued from being ASA members, decided to take some action because

Blacks were not members of the council of the association. Blacks were all but absent from the committee structure of the association . . . Research funds were as a rule not available to blacks even when the primary focus was on blacks, and their articles were not likely to be published in mainstream journals. (Blackwell and Janowitz 1974, 350)

Adding insult to injury, there was only one African American sociologist in the 1968 annual meeting program. These exclusionary practices led to the need to consider what actions were necessary and how to do so from a vulnerable, powerless standpoint. The forces of professional deprivation and marginalization were strong; determined agency and action were required.

Dismayed and disillusioned, Tillman Cothran led an effort to effect change by convening Black sociologists at the 1968 ASA annual meeting (Boston). There was no question that the primary issue was exclusion. When people perceive that they are being denied something that they know that they should have, the typical first response is to identify the party responsible for the denial, in this case the ASA. With the consensual identification of the issue and the guilty party, the essence of a conflict was established. Discussions then focused on developing a strategy to effect change. Sentiments ran

⁷ Quote from Jewell, Terri L. 1993. *The Black Woman's Gumbo Ya-Ya: Quotations by Black Women*. Freedom, CA: The Crossing Press, p. 28.

the gamut between separation and integration. The discussions were divided between advocates for a Black Caucus that was an officially recognized group within the ASA (i.e., similar to the ASA sections) and those for a separate, independent African American sociological association (i.e., similar to SSSP and SWS). The advocates for an ASA affiliated body won out (Blackwell and Janowitz 1974).

The loosely structured assembly named itself the Caucus of Black Sociologists and drew up a six-part resolution calling for specific action to overcome the marginalization many African American sociologists experienced. The resolution demanded Black representation in the Council, in the standing and ad hoc committees, as section chairs in the annual meeting programs, and as presenters and discussants of papers with major relevance to the African American community, the rallying cry being "Nothing about us without us." The resolution also demanded that African American sociologists serve as readers and referees of papers submitted for publication in the ASA journals (Blackwell and Janowitz 1974).

On August 28, 1968, the resolution was presented to and approved by a majority vote at the ASA business meeting. The Council expressed its endorsement through a resolution of its own that acknowledged the historic exclusion of African Americans from "the mainstream of institutional and professional life in the United States." It went on to declare that the ASA "shall make every effort to ensure that black sociologists are brought into fullest participation in all aspects of the governance and other activities of the Association" (American Sociological Association 1968, 323).

After the ASA Council endorsement, the Committee on Committees asked the CBS to recommend Black sociologists for appointments on standing and ad hoc committees. This request placed the CBS in what seemed an untenable position, that of acting as its own "gatekeeper," but it complied and, as a result, seven African American sociologists were appointed to various ASA committees in 1969. In addition, four were nominated to committee seats that required voting, though only one of the four won a seat. During this time Troy Duster was already serving as a member of *The American Sociologist* editorial board. There were more African American sociologists on the program, and rooms were provided for the CBS to meet during the 1969 ASA annual meeting in San Francisco (Blackwell and Janowitz 1974).

The acceptance by the ASA of the resolution was viewed by some as a victory for the CBS inclusion movement that would begin to provide opportunities for more African American ASA members to have access to channels of advancement equal to those of their white counterparts. Blackwell (1974) reports, however, that the ASA actions “remained tepid forays into academic tokenism,” according to the even more militant African American sociologists who were present at the CBS meetings held during that 1969 ASA annual meeting (San Francisco). Sentiments ran the gamut from integration into ASA to separation from ASA. There were advocates for a Black Caucus that was an officially recognized group within the ASA structure similar to the ASA sections, and there were those who wanted an independent, entirely separate and distinct sociological organization (Smith and Killian 1974).

Ernest Works chaired an ad hoc committee of the CBS, itself still an ASA committee ad hoc, that was charged with identifying and monitoring the steps taken by the ASA toward addressing the 1968 resolution. The steering committee was also charged with developing a roster of African American sociologists across the nation. The people on the roster were then surveyed to identify the issues and to determine whether it was feasible to convene the first business meeting of the CBS at the 1970 ASA meeting (Washington, DC). Virtually all the survey respondents saw the central issue as that of being marginalized in the ASA. Furthermore, they expressed the need to increase representation and participation through the election of African American sociologists to the ASA Council and committees, to have them appointed to non-elective positions, and hired in the Executive Office (Scott n.d.).

In 1969, based on the survey results, the CBS presented a two-part statement to the ASA. The first part of the statement consisted of five demands:

accountability—that the ASA share with the CBS what steps had been taken to implement the 1968 demands;

inclusion—that African Americans be appointed to all decision making bodies;

elimination of tokenism—that multiple participation in annual meeting sessions be halted and participation be distributed more equally;

growth—that a program be developed to offer scholarships and other forms of financial assistance to African American students interested in sociology;

recognition—that special sessions be arranged for African American sociologists in the upcoming 1970 annual meeting (Blackwell and Janowitz 1974).

The CBS "watchdog" committee had also assessed the ASA stance on various contemporary social issues and "found the relationship lacking." Subsequently, the CBS went on record in the second part of the statement as "categorically opposed" to the Vietnam War, "counter-insurgency research and the political oppression of the Black Panther Party," and the use of welfare to make the African American population a dependent population (Hawkins 1995; Blackwell and Janowitz 1974). To appreciate the CBS stance fully requires recognizing that there was no disjunction between it and the African American community. Because of the peculiar nature of the African American experience in the U.S. and the centrality of the civil rights and Black Power social movements of the era, there was the heightened awareness of racial group fate. The CBS members were the community's representatives, coming out of a long tradition of often having only African American social scientists truly bearing witness to the realities of life in Black America. They were, in an important sense, the "voices of the community" in the discipline and took this responsibility very seriously.

It was determined that the second half of the statement required no formal action, and the five points in the first half of the statement were passed by the voting membership at the ASA business meeting on September 4, 1969. The ASA Council then approved the resolution and a motion that reaffirmed its "continuing concern for the active participation of all minority groups in Association affairs." Furthermore, the motion stated that the CBS "spokesman" was to be kept abreast of the actions taken by the ASA to increase African American participation in the annual meeting programs and that policies related to expanding participation were under committee review. Finally, a second motion was approved that authorized the ASA to provide funds to a designated African American sociologist to conduct a survey of various funding agencies regarding what they were doing to support African American sociologists through fellowships, grants, etc. (American Sociological Association 1970).

The number of African American sociologists on the ASA elections slate increased from four in 1969 to seven in 1970, though only one was elected. The ASA Council more than doubled the number of appointments of African American sociologists to committees

from seven in 1969 to fifteen in 1970 (Blackwell and Janowitz 1974). "Multiple participation" bolstered the fifteen appointments, however, with three of the appointees serving on two committees each and five of the committee appointees also being on the elections slate. Female African American sociologists were noticeably absent, with only two of the twelve appointees being women.

More Black sociologists were being appointed to committees, but years of exclusion had left many of them relatively unknown to the majority of the ASA voting membership. More decisive action was required to get them "fast tracked" and on equal footing. The frustration resulting from the outcome of the 1970 elections and the seeming lack of progress toward wider participation provided the impetus for the formalization of the Caucus of Black Sociologists, which was officially launched at its first business meeting held during the 1970 ASA annual meeting (Washington, DC). James E. Blackwell was asked to serve as the interim national chairman of CBS until elections could be held in November 1970. The elections were held, and he was subsequently elected the first National Chairman of the CBS, serving from 1970 to 1973 (Blackwell and Janowitz 1974).

A three-part resolution, presented at the 1970 ASA business meeting, opened with the following preamble:

The Caucus of Black Sociologists takes the position that traditional sociology as perpetrated by the establishment of the American Sociological Association does not address itself fully to the needs of the people of the American Society; nor does it address itself to the crucial issues affecting the lives of people at home and abroad. The major focus of what we call empirical sociology is indeed extremely parsimonious and devoid of humanism.

Thus, Whereas we condemn the self-interested professionalism which is implicit in the convention of the ASA and within present-day "mainstream sociology" and

Whereas, the Caucus is committed to re-directing the ASA and its sterile traditionalism on to a new path addressing itself to dynamic social change and the real needs of our society; and

Whereas the legitimacy of this view is derived from the often neglected sociological investigations of such scholars as Lester E. Ward, Albion W. Small, Charles S. Johnson, C. Wright Mills, and W.E.B. DuBois;

It is therefore in this spirit and soul that we submit the following resolutions for acceptance and implementation by the 1970 Convention of the American Sociological Association.

Therefore, Be it resolved that the legitimacy of *the Caucus of Black Sociologists be recognized as of 1 September 1970, as a functioning committee of the ASA* (author's italics).

Part I went on to demand that the ASA provide funds, office space, and other supportive services, including a full-time staffer; ensure that there were always at least three African American sociologists on the Council and that every committee had at least one; establish a CBS-appointed committee that would serve as an advisory committee for the appointments of Black sociologists to the ASA committees; and reconstitute the allocation of sectional (session) chairs to ensure greater dispersion of African American sociologists so that they were not restricted to only those sessions dealing with race and ethnic relations (acknowledging internal diversity).

The ASA was also asked to provide funds for a survey to determine the status of African American faculty and graduate students on campuses across the nation and to ascertain what tangible efforts were being made to increase the numbers; to steer all research projects dealing specifically with African Americans to African American sociologists with professional competence in the areas under study; to urge private and public funding agencies to direct monies for research on African American people to African American sociologists; to provide funds for teams of African American sociologists to conduct seminars on "the integration of the Black perspective in sociology" for sociology faculty across the nation; and, lastly, to establish a *DuBois-Johnson-Frazier Award* in recognition of the longstanding significant contributions of W.E.B. DuBois, Charles S. Johnson, and E. Franklin Frazier (Blackwell and Jankowitz 1974).

The parts of the resolution addressing the allocation and control of research and research funding by and about African Americans were defeated, but Part I of the resolution that dealt with Council representation was approved, though narrowly, with a margin of only five votes. For some CBS members "... the defeat of resolution I would have been interpreted as hypocrisy and blacks would have bolted the organization" (Blackwell 1974, 360). Others, however, considered talk of withdrawing from the ASA as "... not a reasonable, but a foolhardy strategy ..." (Herring 1999, 9). If the changes made as a result of the CBS' persistent agitation and resolution-crafting hadn't happened and the status quo had continued, however, it is highly unlikely that many Black sociologists would have maintained their membership with the ASA.

While a racist segment of individual ASA members may have had a hand in blocking access and fostering the non-progressive attitudes and reactions toward CBS members, many saw the lack of an

adequate response by the ASA organization as the real, disheartening problem. CBS retreatists, still feeling neglected, betrayed, and hopeless, rejected the actions taken by the ASA and dropped out all together. CBS conformists accepted the means proposed by the ASA, arguing that the best route to inclusion was to blend in, to assimilate, to be non-threatening. Others felt that if the CBS sought to be merely ASA-like it would only lead to continued marginalization. These innovators challenged the assimilationist strategies head-on and began to give consideration to the feasibility of creating a separate organization as a way to craft their own means toward the shared goals. They defied the notion that “this is how things are” and pushed all beyond their normal comfort zones. It was clear that the innovators were not about to coddle anyone. Whether others were comfortable or not with what needed to be done was not really their problem. It was undeniable that all would have to move beyond their comfort zones to truly effect change.

Leaders of the CBS met with an ASA subcommittee to negotiate the execution of the 1970 resolutions. The results of the meeting were mixed; there were differing views on the outcomes. For example, instead of the ASA funding office space, support services, and a CBS executive secretary position, as requested by the CBS, the Executive Secretary on Minority Affairs position, to be located in the ASA national office, was created. Rather than stick to the original demand, the CBS agreed to help ASA raise funds to support this new, more encompassing position. Though the first person hired for the position was a CBS member, some considered this an act of “selling out” (Herring 1999).

Despite the differing views on strategies and tactics, the CBS leadership coalition remained unified against what they unanimously saw as the central issue: exclusion. Through the tireless efforts of James E. Blackwell, James E. Conyers, Jacquelyne Johnson Jackson, Charles U. Smith, and others, CBS spearheaded a number of ASA accomplishments. Along with the broader general participation of African American members in the ASA, CBS was instrumental in the establishment of a number of initiatives:

- The expansion of the ASA’s “federal funding package” to include training monies for minority doctoral students which subsequently led to the establishment of the Minority Fellowships Program.

- The establishment of the *DuBois-Johnson-Frazier Award*, first recommended by the CBS and then approved by the ASA Council, which then expanded the nominee pool from the original "sociologists" to include also those at institutions whose work in the development of African American sociologists was in the tradition of the three illustrious but often overlooked scholars for which the award was named.
- The creation of a Committee on the Status of Racial and Ethnic Minorities in the Profession, charged with investigating the status of African American faculty and graduate students.

During the administration of ASA President William Sewell, seventeen African American sociologists were appointed to committees (9% of total committee members), three were elected to constitutional committees (11% of total constitutional committee members), two were appointed to editorial boards (2% of total editorial board members), and one was finally appointed to the Council for the 1970–71 term (Blackwell and Janowitz 1974).

At the 1971 and 1972 ASA annual meetings, the CBS sponsored special programs focusing on African American issues featuring both African American and white presenters. A particular banner year was 1972, for illustrating the advances made toward greater participation by African American sociologists. At the annual meeting (New Orleans), at least thirty-five African American sociologists were active participants, presenting papers, serving as session discussants, organizers, and chairpersons. The range of African American sociologists' scholarly interests was evidenced as they participated in the gamut of topical sessions, in contrast to just those focusing on the African American community. In addition, Jacquelyne Johnson Jackson was appointed to the editorship of the *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, and Maurice Jackson was hired by the ASA as the first Executive Specialist for Race and Minority Relations, a position viewed as a resource for information and for the facilitation of related projects formulated by the CBS.⁸ Lastly, James Blackwell and Morris Janowitz were successful in persuading the University of Chicago to

⁸ Albert J. McQueen to the Caucus of Black Sociologists Executive Committee Members. Association of Black Sociologists Reference Files, Box 1.

sponsor a 1972 National Conference on Black Sociologists. Papers presented from the conference were subsequently published in the revealing and comprehensive *Black Sociologists: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives* (Blackwell and Janowitz 1974).

Creating the ABS was not the initial intent of the CBS as evidenced by its symbiotic relationship with the ASA. It was functioning as a committee of the ASA as per its own resolution, and the ASA was experiencing a proliferation of new groups (e.g., Womens' Caucus, Chicano Caucus). Given the perceived success of the CBS movement, other minority groups seized on the inclusivity trend, demanding equal treatment and equal recognition for their respective contributions (American Sociological Association 1970). In determining that it could not assume permanent financial responsibility and programmatic oversight for yet another group, the ASA further stimulated the creation of new voluntary organizations in opposition to, but not at the exclusion of, it. The CBS moved forward with plans for greater independence including the formation of a new organization that was not just an appendage of the ASA.

With limited access to many areas of professional and organizational life, African American sociologists had turned to each other for mentoring, recognition, and leadership development. Nothing was so completely a product of their own agency than the CBS, and on August 6, 1976, it was officially incorporated as the Association of Black Sociologists (ABS).

The Association of Black Sociologists

... we can be our own voices of authority.
Elsa Barkley Brown

The real test of inclusion came when the CBS founders demanded their rightful place at the ASA table bringing with them a whole new panorama of issues and challenges that were unique to their particular lived experiences. Had they continued to internalize the prejudices and mistrust experienced from within the ASA, it could have proved damaging and hurtful to their professional growth and advancement. Instead, they knew the time had come to put academic individualism aside and to work collectively to provide the same space for themselves and for those that would follow them as was

provided to other sociologists. As a result of their efforts to strengthen their inclusion and influence in the ASA, the ABS was born and thrived, having members who have led some of the most significant initiatives in the ASA.

ABS has no challenger for the heart and soul of the community of African American sociologists. It grew out of a need for institutional change and helped democratize the sociological enterprise in the process. It has been a safe haven for its members and an incubator for leadership in the discipline. The ABS has been the starting point for scores of careers. The influence of its members extends beyond the confines of sociology. It serves as a primary source of information and support for the increasing number of gifted and talented African American sociologists and their supporters (Herring 1999). It continues to work towards the goals and objectives set by its founders as it provides a forum for the theories and research focusing on issues impacting Black people in the U.S. and around the globe.

The CBS left quite a legacy to the ABS. In the early years, a part of the CBS mission focused on the identification, socialization, and reproduction of African American sociologists. It formulated programs that would attract faculty and graduate students in order to create and maintain a dynamic network of scholars and scholar-activists producing knowledge and honing their skills in service to the African American community.

The mission of the ABS, as stated in its journal *Race & Society*,

... is to be a direct catalyst for change in the African American community. The goal is to create a powerful network of scholars to influence such change. Our approach is non-adversarial and collaborative. This approach permits us to build bridges and forge links with all of our colleagues locally, nationally, and internationally, to find solutions to problems; to support effective programs and policies in our communities. (Association of Black Sociologists 2002; Herring 2000: 4)

According to Blackwell (Hawkins 1995, 26) "Implementation of our mission occurs in two ways—what the individual chooses to do in their own community and it's also manifested organizationally." Its constitutional objectives, focusing clearly on African American sociologists and the African American community, are:

- a. To enhance the transmission of sociological knowledge to Black communities of their utilization in development and survival;

- b. To provide perspectives for the analysis of Black experiences as well as knowledge for understanding and resolving the varied problems confronted by Black people;
- c. To stimulate and improve the quality of research and the teaching of Sociology;
- d. To promote a substantial increase in the numbers of professionally trained Black Sociologists and to encourage their active participation in all areas of Sociology;
- e. To promote the individual and collective interests of Black Sociologists; and
- f. To protect the professional rights and safeguard the civil rights of Black Sociologists against any and all repressive measures which may stem from their values, ideologies, and/or activities related to the aforementioned objectives.

(Association of Black Sociologists 2000, 1)

The ASA Minority Fellowships Program, MFP, a programmatic response to the need voiced by the CBS to increase the representation of faculty and students, has made significant contributions to that network of scholars that the CBS was intent on forming. The success of the MFP is attested to by the number of race/ethnic and gender minority sociologists it has produced since its inception in 1974, many of whom are ABS members.

The ASA *DuBois-Frazier-Johnson Award* honors the outstanding work done in the tradition of the three scholars for whom it is named, and a number of its recipients have been ABS members. In addition, ABS established its own awards to honor the achievements of colleagues for their contributions to scholarship and service to students, faculty, and the profession. The *Joseph Himes Award*, established in 1992, is given to honor individual career achievement in scholarship, and the *A. Wade Smith Award*, established in 1999, honors teaching, mentorship and service. In 2002, the *Jones E. Blackwell Founders Award* was established to acknowledge exemplary service to the organizational lifetime achievement and sustained contributions for 20 or more years to the profession.

Some of the barriers to gender inclusion evidenced in the early years seem to have broken down as eleven of the ABS' twenty-nine presidents and two of the first three recipients of the newly established A. Wade Smith Award for Teaching, Mentorship, and Service were women. However, as of 2001, only two of the ten recipients of the Joseph Sandy Himes Award for Lifetime Scholarship were women. The paths to scholarly distinctions for African American

female sociologists are still blocked, it seems, exclusionary practices that limit their mobility.

The fight for parity in the academy continues. ABS still defends the interests of its members when their participation is marred by exclusion from formal and informal networks, prejudices, and discrimination, and other oppressive practices. Lobbying for distancing from ASA has continued over the years. Motions arise from time to time to hold the ABS annual meetings at dates and locations different from those of the ASA annual meetings. To date, they have always been soundly defeated, less from a desire to remain glued to the ASA meeting cycle and more from exorbitant expenses that would be incurred by having to attend two major professional conferences at different times and places each year (most ABS members are also member of the ASA). So, ABS continues to meet in the shadow of the ASA.

A major problem remains regarding the lack of sufficient organizational resources to routinize the conservation of historical information and its conveyance to new generations, but the first steps toward addressing it have begun. Through the efforts of the ABS History and Archives committee,⁹ the first boxes of ABS archival materials were transferred to the Moorland-Spangarn Research Center at Howard University, on April 13, 2004.

That ABS exists at all is remarkable enough, but the fact that it has grown consistently over the years, ultimately to be of such benefit to its members, is a true source of wonder. However, the question of whether there is still a need for a separate African American professional organization surfaces occasionally. Conyers (Hawkins 1995, 26) maintains "Collectively [ABS] is producing an atmosphere for our liberation" and Herring (Hawkins 1995, 27) contends "There still needs to be a watchdog organization, not that that's the only function of ABS, but there is quite clearly a need for ABS." Furthermore, the following reasons why the ABS is still needed were among those shared in an organizational survey (Association of Black Sociologists 1997):

... there is a need for an organization that gives Black sociologists a voice.

To associate myself with Black sociologists from whom I believe (I hope) I will get more realistic and relevant viewpoints.

⁹ ABS History and Archives committee members: Rutledge M. Dennis (chair), Donald Cunnigen, Bette J. Dickerson, Johnnie Griffin, Najja Modibo, and Sharon Squires.

ABS has a unique mission with respect to research and services. It offers a forum that's missing in the ASA . . .

ABS provides the opportunity to network with other Black sociologists. This level of interaction with colleagues is not possible in other professional organizations or at individual work sites, e.g., universities which are usually predominantly white/non-Black.

In 1996, a survey of the participants in the 1995 annual meeting of the ABS was conducted to gauge the reasons why the meetings were important to them. The factors, in order of importance, that affected their decisions to attend the ABS annual meetings were "presenting current research," "meeting with professional friends," "enhancing professional networks," and "learning about general research in the discipline." These sentiments could have just as easily been expressed in an ASA survey with one extremely important exception: the ABS focuses on the intellectual and professional growth of African American sociologists and on knowledge produced for and about African American communities. As evidenced from the following responses (Association of Black Sociologists July 1997), there is an obvious need that only the ABS has the specific mandate to meet.

To commune with other African American sociologists socially and intellectually.

To gauge the integrity of my own research by having the scrutiny of other Black scholars.

To learn about and to encourage the growth of scholarship by ABS sociologists.

The ABS annual meetings offer safe space to create, nurture, and educate the membership. Opportunities are provided to learn and develop . . .

It was a great experience for me. It was very motivating and exhilarating. I loved meeting so many dynamic accomplished black women. I gained a new perspective. I will always attend ABS and that helps me to get through the year.

Clearly, the Association of Black Sociologists provides its members a unique and necessary sense of community within the discipline of sociology. The relationship is reciprocal in that, ultimately, the success of the organization is contingent upon the membership. The battle for inclusion waged by the Caucus of Black Sociologists led to corrective actions taken by the American Sociological Association. Through it all they held on to a larger vision that lives on in the Association of Black Sociologists.

CHAPTER TWELVE

AN INTELLECTUAL WASTELAND OR GARDEN OF EDEN? SOCIOLOGY IN THE AMERICAN SOUTH BEFORE 1950

KAY RICHARDS BROSCART

Introduction

This study examines the founding and development of sociology in the southern United States. Several general questions were posed to guide the investigation. First, were any southerners engaged in significant sociological endeavors in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries? If so, who were these sociological pioneers? What was the nature of their careers and contributions? Second, were early southern sociologists concentrated in specific institutional settings? If so, where were these clusters of southern sociologists located? Prior to 1950, was the American South an intellectual wasteland or a Garden of Eden for sociologists?

The information presented in the tables and text that follow was derived from an extensive search of primary and secondary sources. Especially useful were the records of national and regional professional societies and conferences, organizational and institutional histories, newspaper and journal obituaries, biographical reference works and bibliographical resource materials. An examination of these sources was preceded and accompanied by an in-depth study of the history of the South, with special attention to the history of African Americans and the history of women.¹

The presentation of the findings from this investigation will begin with a brief description of two early nineteenth century arm chair social analysts. This introduction will be followed by a more detailed description and analysis of the careers and contributions of two generations of early southern sociologists. The members of the first

¹ These methods evolved from research strategies originally developed and employed in an earlier study of the sociological contributions of early southern women sociologists (Broschart 1997).

cohort, labeled *Southern Sociological Pioneers*, were born in the middle of the nineteenth century, immediately before or after slavery was abolished in the United States. The second group of sociologists, born between 1880 and the turn of the twentieth century, rose to national and regional prominence before 1950. They have been designated *Early Twentieth Century Southern Sociologists*.

Nineteenth Century Southern Arm Chair Social Analysts

It was surprising to find that the earliest sociological volumes produced in America were written and published by two nineteenth century southerners. George Fitzhugh, a self-educated Virginia lawyer, first issued *Sociology for the South* in 1854. In the same year Henry Hughes, a college educated Mississippi lawyer, published a *Treatise on Sociology* (Bernard 1937, 8). Although neither of these proslavery monographs served as the foundation for further publications, research, or analysis, they constitute noteworthy contributions because they were the earliest works with sociology in the title published in the nation. A summary of the social background characteristics and publications of George Fitzhugh and Henry Hughes is displayed in Table 12.1.

Southern Sociological Pioneers

Four pioneering African American men and women have been identified as members of the founding generation of southern sociologists. They are Anna Julia Cooper (1858–1964), Ida-Wells Barnett (1862–1931), Kelly Miller (1863–1939), and William Edward Burghardt DuBois (1868–1963). The social background characteristics of these southern sociological pioneers are presented in Table 12.2A. The members of this pioneering sociological cohort were born in the decade between 1858 and 1868, immediately before or after the Civil War. It was surprising, therefore, to find only African American men and women represented in this group of early sociologists.

The educational attainment of these early African American sociologists far exceeded the general level of schooling of all races and all geographic sectors of the nation in the nineteenth century. Both DuBois and Cooper, for example, earned doctoral degrees from highly respected universities. Miller undertook two additional years of graduate course work after completing his bachelor's degree and

a year of post-graduate study at the U.S. Naval Observatory. Wells-Barnett, the only pioneer without a college education, enrolled in post secondary classes at several institutions of higher education as an adult.

The distinguished sociological contributions of these pioneering southern sociologists clearly justifies placing them among the foremothers and forefathers of American Sociology. They designed and conducted empirical field studies and constructed grounded social theory long before these methods were generally employed in the social sciences. They also founded academic organizations, programs and journals, taught and inspired graduate and undergraduate students, and helped to establish and direct social and political action groups. The occupations and major publications of the southern sociological pioneers are shown in Table 12.2A and 12.2B. A summary of the substantive contributions of the early southern sociological pioneers is presented in Table 12.3.

Anna Julia Haywood Cooper

Anna Julia Haywood was born in Raleigh, North Carolina in 1858. After emancipation, she was educated at St. Augustine's Normal School and Collegiate Institute, an Episcopal freedman's school. Appointed a "pupil-teacher" at the age of eight, she later served as a member of the Institute's teaching faculty. Haywood married fellow teacher and colleague George C. Cooper, an ordained minister, in 1877. Two years later her husband died. In 1881 Cooper applied for admission to Oberlin College and was admitted on a full scholarship with sophomore standing. She completed the requirements for a bachelor's degree from Oberlin in 1884 and a master's degree in 1888.

After teaching for a year at Wilberforce University and returning briefly to St. Augustine's Institute, Cooper accepted a teaching position at M Street High School in Washington, DC. She was appointed principal of the school in 1901. At M Street School, Cooper actively opposed limiting educational opportunities for African Americans to vocational training. Arguing that level of education should be based on aptitude, not race or sex, she promoted access to a classical college preparatory curriculum. After five years as principal, Cooper's contract was not renewed due to opposition to her liberal educational philosophy. She spent the next four years "in exile," teaching

at Lincoln Institute in Jefferson, Missouri (Gabel, 1980:164). She was rehired as a teacher at M Street High School in 1910. For almost a decade, her summers were spent studying at the *Guilde Internationale* in Paris (1911–1913) or at Columbia University (1914–1919), where she completed the required course work for the doctoral program. After World War I, Cooper transferred her graduate credits to the Sorbonne, where she completed the requirements for a doctorate in French history and literature in 1925. After receiving her Ph.D., Cooper continued to teach high school until 1930. Immediately after retiring from the M Street (Dunbar) High School she assumed the post of president of Frelinghuysen University. She served in that position until 1942.

A pioneering social theorist and life long advocate of racial and sexual equality, Cooper is deemed a southern sociological pioneer on the basis of her original and insightful analysis of the intersection of race, gender and region published in *A Voice From the South* in 1892. Writing from a feminist as well as a sociological perspective, she argued “there is a feminine as well as a masculine side to truth.” (Cooper, 1988 [1892], 60) Although clearly influenced by the doctrine of separate spheres, Cooper’s recognition of gender issues is unprecedented among early scholars (Lemert and Bhan 1997, 25). Less well known and less accessible, than her treatise on racism and sexism in the American South is her doctoral dissertation, originally written in French at the Sorbonne. First translated and published in English in 1988 under the title *Slavery and the French Revolutionists*, this original and insightful study brings an international perspective to Cooper’s analysis of race, gender and society.

Ida Wells-Barnett

Born into slavery in 1862, Ida Bell Wells lived with her parents and siblings in Holly Springs, Mississippi, both before and after emancipation. She attended Rust College for twelve years, a local freedman’s school. Her life abruptly changed at the age of sixteen, when her parents and an infant brother died in a yellow fever epidemic. She dropped out of school and found employment as a teacher to support herself and her six orphaned siblings.

In 1884, Wells moved to Memphis where she accepted another teaching position. She enrolled in summer school classes at Fisk

University and LeMoyne Institute. In Tennessee, she soon became involved in journalism and social activism. After writing articles for a number of newspapers, she became an editor and co-owner of a Memphis-based paper, *The Free Speech and Highlight*. Working as an investigative reporter, she conducted ground breaking studies of lynching. While the aims of her research were reformist, her methods of inquiry were unquestionably empirical. Her investigations comprised the first study of lynching based on the analysis of statistical data. She drew conclusions from systemically collected and critically examined evidence (Broschart, 1991:436).

Wells-Barnett's pioneer contributions to sociological research have not been as widely recognized as her contributions to social reform. A dedicated and effective political activist, as well as a pioneer in social research, she was the foundress of an international anti-lynching movement. She was also an outspoken leader in the civil rights and women's suffrage movements.

Wells-Barrett's most significant sociological publications are based on her studies of lynching. They include *A Red Record* (1895), *Southern Horrors* (1892), *Mob Rule in New Orleans* (1900) and "Lynching and the Excuse for It" (1901), an exchange with Jane Addams, reprinted in *Lynching and Rape* in 1971.

Kelly Miller

A native of Winnsboro, South Carolina, Kelly Miller (1863–1939) was the son of Kelly Miller, Sr., a free African American who served in the Confederate Army, and Elizabeth Roberts Miller, a slave. Initially, educated at a Freedman's primary school and institute in Winnsboro, he later attended Howard University and earned a bachelor's degree there in 1886 while working for the U.S. Post Office and the U.S. Pension Office. After completing his undergraduate education, he studied advanced mathematics at the U.S. Naval Observatory, where Simon Newcomb, a professor at Johns Hopkins, recommended he enroll as a graduate student at that University. Miller studied mathematics, physics, and astronomy at Johns Hopkins for two years until a tuition increase forced him to withdraw. He had been the first African American to be admitted to a Johns Hopkins graduate program. He subsequently taught at the M Street High School in Washington, D.C. until 1890, when he was appointed

to the Howard University faculty as a Professor of Mathematics. Five years later he introduced sociology into the curriculum because “its discipline and rigor provided the possibility for an objective understanding of the race issue in America” (Coleman 1999, 815). After 1907, Miller limited his teaching to courses in the field of sociology. While Dean of the College Arts and Sciences (1907–1915), he formally established the Department of Sociology at Howard University in 1915 and served as its chairman for a decade. He was instrumental in expanding the undergraduate curriculum to include more courses in the social and physical sciences. When Miller retired from the faculty of Howard University in 1934, a former student, E. Franklin Frazier, was appointed Professor and Chair of the Sociology Department.

During his lifetime, Kelly Miller was considered to be one of the most influential Black educators in the nation. He was also “one of the most effective advocates of higher education for Black Americans.” (Winston, 1999: 503) He is recognized as a prominent early southern sociologist not only for his contributions to higher education, but also for his pioneering role in the systematic study of African Americans. To this end, he promoted and modeled the use of scientific principles, and statistical analysis. He was instrumental in making Howard University a center for African American studies, despite the opposition of the University’s administration, which removed him as Dean of Arts and Sciences in 1919.

Miller was a columnist and essayist as well as an educator and empirical sociologist. He supported his views on racial issues with facts. In addition to his widely read newspaper columns and pamphlets, he published many articles and essays in respected journals including the *Educational Review*, *Atlantic Monthly*, *Scientific Monthly* and *The Journal of Social Science*. Two volumes of Miller’s essays have collected and published. *Race Adjustment* was issued in 1908 and *The Everlasting Stain* in 1924.

William Edward Burghardt DuBois

Born in Massachusetts in 1868, W.E.B. DuBois earned his first bachelor’s degree in the South, at Fisk University, in 1888. Subsequently, he earned three additional degrees at Harvard—a bachelor’s degree in 1890, a master’s degree in 1891, and a doctorate in 1895. DuBois

was the first African American to earn a Harvard Ph.D. Although his graduate degrees were awarded in the field of history, he later stated "my course of study could have been called sociology" (Rudwick 1974, 27). After leaving Harvard, DuBois taught briefly at Wilberforce University. Then at the University of Pennsylvania he conducted a ground-breaking study in urban sociology, leading to the publication of *The Philadelphia Negro* in 1899. This study has been recognized as the source of "the first reliable information about Negroes in America based on empirical research" (Broderick 1974, 3).

DuBois returned to the South in 1897 when he accepted a position as Professor of Economics and History at Atlanta University. He remained at Atlanta for thirteen years, where he assumed responsibility for an unprecedented series of sociological studies and monographs on African American life in America. He also published *The Souls of Black Folk* (1905), a collection of essays which examine the meaning of being Black in America.

Almost from the beginning of his career, DuBois was a political activist as well as teacher and scholar. In the early 1900's he helped found and served as general secretary of the Niagra Movement, an organizational forerunner of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. One of the founders of the NAACP, DuBois served as its Director of Publications and Research from 1910 to 1934. He also founded and edited *The Crisis*, the NAACP journal, for twenty-four years.

In the early 1930's, DuBois once again returned to the South and Atlanta University. He held the post of Head of the Department of Sociology there from 1934 to 1944. During this decade he co-founded and edited *Phylon*, a journal devoted to the study of race and culture. He also published *Black Reconstruction in America, 1860-1880* (1935), *Black Folk, Then and Now* (1939), and an autobiographical work, *Dusk of Dawn* (1940). DuBois served as Editor in Chief of *The Encyclopedia of the Negro* from 1935 to 1945. A list of his book-length publications issued before 1950 appears in Table 12.2B.

W.E.B. DuBois easily meets the criteria to be considered a southern sociological pioneer. Initially educated at Fisk University, he served as a distinguished member of the Atlanta University faculty for two terms, a total of twenty-three years. While employed at Atlanta, he undertook a series of ground-breaking empirical studies of American Negro life. A prolific author and editor as well as a

civil rights activist and leader, DuBois' numerous published works include sophisticated reports of empirical research as well as insightful and original works of social theory and social analysis.

Early Twentieth Century Southern Sociologists

The names and social background characteristics of nine distinguished early twentieth century southern sociologists are displayed in Table 12.4. This group represents a generation of men and women who made significant contributions to the development of sociology in the South and in the nation. It includes George Edmund Haynes (1880–1960), Howard Odum (1883–1954), Wilson Gee (1888–1961), Katharine Jocher (1888–1983), Harriet Herring (1892–1976), Charles S. Johnson (1893–1956), E. Franklin Frazier (1894–1962), Rupert Vance (1899–1975) and Guy Johnson (1901–1991). While this *sample* is by no means exhaustive, it clearly demonstrates that a number of noteworthy sociologists were practicing in the South prior to 1950.

An inspection of the data in Table 12.4 shows that all but one of those listed were born in the South and received a bachelor's degree from a southern college or university. It is interesting to note that the type of undergraduate institution they attended varied by race and gender. While the white men were educated at predominantly white male institutions, the white women studied at regional women's colleges. Moreover, the Black sociologists were enrolled in racially segregated southern colleges or universities. With one exception, all of the members of this cohort ultimately earned a terminal degree (Ph.D.) in sociology. They also spent at least part of their professional careers employed at southern universities. A brief description of the educational background, careers, and contributions of these nine early southern sociologists is presented in the section that follows. A list of their major publications is displayed in Table 12.5.

George Edmund Haynes (1880–1960)

Born and reared in Arkansas, George Edmund Haynes received a bachelor's degree in 1903 from Fisk University. The following year he earned a master's degree in sociology from Yale University. Subsequently, he enrolled for a year at the Yale Divinity School and studied for several summers at the University of Chicago. Haynes

later became the first African American to enroll in and graduate from the New York School of Philanthropy. In 1912, Haynes was awarded a Ph.D. from Columbia University. He was the first Black graduate student to receive a doctoral degree from that institution (Toppin 1999, 415).

The years between 1910 and 1918 were ones of heavy professional responsibility for Haynes. He co-founded the National League of Urban Conditions Among Negroes (later renamed the National Urban League) and until 1918 served as its first Executive Director. He established the Association of Negro Colleges and Universities and served as that organization's secretary during the same period. In addition, he simultaneously held the positions of Chair of the Social Sciences and Professor of Economics and Sociology at Fisk University. At Fisk, Haynes founded the Department of Sociology and established the first program in social work in America for Black graduate students. He also "was in great demand as a consultant to industrial, religious and welfare groups that evinced an interest in race relations" (Blackwell and Janowitz 1974, 143). In 1918, Hayes accepted the position of Director of Negro Economics at the U.S. Department of Labor. He later served as Head of the Department of Race Relations at the National Council of Churches from 1921 until his retirement in 1946.

Haynes was the author of many studies and publications focusing on race in the workplace and religion. The most noteworthy publications include *The Negro at Work in New York City* (1912) and *The Negro at Work During the World War and Reconstruction* (1921). In addition to his writings, Haynes' most significant contributions include his leadership of national organizations that promoted social reform and inter-racial harmony and the pioneering educational programs and associations he helped to establish.

Howard Odum (1884–1954)

Howard Odum, a Georgia native, earned his bachelor's degree in classics at Emory College in 1904. He received a master's degree in classics at University of Mississippi in 1906. In the course of his studies he developed an interest in culture and social science. Consequently, Odum continued his graduate education at Clark University in Worcester, Massachusetts, where he earned the Ph.D. in psychology in 1909. Not satisfied with psychology, he completed a second doctoral

dissertation and received a Ph.D. in the field of sociology from Columbia University in 1910.

Odum's first academic appointment was at the University of Georgia. He taught educational sociology there for a period of seven years. After an additional year of teaching and administration at Emory University, he accepted an appointment at the University of North Carolina. During his first year at Chapel Hill, 1920, Odum founded both the University of North Carolina Department of Sociology and the School of Public Welfare. He served as Chairman of the Department of Sociology until his retirement in 1954. He also headed the School of Public Welfare for a term of twelve years. In 1922 Odum founded *The Journal of Social Forces* and assumed the role of editor. Two years later he established the Institute for Research in the Social Sciences, which he ably directed for twenty years.

All of the enterprises Odum founded at the University of North Carolina became widely recognized and successful. Throughout his career, he was a highly productive writer and scholar as well as a popular teacher and an academic entrepreneur. Odum was the author of twenty-three books, twelve monographs and several hundred articles and book chapters. "Folk sociology, regionalism, the Negro and the South stand out as his chief centers of scientific interest" (Blackwell 1955, 505). Respected by his professional colleagues, he was elected Vice President and President of the American Sociological Society in 1929 and 1930, respectively. An editorial published in the *Washington Post* shortly after his death described him this way. "Howard Odum was the Eli Whitney of the Modern South. He inspired a revolution. Certainly there was no one—unless it was Franklin Roosevelt—whose influence was greater than Odum's on the development of the region below the Potomac" (Cited by Ogburn 1955, 237). Howard Odum has been characterized as "the South's most notable sociologist in the first half of the twentieth century" (Hobson 1979, 331–32).

Wilson Gee (1888–1961)

Born and raised in rural South Carolina, Wilson Gee initially pursued an education and career in the field of biology. He earned a bachelor's degree from Clemson Agricultural College in 1908, and a master's degree from the University of South Carolina in 1910. After pursuing further graduate study at University of Chicago and

the University of Wisconsin, Gee received a Ph.D. in sociology in 1913 from the University of California.

Wilson Gee served as Professor of Biology at Emory University from 1914–1917. During the next four years he held the post of Professor of Rural Economics and Sociology at the University of South Carolina. In 1923 he was appointed Professor of Rural Economics and Sociology at the University of Virginia. There he founded the Department of Rural Sociology and served as its chairman until his retirement in 1959. Gee also was instrumental in establishing the Institute for Research in Social Science in Charlottesville in 1926. He held the position of Director of the Institute for a term of thirty-three years.

Gee was a leader in professional associations as well as on campus. He was elected Vice President of the Southern Sociological Society in 1936 and President in 1937. He also served as a member of the Executive Council of the American Sociological Society from 1937 to 1939.

Wilson Gee is remembered for his many publications in rural sociology and economics. He wrote or co-authored more than fifteen books and a hundred articles in his field (Molyneaux 1961, 458). He is recognized as a significant early twentieth century southern sociologist for his legacy of research and writing, his leadership in professional organizations, and for establishing a major department of sociology and a social science research institute in a southern university.

Katharine Jocher (1888–1983)

Katharine Jocher received a bachelor's degree from Goucher College in Maryland in 1922 and a master's degree from the University of Pennsylvania in 1923. The following academic year she was employed as an Instructor at Sweet Briar College. In 1924, Jocher accepted a position as Research Assistant at the Institute for Research in Social Science and Instructor in Sociology and Public Welfare at the University of North Carolina. She completed the requirements for a Ph.D. in Sociology at the University in 1929, and was promoted to the rank of Research Associate. She was appointed Research Professor in 1943. Jocher was "the first woman on the (UNC) faculty to rise through . . . the ranks to that position" (Powell 1988, 282).

Katharine Jocher was appointed Assistant Director of the Institute

for Research in Social Science in 1927 and Associate Director in 1957. In addition to her increasing administrative duties, she gradually assumed editorial responsibility for the *Journal of Social Forces*. She was appointed Managing Editor of *Social Forces* in 1931 and Editor in 1951.

Jocher wrote several books in collaboration with Institute colleague Howard Odum. Their textbook, *An Introduction to Social Research* was published in 1929. *In Search of Regional Balance in America*, an edited volume commemorating the twentieth anniversary of the founding of the Institute, was issued in 1945. She also regularly edited manuscripts produced by other researchers at the Institute before they were submitted to publishers.

Jocher was active in national professional societies as well as associations in the region. For example, she was elected to serve two consecutive terms as President of the Southern Sociological Society in 1936 and 1937. She also held several official positions in the American Sociological Association. She was elected Second Vice President of that society in 1942 and also served as a member of the ASA Executive Committee from 1947 to 1950 and the ASA Council from 1952 to 1955.

After thirty-five years of distinguished service, Jocher retired from the faculty of the University of North Carolina and from the administrative and research staff of the Institute for Research in Social Science. In describing her career, Daniel O. Price, Director of the Institute stated, "She has contributed more than any other person to the success of the Institute as a research facilitating agency of the University" (IRSS Annual Report, 1958-59, cited in Johnson and Johnson 1980, 81).

Harriet L. Herring (1892-1976)

North Carolina native Harriet Herring was a 1913 graduate of Meredith College. She received a master's degree in history from Radcliffe College in 1918. A year later she was awarded a special certificate in industrial relations from Bryn Mawr College. From 1925 to 1928, she enrolled in additional graduate classes at the University of North Carolina. In 1920 she returned to the South to work as a community worker for a North Carolina textile mill. In 1922, she was appointed Personnel Director at the Carolina Cotton and Woolen

Mill. There “she instituted the first comprehensive employee welfare system for cotton mill workers in the South” (Martin 1979, 119).

In 1925, after a year of intensive recruiting efforts, Herring was persuaded to accept a position on the staff of the Institute for Research in Social Science as an industrial research specialist (Brazil 1988, 478). In her ensuing forty-year career at the Institute, she wrote and published many research articles and four major books in her specialty area. The books are *Welfare Work in Mill Villages* (1929), *Southern Industry and Regional Development* (1940), *Southern Resources for Industrial Development* (1948), and *Passing of the Mill Village* (1949).

In addition to her own studies of southern industrialization, Herring often joined with colleagues at the Institute to conduct research on other regional problems and issues. Consequently she co-authored many other research reports and monographs. Several examples of publications which resulted from these collaborative projects are *Part-Time Farming in the Southeast* (1937) and *North Carolina Associated Communities* (1953).

Throughout her long and productive affiliation with the Institute, Herring taught courses in the Department of Sociology at the University of North Carolina. When she retired in 1965 she held the rank of Research Professor. She is considered a significant early twentieth century southern sociologist for her ground-breaking research in industrial sociology. More specifically, she is recognized for her extensive documentation and insightful analyses of North Carolina mill towns and the changing economy of the South.

Charles S. Johnson (1892–1956)

Charles Johnson was born and raised in Virginia. He received a bachelor's degree in 1916 from Virginia Union University. Subsequently, he was admitted to the University of Chicago where he earned a second bachelor's degree in 1918. He was enrolled in graduate courses at the University until 1921.

Johnson began his career as Director of Research at the Chicago Urban League from 1917 to 1919 and for the Chicago Commission on Race Relations from 1919 to 1921. From 1921 to 1928 he held the post of Director of the National Urban League. He also served as editor of *Opportunity*, the League's official journal, for five years beginning in 1923.

In 1928, Charles Johnson was appointed Professor of Sociology and chairman of the Department of Sociology at Fisk University. "Under his leadership, the department developed into the leading research center in race relations in the world" (Burgess 1956, 319). In addition, through Johnson's efforts, Fisk became a major training center for African American sociologists (Robbins 1999a, 617).

Johnson was the first African American president of Fisk University. He ably served in that office for a decade, from 1946 until his death in 1956. Earlier, in 1937, he was the first African American to be elected Vice President of the American Sociological Society. Johnson also was elected President of the Southern Sociological Society twice, first in 1946 and again in 1954.

At the time Charles Johnson was appointed President of Fisk University, he already had become an internationally recognized scholar. By the mid 1940s he had published seventeen books, fourteen book chapters and seventy-two articles (Valien 1958, 243). In his writings Johnson skillfully integrated social theory with empirical evidence derived from personal documents and statistical data. Noteworthy examples of his book length publications are *The Negro in Chicago* (1922), *The Negro in American Civilization* (1930), *Shadow of the Plantation* (1934), *Growing Up in the Black Belt* (1941), and *Statistical Atlas of Southern Counties* (1941).

An educational leader as well as a distinguished scholar and institution builder, Johnson is recognized as an early twentieth century southern sociologist for his pioneering contribution to the study of and improvement of race relations. He clearly made "a major contribution to the understanding of the South as a region, the economic foundations of race relations, and the racial problem itself" (Robbins 1974, 62).

E. Franklin Frazier (1894–1962)

After graduating from high school in Maryland at the top of his class, E. Franklin Frazier attended Howard University on a scholarship. He graduated with honors from Howard in 1916. He taught briefly at schools in Alabama, Georgia, Virginia and Maryland before enrolling in the Clark University graduate program in sociology. Frazier earned a master's degree from Clark in 1920 and subsequently spent several years conducting research in New York City and Copenhagen, Denmark.

For five years beginning in 1922, Frazier served as a member of the teaching faculty at Morehouse College. During the same period, he also held the position of Director of the Atlanta University School of Social Work. While simultaneously holding these two positions was demanding, Frazier still managed to author thirty-three articles.

In 1927, Frazier left Atlanta to become a graduate student and research fellow in sociology at the University of Chicago. After completing the required course work in the doctoral program, he accepted a position as Lecturer in Sociology at Fisk University. Frazier was promoted to the rank of Research Professor at Fisk in 1931, after he received his Ph.D. from the University of Chicago. In addition to his dissertation, Frazier wrote and published more than a dozen articles during his years at Fisk (Carter 1999, 430).

Frazier was appointed Professor and Head of the Department of Sociology at Howard University in 1934. He was also named Head of the Social Work Program in 1935. He continued to head the Social Work Program for a decade and the Sociology Department for a decade and a half. Under his leadership, the enrollment in both of these programs increased dramatically. He remained an active member of the Howard teaching facility until his retirement in 1959. Thereafter, he continued to conduct courses in African Studies at Howard and at the School of Advanced International Studies at Johns Hopkins University (Jackson 1999, 420).

Frazier was a leader in professional associations as well as on campus. He was a founding member and the first President of the District of Columbia Sociological Society (1943–1944). He also served as President of the Eastern Sociological Society in 1943. He was elected Second Vice President of the American Sociological Society in 1946 and First Vice President in 1947. He became the first African American to head a predominantly white national professional organization when he was elected President of the American Sociological Society in 1948.

Frazier was a productive scholar throughout his professional career. His best known books are based on his studies of Black social institutions and population groups: *The Negro Family in Chicago* (1932), *The Negro Family in the United States* (1939), *Negro Youth at the Crossways* (1940), *The Negro in the United States* (1949), and *Black Bourgeoisie* (1957).

E. Franklin Frazier deserves recognition as an outstanding Early Twentieth Century Southern Sociologist for his path breaking research and publications on the Black family, youth, social class, and religion.

He is also recognized for his efforts to strengthen the undergraduate curriculum and programs in sociology and social work at several Black institutions of higher education.

Rupert Vance (1899–1975)

Arkansas native Rupert Vance earned a bachelor's degree from Henderson-Brown College in 1920 and a master's degree in economics from Vanderbilt University in 1921. In the early 1920s he was employed as a high school principal and as a college English instructor. Ultimately, he decided to become a sociologist because he believed "that sociology could be a tool for bettering the conditions of his native South" (Kladky 1999, 166).

For three years, beginning in 1925, Vance was a graduate student at the University of North Carolina and a Research Assistant at the Institute for Research in Social Science. He completed the requirements for a doctoral degree in sociology in 1928. He was promoted to the rank of Research Associate at the Institute and appointed to the faculty in the Department of Sociology the following academic year. He was promoted to the rank of professor in 1937 and was named Kenan Professor of Sociology in 1945. He held that endowed position until he retired, after forty years of service, in 1969.

Vance was widely known and respected by his peers as a leader in a number of professional societies. He has been described as "the best known and most widely cited sociologist in the South" (Thompson 1979, 1269). He was elected President of the Southern Sociological Society in 1938 and President of the American Sociological Association in 1944. He also served as a member of the ASA Executive Committee from 1944 to 1946. He was elected President of the Population Association of America in 1952.

Vance was an advocate of a unified social science and consequently adopted a multidisciplinary approach in his research (Reed 1993, 27). His major contributions lie in the fields of demography and human ecology and southern regional studies. Among his most significant publications are *Human Factors in Cotton Culture* (1929), *Human Geography of the South* (1932), and *All These People: The Nation's Human Resources in the South* (1945).

Rupert Vance was a distinguished early twentieth century southern sociologist. His insightful analyses of the demographic prob-

lems and transformation of the South are considered classics in the field.

Guy B. Johnson (1901–1991)

A 1921 graduate of Baylor University, Guy Johnson was born and reared in Texas. He earned a master's degree in Sociology at the University of Chicago in 1922. After teaching for a year at Ohio Wesleyan University, he accepted a position in the Department of Sociology at Baylor College for Women. During this early phase of his career, he submitted a paper based on his master's thesis to the *Journal of Social Forces*. His paper, "A Sociological Interpretation of the New Ku Klux Movement," was accepted and published in May, 1923. The following year Johnson was offered an appointment as Research Assistant at the Institute for Research in Social Science and a teaching fellowship in the doctoral program in sociology at the University of North Carolina by Journal Editor, Institute Director, and Head of the Department of Sociology, Howard Odum. Johnson accepted the offer and moved to North Carolina in 1924.

Johnson received a Ph.D. in sociology from the University of North Carolina in 1927. He remained affiliated with the University for the rest of his forty-five year postgraduate career. Immediately after completing his doctorate, he was promoted to Research Associate at the Institute and offered an appointment on the teaching faculty at the University. He was later promoted to the rank of Research Professor and Professor at the two Chapel Hill institutions. Johnson retired from the University of North Carolina in 1969 as Kenan Professor of Sociology and Anthropology.

Johnson's scholarly activities focused on race relations and the status of African Americans. He was the author of many articles published in respected professional journals, including the *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *American Journal of Sociology*, *American Sociological Review*, *Social Forces* and *The American Anthropologist*. Johnson also studied African American culture, including folk music and dialect. His most significant writings on African American culture appeared in a series of monographs issued relatively early in his career. These include two volumes co-authored with Howard Odum, namely *The Negro and His Songs* (1925) and *Negro Workaday Songs* (1926). He also issued two volumes independently, *John Henry: Tracking Down a Legend* (1929) and *Folk Culture on St. Helena Island* (1930).

Johnson was active in public interest groups such as the Commission on Interracial Cooperation, a forerunner of the Southern Regional Council. In fact, he took a leave of absence from the University from 1944 to 1947 to serve as that Commission's first executive director. He also served for thirty-seven years as a member of Howard University's Board of Trustees.

Guy Johnson is designated a significant early twentieth century southern sociologist for his scholarship on race and Black culture and his efforts to improve interracial understanding and race relations in the South.

Contributions of the Early Twentieth Century Southern Sociologists

The contributions of the early twentieth century southern sociologists are summarized in Table 12.6. As the preceding biographical summaries have demonstrated, the contributions of the early southern sociologists were extensive and varied. All of the men and women in this group made significant contributions to social research. In addition, most were actively involved in mentoring and training the next generation of sociologists. Three of the early twentieth century sociologists were founders and/or editors of respected journals. Four made outstanding applied sociological contributions through their leadership roles in public service organizations.

The early southern sociologists also held important leadership positions in social scientific societies. Collectively, they served eleven terms as president of six different professional associations. For example, three of the early twentieth century sociologists were elected president of the American Sociological Society (later Association) and four were chosen to serve as president of the Southern Sociological Society. Collectively, they also served five terms as vice president of the American Sociological Society and a combined total of ten years on its Executive Committee or Council.

Early Centers of Sociological Practice in the South

The early twentieth century southern sociologists, as well as the southern sociological pioneers, were instrumental in establishing and building departments of sociology, graduate training programs, and university based research organizations in the South.

The location and length of the university appointments of the southern sociological pioneers and the early twentieth century southern sociologists are shown in Table 12.7. The evidence shows that the early southern sociologists were clustered in five southern universities, Atlanta University, Fisk University, Howard University, the University of North Carolina and the University of Virginia. An inspection of this table also reveals that these southern academic institutions were segregated by race.² It is interesting to note that courses in sociology apparently were introduced into the curriculum of the traditionally Black institutions of higher education earlier than in the predominately white institutions. That is, sociology was initially taught at Atlanta University in the 1890s, at Howard University in 1895, and at Fisk University in 1910. Sociology courses subsequently were introduced at University of North Carolina in 1920 and at the University of Virginia in 1923.

The early southern sociologists established a number of distinguished departments of sociology and research institutes at southern universities. Prominent sociology departments were founded by George Haynes at Fisk University (1910), by Kelly Miller at Howard University (1915), by Howard Odum at the University of North Carolina (1920), and by Wilson Gee at the University of Virginia (1923). Distinctive research programs and institutes were established by W.E.B. DuBois at Atlanta University (1897), by Howard Odum at the University of North Carolina (1924), by Wilson Gee at the University of Virginia (1926), and by Charles Johnson at Fisk University (1928). These university based research organizations provided a setting for training and supporting graduate students as well as for conducting research.

It is important to note that DuBois initiated his pioneering series of sociological studies of African American life in the 1890s. In other words, his research program began at approximately the same time that sociology departments were being founded in major northern universities such as the University of Chicago and Columbia University (Odum 1951, 379). Although the ambitious series of studies DuBois launched at Atlanta University was completed, the program was hampered by a lack of adequate funding. Later research programs established at the University of North Carolina, the University of Virginia

² A pattern of racial segregation also was observed in the southern undergraduate institutions in which the early southern sociologists enrolled.

and at Fisk University in the 1920s, in contrast, were financially supported by generous grants from outside the University. For example, the social science research institutes at the University of North Carolina and at the University of Virginia both received several large multiyear grants from the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Fund (Gee 1934, 175, 176, 222). The research program at Fisk University also received substantial funding from the Julius Rosenwald Fund and the American Missionary Society (Smith 1974, 171–73).

Undoubtedly, these departments were not the only sites of early southern sociological practice. Nevertheless, the sociology programs and research established at Atlanta University, Howard University, Fisk University, the University of North Carolina, and the University of Virginia are historically significant early southern centers of sociology.

Conclusions

To date, accounts of the development and history of sociology in the United States have been flawed by regional omissions and biases. While pioneering events and persons in the Middle West and Northeast generally have been acknowledged, the contributions of individuals and institutions in other sections of the nation have been largely ignored and unrecognized (Broschart 2002, 100).

The study described in this report was undertaken in an effort to identify individuals and institutions in the American South that have made significant contributions to the field of sociology. In the course of this investigation, two generations of early southern sociologists and several major southern centers of sociological practice were identified. In addition, as the preceding analysis has clearly shown, these late nineteenth and early twentieth century individuals and institutions made many significant and lasting sociological contributions.

Was the South before 1950 an intellectual wasteland or a Garden of Eden? The findings of this study suggest that it was neither. From 1900 to 1950, the South was a region primarily populated by farmers and mill hands. Nevertheless, it also was populated by a significant number of social scientists and teacher/scholars who were clustered on southern university campuses.

In the first half of the twentieth century, the South faced serious regional problems arising from a declining agricultural economy,

overpopulation, wide-spread poverty, and racial inequities. Many of the studies conducted by the early southern sociologists led to a greater understanding of these regional issues and served as a foundation for regional reform. Southern sociologists, therefore, contributed to the economic development and social transformation of the region as well as to the establishment and development of their discipline. A more comprehensive and regionally inclusive history of sociology is necessary if we are to understand fully the nature of sociology and its contributions to society.

Table 12.1: Social Background Characteristics and Major Publications of Two Early Southern Arm-Chair Social Analysts

| Name | Place of Birth/ Employment | Race | Gender | Education | Occupation | Major Publications |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------|--------|------------------------------------|------------------|--|
| George Fitzhugh (1806–1881) | Virginia | White | Male | Self Educated | Lawyer | <i>Sociology for the South</i> (1854) <i>Cannibals All</i> (1857) |
| Henry Hughes (1829–1862) | Mississippi | White | Male | Graduate Alcorn College 1847 | Lawyer Writer | <i>A Treatise on Sociology</i> (1854) |

Table 12.2A: Social Background Characteristics and Major Publications
of Southern Sociological Pioneers

| Name | Place of Birth/ Employment | Race | Gender | Education | Occupation(s) | Major Publication(s) |
|---|--|-------|--------|---|--|---|
| Anna Julia Cooper (1858–1964) | North Carolina/ Washington, DC | Black | Female | BA Oberlin 1884 MA Oberlin 1887 Ph.D. Univ. of Paris 1925 | Educator Social Theorist | <i>A Voice From the South</i> (1899) |
| Ida Wells Barnett (1862–1931) | Mississippi/ Tennessee— Illinois | Black | Female | Post Secondary Course Work at Fisk and Lemoyne Institute 1883–84 | Journalist Social and Political Activist | <i>Southern Horrors</i> (1892) <i>The Reason Why the Colored American is Not in the Columbian Exposition</i> (1893) <i>A Red Record</i> (1895) <i>Mob Rule in New Orleans</i> (1900) <i>Race Adjustment: Essays on the Negro and America</i> (1908) <i>Everlasting Stan</i> (1924) *See Table 11.2B |
| Kelly Miller (1863–1939) | South Carolina/ Washington, DC | Black | Male | BA Howard 1886 Post Graduate Study at Johns Hopkins 1887–89 | Educator Writer | |
| William Edward Burghardt DuBois (1868–1963) | Massachusetts/ Georgia New York | Black | Male | BA Fisk 1888 BA Harvard 1890 MA Harvard 1891 Ph.D. Harvard 1895 | Social Scientist Political Activist Educator, Writer Editor | |

Table 12.2B: Chronological Listing of Publications of
William Edward Burghardt DuBois Prior to 1950*

| |
|---|
| <i>The Suppression of the African, Slave-Trade to the United States of America</i> , 1896 |
| <i>The Conservation of Races</i> , 1897 |
| <i>The Philadelphia Negro</i> , 1899 |
| <i>The Souls of Black Folk</i> , 1903 |
| ** <i>The Negro in the South</i> , 1907 |
| <i>John Brown</i> , 1909 |
| <i>The Negro</i> , 1915 |
| <i>Dark Water: Voices From within the Veil</i> , 1920 |
| <i>The Gift of Black Folk: The Negroes in the Making of America</i> , 1924 |
| <i>Africa: Its Geography, People and Products</i> , 1930 |
| <i>Africa: Its Place in Modern History</i> , 1930 |
| <i>Black Reconstruction, 1860–1880</i> , 1935 |
| <i>Black Folk, Then and Now</i> , 1939 |
| <i>Dusk of Dawn</i> , 1940 |
| <i>Color and Democracy: Colonies and Peace</i> , 1945 |
| <i>The World and Africa</i> , 1947 |
| <i>Atlanta University Studies</i> (Edited Proceedings and Recommendations of the Annual Conference for the Study of Negro Problems. Published by the Atlanta University Press.) |
| <i>Mortality Among Negroes in Cities</i> , 1896 |
| <i>Social and Physical Condition of Negroes in Cities</i> , 1897 |
| <i>Some Efforts of American Negroes for Their Own Social Benefit</i> , 1898 |
| <i>The Negro in Business</i> , 1899 |
| <i>A Select Bibliography of the American Negro</i> , 1901 |
| <i>The Negro Common School</i> , 1901 |
| <i>The Negro Artisan</i> , 1902 |
| <i>The Negro Church</i> , 1903 |
| <i>Some Notes on Negro Crime, Particularly in Georgia</i> , 1904 |
| <i>A Select Bibliography of the Negro American</i> , 1905 |
| <i>The Health and Physique of the Negro American</i> , 1906 |
| <i>Economic Co-Operation Among Negro Americans</i> , 1907 |
| <i>The Negro American Family</i> , 1907 |
| <i>Efforts for Social Betterment Among Negro Americans</i> , 1909 |
| ** <i>The College Bred Negro American</i> , 1910 |
| ** <i>The Common School and the Negro American</i> , 1911 |
| ** <i>The Negro American Artisan</i> , 1912 |
| ** <i>Morals and Manners Among Negro Americans</i> , 1914 |

* Excluding novels, poetry, and plays as well as articles and essays published in periodicals.

** Co-Author

Table 12.3: Major Professional Contributions of Early Southern Sociological Pioneers

| <i>Author of Ground Breaking Sociological Research/Theory</i> | <i>Founder/Editor of Journal</i> |
|--|--|
| Cooper—Race/Gender/Region Wells-Barnett—Lynching Miller—Race/Racial Injustice DuBois—Race/African History/ Empirical Studies of Negro Life | DuBois— <i>Crisis</i> , Editor 1910–1934 <i>Phylon</i> , Editor 1940–1944 |
| <i>Areas of Social and Political Activism</i> | <i>Founder/Founding Member of Educational or Political Organization</i> |
| Cooper—Secondary and Adult Education Wells-Barnett—Anti-Lynching/Civil Rights/ Women's Suffrage Miller—Higher Education DuBois—Civil Rights/Pan Africanism | Cooper—Frelinghuysen University Wells-Barnett—International Anti-Lynching Crusade Alpha Suffrage Club NAACP DuBois—American Negro Academy Niagara Movement NAACP Council on African Affairs |

Table 12.4: Social Background Characteristics of Early Twentieth Century Southern Sociologists

| Name | Place of Birth/ Employment | Race | Gender | Education | Primary Employer(s) |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------|--------|--|---|
| George Edmund Haynes (1880–1960) | Arkansas/ New York Tennessee District of Columbia | Black | Male | BA Fisk ^{ab} 1903 MA Yale 1904 Ph.D. Columbia 1912 | Fisk University ^{ab} Nat'l Urban League U.S. Dept of Labor Nat'l Council of Churches |
| Howard Odum (1884–1954) | Georgia/ North Carolina | White | Male | BA Emory ^a 1904 MA U of Mississippi ^a 1906 Ph.D. Clark 1909 Ph.D. Columbia 1910 | University of Georgia ^a University of North Carolina ^a Institute for Research in Social Science ^a |
| Wilson Gee (1888–1961) | South Carolina/ Virginia | White | Male | BS Clemson ^a 1908 MA U of So Carolina ^a 1910 Ph.D. U of California 1913 | University of South Carolina ^a University of Virginia ^a |
| Katharine Jocher (1888–1983) | Pennsylvania/ North Carolina | White | Female | BA Goucher ^{ac} 1922 MA U of PA 1923 Ph.D. U of No Carolina ^a 1929 | Institute for Research in Social Science ^a University of North Carolina ^a Institute for Research in Social Science ^a |
| Harriet L. Herring (1892–1976) | Virginia/ North Carolina | White | Female | BA Meredith ^{ac} 1913 MA Radcliffe ^c 1918 Post Graduate Studies U of No Carolina ^a 1925–28 | University of North Carolina ^a |

| | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------|------|---|---|
| Charles S. Johnson (1893–1956) | Virginia/ New York/ Tennessee | Black | Male | BA Virginia Union ^{ab} 1916 Ph.B. U of Chicago 1918 Post Graduate Studies/Chicago | National Urban League Fisk University ^{ab} |
| E. Franklin Frazier (1894–1962) | Maryland/ Washington, DC | Black | Male | BA Howard ^{ab} 1916 MA Clark 1920 Ph.D. Chicago 1931 | Morehouse College ^{ab} Atlanta School of Social Work ^{ab} Fisk University ^{ab} |
| Rupert Vance (1899–1975) | Arkansas/ North Carolina | White | Male | BA Henderson- Brown ^a 1920 MA Vanderbilt ^a 1921 Ph.D. U of No Carolina ^a 1928 | Howard University ^b Institute for Research in Social Science ^a University of North Carolina ^a |
| Guy Johnson (1901–1991) | Texas/ North Carolina | White | Male | BA Baylor ^a 1921 MA U of Chicago 1922 Ph.D. U of No Carolina ^a 1927 | Institute for Research in Social Science ^a University of No Carolina ^a |

^a Southern Institution ^b Black Institution ^c Women's College

Table 12.5: Major Publications of Early Twentieth
Century Southern Sociologists

George Edmund Haynes (1880–1960)

The Negro at Work in New York City (1910)

The Negro at Work During the World War and During Reconstruction (1921)

Howard W. Odum (1884–1954)

Social and Mental Traits of the Negro (1910)

Southern Pioneers (1925)

Sociology and Social Problems (1925)

*The Negro and His Songs** (1925)

*Negro Workaday Songs** (1926)

An Approach to Public Welfare and Social Work (1926)

American Masters of Social Science (1927)

*Introduction to Social Research** (1929)

*Southern Regions of the United States** (1936)

*American Regionalism** (1938)

American Social Problems (1939)

American Democracy Anew (1940)

Race and Rumors of Race (1943)

Understanding Society (1947)

The Way of the South (1947)

Wilson Gee (1888–1961)

The Country Life of the Nation (1930)

The Place of Agriculture in American Life (1930)

The Social Economics of Agriculture (1932)

Research Barriers in the South (1932)

*The Cotton Cooperation in the Southeast** (1933)

Social Science Research Organizations in American Colleges and Universities (1934)

Social Science Research Methods (1950)

Katharine Jocher (1888–1983)

*An Introduction to Social Research** (1929)

*In Search of Regional Balance in America** Editor (1945)

Harriet L. Herring (1892–1976)

Welfare Work in Mill Villages (1929)

Southern Industry and Regional Development (1940)

Southern Resources for Industrial Development (1948)

Passing of the Mill Village (1949)

Charles S. Johnson (1893–1956)

*The Negro in Chicago** (1922)

The Negro in American Civilization (1930)

Table 12.5 (*cont.*)

Shadow of the Plantation (1934)
*The Collapse of Cotton Tennancy** (1935)
The Negro College Graduate (1936)
Growing Up in the Black Belt (1941)
*Statistical Atlas of Southern Counties** (1941)
Patterns of Negro Segregation (1943)

E. Franklin Frazier (1894–1962)

The Negro Family in Chicago (1932)
The Negro Family in the United States (1939)
Negro Youth at the Crossways (1940)
The Negro in the United States (1949)
Black Bourgeoisie (1957)
The Negro Church in America (1963)
Race and Culture Contacts in the Modern World (1965)

Rupert B. Vance (1899–1975)

Human Factors in Cotton Culture (1929)
Human Geography of the South (1932)
The South's Place in the Nation (1936)
Farmers Without Land (1937)
*All These People: The Nation's Resources in the South** (1945)
Regionalism and the South: The Selected Papers of Rupert Vance (1982)

Guy B. Johnson (1901–1991)

*The Negro and His Songs** (1925)
*Negro Workaday Songs** (1926)
John Henry: A Negro Legend (1929)
The Folk Culture on St. Helena Island (1930)

* Co-Authorred Publication

Table 12.6: Major Professional Contributions of Early Twentieth Century Southern Sociologists

| <i>Officer in Professional Association</i> | | <i>Applied Sociological Principles to Social Problems & Issues</i> | |
|---|-------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| <u>President ASS/ASA</u> | <u>Vice President ASS/ASA</u> | Haynes | National Urban League |
| Odum 1930 | Odum 1st VP 1929 | | National Council of Churches |
| Vance 1944 | C.S. Johnson 1st VP 1937 | C.S. Johnson | National Urban League |
| Frazier 1948 | Jocher 2nd VP 1942 | | Institute of Race Relations |
| | Frazier 1st VP 1947 | Frazier | Atlanta School of Social Work |
| | Frazier 2nd VP 1946 | G. Johnson | Howard University Social Work Program |
| | | | Southern Regional Council |
| <u>Executive Committee/ASS/ASA</u> | <u>President SSS</u> | <i>Founder/Editor Journal</i> | |
| Gee 1937-1939 | Gee 1937 | | |
| Vance 1944-1946 | Vance 1938 | Social Forces | |
| Jocher 1947-1950 | Jocher 1943 & 1944 | Howard Odum, Founder & Editor 1922-1951 | |
| | C. Johnson 1946 | Katharine Jocher, Managing Editor/Editor 1931-1962 | |
| | C. Johnson 1954 | <u>Opportunity</u> | |
| <u>Member ASA Council</u> | | Charles S. Johnson, Founder & Editor 1921-1927 | |
| Jocher 1952-1955 | | | |
| <u>President Other Professional Societies</u> | | | |
| DC Sociological Society | Frazier 1943-44 | | |
| Eastern Sociological Society | Frazier 1943 | | |
| Population Assn of American | Vance 1952 | | |

Table 12.7: Location and Duration of Early Southern Sociologists' University Appointments by Race*

| White | Black |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| <u>University of North Carolina</u> | <u>Atlanta University</u> |
| Howard Odum (34) | W.E.B. DuBois (23) |
| Katharine Jocher (35) | E. Franklin Frazier (5) |
| Harriet Herring (40) | <u>Fisk University</u> |
| Rupert Vance (40) | George Haynes (8) |
| Guy Johnson (42) | Charles Johnson (28) |
| <u>University of Virginia</u> | E. Franklin Frazier (7) |
| Wilson Gee (36) | <u>Howard University</u> |
| | Kelly Miller (44) |
| | E. Franklin Frazier (25) |

* The number of years of service at an institution is displayed in parentheses.

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

SOCIOLOGY AT WOMEN'S AND BLACK COLLEGES, 1880s–1940s¹

VICKY M. MACLEAN AND JOYCE E. WILLIAMS

Introduction

The history of sociology in the United States has been written in various ways—in terms of its theoretical paradigms (Hinkle 1980; 1994), antecedents and influences (Greek 1992; Morgan 1997), pre-sociological evolution (Bernard and Bernard 1943), empirical works (Madge 1962), the works of individuals (Page 1982; Bannister 1991, Killian 1994), and even the presidents of the American Sociological Association and the authors of major textbooks prior to World War II (Odum 1951). The study by Vidich and Lyman (1985) is both evolutionary and institutional, dealing with the expansion of sociology as part of the expansion of higher education. However, their examination of higher education does not include the contributions of historically female and black colleges to the discipline. Indeed, the history of American sociology is a socially constructed one that has with few exceptions failed to include those marginalized by their race and or gender (Deegan 1981; 1991; Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley 1998). The present research seeks to document some of the plural disciplinary histories and the intellectual and programmatic

¹ Address correspondence to vmaclean@mtsu.edu. We acknowledge funding provided by Middle Tennessee State University Faculty Research Grant Program. Our thanks to Jean Berry and the Wellesley University Archives, Jane Knowles and the Schlesinger Library Archives of the Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study, Patricia Albright and the Mount Holyoke Archives, Jason Wood and the Simmons College Archives, Nancy Young and the Smith College Archives and Sophia Smith Collections, Donzella Maupin and the Hampton Museum and University Archives, Frank Edgecombe of Hampton University, Jessie Carney Smith and the Fisk University Archives, the archives and staff of the Atlanta University Robert W. Woodruff Library, and Howard University Moorland-Spingarn Research Center. We thank Christopher Everhart and Shannon Mathis for research assistance. We extend thanks to our editor Anthony Blasi and to the American Sociological Association and the ASA section on Historical Sociology.

contributions made through the venue of women's colleges and black colleges.

It is appropriate to consider the legacies and contributions of women's and black colleges together. Prior to the Civil War there were only four institutions of higher learning for African Americans.² In the three decades after the Civil War at least two hundred schools were established for African Americans, although not all were worthy of the designation *college* (Ballard 1973, 13). The source of funding for these institutions was largely white, as were most of the faculties and administrators (Johnson 1946, 472). The American Missionary Association³ in collaboration with the Freedmen's Bureau and wealthy white philanthropists served as the impetus for fund raising. These early institutions became the "spawning ground of black intelligentsia but were [originally, only] meant to train clergy" (Ballard 1973, 14). Just as most of the black institutions were established after the civil war, so were most women's colleges. Solomon noted that "the forced reevaluation of society that accompanied the end of slavery logically extended to a reconsideration of the status of women" (1985, 45).

Four-year female schools were founded at different times in different parts of the country, more than 100 between 1830 and 1870. With few exceptions, their growth in the South was slower than in other parts of the country, as was the development of normal, industrial, and Catholic colleges for women. Schools founded in the post-civil war North and modeled after the early Mount Holyoke Seminary (1837, Massachusetts) became national elite private institutions for women's education. Vassar, Wellesley, Smith, Bryn Mawr, Mount Holyoke, Radcliffe, and Barnard formed a seven-conference reference group setting the standard for quality liberal arts education for women (Horowitz 1984). Several of these schools were founded and funded by men "for the glory of God."⁴ "Coordinate female institutions founded next door to resistant male ones offered a compromise

² They were Cheyney University and Lincoln University, both in Pennsylvania; Wilberforce in Ohio, and LeMoyné-Owen College in Tennessee.

³ The American Missionary Association was involved in the creation of several early black schools. The Association originated as an abolitionist group in 1846. It affiliated with the National Council of Congregational Churches in 1865.

⁴ So filled with missionary zeal, was Matthew Vassar that he wrote of himself in his diary: "the founder of Vassar College and President Lincoln—Two Noble Emancipationists—one of women—[the other of] the Negro" (Solomon 1985, 48).

between single-sex and coeducational institutions” (Solomon 1985, 43). Such was the case with Radcliffe and Harvard, Barnard and Columbia, Pembroke and Brown, Sophie Newcomb and Tulane, and Evelyn and Princeton. Although black schools were likely to be co-educational because the cost of single-sex education was prohibitive, there were three black women’s colleges founded before the turn of the century (Soloman 1985).⁵

Few of the early founders in the women’s education movement challenged the doctrine of separate spheres for men and women. Higher education for the “mother’s of the Republic” was viewed as fully compatible with traditional Christian female virtues and roles in the family, church, and community (Horowitz 1985; Harwarth *et al.* 1997). Many of the faculty at women’s colleges were males, and some “gave scholarly guidance despite their general reservations about feminism” (Solomon 1985, 88). Franklin Giddings in his early years on the faculty of Bryn Mawr, for example, steered Emily Balch into sociology and later shaped Elsie Clew’s graduate plans at Columbia, despite the fact he once stated that “the social order demanded the subordination of women” (Solomon 1985, 88). Ironically, one reason for educating women was to fill the critical need for teachers in the South. “Women with an evangelical missionary spirit found a new focus in educating men and women recently freed from slavery” (Solomon 1985, 45). Educating women for teaching was acceptable in religious circles, and “teaching became an important female mission” as New York and New England sent graduates south to teach (Solomon 1985, 16).

The Socio-historical Context

Understanding the development of sociology at women’s and black colleges requires an understanding of the interrelated development of higher education and American sociology. Women’s and black colleges were established about the same time that American sociology was emerging as a distinct discipline. The Social Gospel movement

⁵ Scotia College (today, Barber-Scotia) was founded as Scotia Seminary in 1867 in Concord, North Carolina, by the Presbyterian Church. Spelman College was established in Atlanta in 1881 as a female seminary. Bennett was established in Greensboro, North Carolina, in 1873 and became a senior college for women in 1926, offering both a liberal arts education and teacher training.

(Vidich and Lyman 1985) and trends in the secularization of science (Buck 1965) were both important influences on the emergence of the social sciences. Classical education with its emphasis on recitations from a specific cannon of knowledge was giving way to elective education, the rise of a scientific method, and new pedagogy (Buck 1965). The new pedagogy emphasized the pursuit of truth through systematic inquiry, which led to different and plural answers to the problems of the day, thereby creating strains in the old modes of thinking (Vidich and Lyman 1985; Buck 1965).

American sociology developed in the multiple contexts of political economy and social ethics in the private theological schools such as Harvard and Columbia (Nichols 1997; Vidich and Lyman 1985; Buck 1962). Vidich and Lyman note that early curricula and scholarship placed emphasis on "philosophical pragmatism, theories of social and moral uplift, and programs for the socialization of newer immigrant and older racial groups" (1985, 151). In the Midwest, the universities of Michigan, Chicago, and Wisconsin "selectively absorbed the modified versions of both the Harvard and the Columbia styles of sociology, the latter most prominently at the large state universities such as Wisconsin, the former at the privately sponsored University of Chicago" (Vidich and Lyman 1985, 152). A convergence of the influences of the Social Gospel movement and the more egalitarian (if xenophobic) midwestern populism could be observed. The growing influence of midwestern sociology came to replace the elitist ideals of New England salvational ethics. "In contrast to eastern schools, where students were exhorted to be reborn through encounters with urban masses, at the University of Chicago the urban masses were brought into the university as students and awarded higher degrees" (Vidich and Lyman 1985, 152).

A similar intellectual milieu shaped curricular development in women's and black colleges during the *pre-sociology era*, prior to the 1900s. This was particularly the case when their faculties were educated in New England and midwestern universities (or in Europe) where labor problems, population movement, urban growth, social welfare, and gender and race were debated. The specific manifestations of these issues were also shaped by the histories and missions of their respective institutions. Moreover, external debates and attitudes concerning the "appropriate" education for women and blacks had an impact on institutional development, the hiring and career paths of faculty, and curricular development. We can thus expect

that the specific programmatic developments in sociology at women's and black colleges will reflect these external influences as well as the mission of each institution and the intellectual backgrounds and training of faculties.

During the *early sociology era*, defined here as the period between the turn of the century and the early 1940s, there were several surveys documenting the development of sociology in American colleges and universities (Fulcomer (Folkmar) 1894; Howertz 1894; Tolman 1902a; 1902b; 1902c; 1903; L.L. Bernard 1909; Chapin 1911; J. Bernard 1929; Kennedy and Kennedy 1942). Utilizing data from his work in 1909 and adding data from 1940–44 college catalogs, Bernard (1945) provided an analysis of the growth of sociology courses in different categories of schools, including 23 women's colleges and 8 black schools.⁶ As can be seen in Table 13.1, which corrects some errors made by Bernard, by the 1940s courses in sociology had grown by almost 400 per cent at women's colleges and by more than 1100 per cent in black colleges. Proportionate to their size relative to other colleges, both black and women's colleges were offering a large number of sociology courses by the 1940s.⁷

Methodology

The theoretical perspective that informs this investigation involves a critical reconstruction of the historical and institutional foundations of American sociology (Hill 1993, 3). Following the theoretical orientations of Mills (1959) and Giddens (1987), and the more recent revisionist social historical analyses by Deegan (1988a; 1991), the conceptual framework places emphasis on understanding social phenomena in the context of the broad "temporal sweep of institutionalized social patterns" (Hill 1993, 3). Verifiable archival data are used to document and explicate the lives, ideas, intellectual accomplishments, and institutional embeddedness of sociological predecessors at black and women's colleges from their foundings to approximately 1940.

Hill notes that lists, purposively conceptualized to be inclusive, can

⁶ It appears that Barnard was in error in including three schools that were not women's colleges at the time: Geneva, Middlebury, and Seton Hall. Thus he actually had only 20 women's colleges.

⁷ Note that women's and black colleges tended to be smaller than other schools, especially state schools, and even the Catholic schools included by Bernard were the largest Catholic schools at the time.

serve an important form of surveillance in writing social histories, providing “a methodological framework that curtails the seemingly inherent tendency of historical writers to overlook the contributions and participation of minority members. . . .” (2003, 1). For this research inclusive lists were compiled from university archives and collections. Lists included early sociology course offerings, individual scholar-sociologists with linkages to these institutions and courses, and the works and papers of scholars.⁸ We selectively identified for in-depth archival data collection, five key women’s colleges located in the Boston-Amherst area of the New England region (Radcliffe, Wellesley, Smith, Mount Holyoke, and Simmons) and four key black colleges located in the Southern region and in Washington, D.C. (Atlanta, Fisk, Hampton, and Howard). Each university was selected for its visibility and reputation as a pioneering institution for the education of women and blacks, for the known presence of early sociology programs (Tolman 1902, Bernard 1945, Deegan 1991), or for variation in type of institution. We used a variety of sources from published and unpublished archival materials gathered from college catalogs, presidential reports, departmental histories, faculty collections, and files and papers on or by outstanding alumni.

Early Sociology at Black Colleges

Bernard said of the growth and development of sociology that it “was first accepted by the smaller institutions of the South and by the Negro colleges” (1948, 14), and Jones noted that “sociology appeared [in black colleges] as a separate discipline before it did in a host of colleges and universities . . .” (1974, 122). By 1916–17, sociology in black colleges outranked all social sciences except history, and thirty years later it had emerged as the leading social science and was taught in “every Negro collegiate institution in the country” (Himes 1949, 22–24). Not only were Atlanta, Fisk, Hampton, and Howard the first African American institutions to teach sociology

⁸ An examination of the biographies included in *Women in Sociology* (Deegan 1991) established that 22 of the 47 American female sociologists had at least one direct link with a woman’s college—that is these women had either earned a degree from a woman’s college or taught at one. The linkages of the 22 women extended to 14 women’s colleges by means of 33 different links. Wellesley and Barnard, accounted for one third of these 33 links, and four schools accounted for over half: Wellesley, Barnard, Radcliffe, and Vassar.

but Fisk, Hampton, and Atlanta were also participants in the Negro Conference Movement, an important part of the development of sociology in early black colleges and one that reinforced the notion expressed by DuBois in 1897 that the Negro college was “a vast college settlement for the study of a particular set of peculiarly baffling problems” (Jefferson 1996:154). These conferences, held from 1892 to 1912, brought in graduates, speakers, white supporters, farmers, and teachers in a venue that was both instructional and inspirational (Jefferson 1986, 138–39). For Hampton the purpose was primarily community outreach and to showcase accomplishments; for Atlanta, under DuBois, the conferences were to share ideas and research findings that would “facilitate an improvement in American race relations” (Young 2002, 79). At black colleges, sociology had four aspects: (1) teaching, (2) research, (3) community outreach, and (4) reform. At any given time, schools attended differently to one or more of the four, depending on their respective missions, personnel, and location in the larger context of community and society.

Atlanta University: Advanced Study of the Negro Problems

The Atlanta University System today includes Clark Atlanta University, Morehouse, Spelman, Morris Brown College, and the Interdenominational Theological Center. Established in 1865 as a high school academy and normal college by the American Missionary Association with later assistance from the Freedman’s Bureau, by 1894 the focus turned to higher education. By 1929, Atlanta became the graduate branch of the Atlanta black colleges, the nation’s oldest graduate institution serving a predominantly African American student body.

From 1897 until 1944, sociology at Atlanta was associated with W.E.B. DuBois, who taught and practiced there for more than half of that period. DuBois brought with him not only a specific plan for sociology but ideas about the need for black colleges to teach a classical liberal arts education (Lewis 1995). According to Cunnigen, courses taught by DuBois, beginning in 1897, were the first sociology courses offered in the United States at a historically black college (2003, 402). Sociology course descriptions appeared in the Atlanta college catalog the same year that DuBois joined the faculty.

Social Reform. Three terms of the senior year are given to sociology; the first term to a general study of principles, the second term

to a general survey of social conditions, and the third term to a study of the social and economic conditions of the American Negro, and to methods of reform. Mayo-Smith's *Statistics and Sociology* is the textbook in use, and special library and thesis work is required.

In addition to this, graduate study of the social problems in the South by the most approved scientific methods is carried on by the Atlanta Conference, composed of graduates of Atlanta, Fisk, and other institutions. The aim is to make Atlanta University the center of an intelligent and thorough-going study of the Negro problems. Three reports of the Conference have been published, and a fourth is in preparation (*Atlanta University Catalogue 1897-98*, 13).

DuBois' periods of service at Atlanta were 1897 to 1910 and again 1934 to 1944. He came to Atlanta after having completed the first study of an African American community, but before publication of the *Philadelphia Negro* (1899). DuBois held a doctorate in History from Harvard and entered Atlanta with the rank of Professor of Economics and History, in the Department of Sociology and History.⁹ He had the added title of Director of the Sociological Laboratory and of the Atlanta University Conferences. The curriculum remained much the same during his first 12 years in Atlanta (See Table 13.2). Its simplicity, however, fails to reflect the research experience offered and required of students. Early in his tenure DuBois convened the third Atlanta Conference (his first) in which he laid out what Paul Jefferson termed his "practice theory" and plan for putting "science into sociology through a study of the conditions and problems of [his] own group" (Jefferson 1996, 130). DuBois believed that only sociology could offer the methodology and analysis needed to educate and to solve racial problems. He proposed a ten year plan for gathering, interpreting, and publishing data. Annual publications dealt with such topics as black businesses, the black church, health, the black family, and black artisans.

The plan of work is this: a subject is chosen; it is always a definite, limited subject covering some phase of the general Negro problem; schedules are then prepared, and these with letters are sent to the voluntary correspondents, mostly graduates of this and other Negro institutions of higher training. They, by means of local inquiry, fill out and

⁹ DuBois' Ph.D. was in history from Harvard; however, he had studied in Germany where he had the same mentor as Albion Small, Gustav Schmoller of the University of Berlin (Blackwell 1974, 47).

return the schedules; then other sources of information, depending on the question under discussion, are tried, until after six or eight months' work a body of material is gathered. Then a local meeting is held, at which speakers, who are specially acquainted with the subject studied, discuss it. Finally, about a year after the beginning of the study, a printed report is issued (DuBois 1978, 63–64).

DuBois' methodology for collecting and disseminating data was not improved on until after World War I at the University of Chicago (Jefferson 1996, 148). All of this was done on a budget of \$500 per year, for which DuBois always had to fight. He left teaching to become the managing editor of *The Crisis*, the official publication of the NAACP, holding that position until he returned to Atlanta in 1934, then 66 years of age. During the more than 20 years DuBois was away from Atlanta, five men taught sociology for varying lengths of time. A number of traditional courses were added to the sociology curriculum: Social Work, The Family, Social Problems and Research, Criminology and Social Pathology. Other new courses suggested a growing global and theoretical awareness: Nationalism and Imperialism, Contemporary Theory, and Contemporary Social Thought. In 1929, because of Atlanta's affiliation with Spelman and Morehouse, undergraduate courses were phased out, leaving the Department to focus on the graduate program.

When DuBois returned to Atlanta, he was joined by Ira DeAugustine Reid, a widely published author who had been Director of Research for the Urban League and who held a master's degree from Pittsburgh. The Reverend Strong continued to teach some courses at Atlanta while on the faculty at Spelman. With DuBois and Reid came a more sophisticated and diverse curriculum with a stronger conflict orientation than in the previous periods. In the 1930s Atlanta was teaching The Sociology of Conflict, and Karl Marx and the Negro, along with traditional courses such as Methods and Statistics, Social Thought, Urban Sociology, and Social Institutions. By 1940, the Atlanta curriculum was noticeable for its local and global emphases offering on the one hand, Race Problems and the Negro in the South, but also courses on African and Asiatic cultures and European sociology.

DuBois left Atlanta the first time because of fractious relations with administrators over funding, his involvement in the Niagara Movement, and his general activism as a race leader. He returned more than 20 years later, and from 1934 to 1944 chaired, taught

and practiced in the Department of Sociology. He initiated a Cooperative Social Studies Program with Negro Land Grant Colleges and began a quarterly journal, *Phylon: The Atlanta University Review of Race and Culture*. In 1944, he was dismissed from Atlanta "in accordance with tenure and retirement provisions" (Lewis 2000, 493). The real reasons were internal conflicts and DuBois' constant demands for funding of projects such as the Land Grant Cooperative and secretarial help for *Phylon*. As DuBois ended his service to higher education and returned to the NAACP, he lamented that the black sociological tradition had been "bypassed and reduced to social work" (Jefferson 1996, 156). But DuBois had also changed. His work on *The Philadelphia Negro* (1899) was well-balanced and demonstrated remarkable insight with regard to the impact of "social environment" on black self-esteem and achievement. When he left academe, he was angry and disillusioned. Neither Atlanta as an institution of higher education nor sociology as his scientific solution to race problems had met the challenge DuBois had set for them.

Hampton Institute: A Script for Racial Betterment

Hampton Institute (now University) was established in Virginia in 1868 as a normal and agricultural school by General Samuel Chapman Armstrong, who became its first principal. General Armstrong, a white male and the son of missionary parents, received support from the Freedmen's Bureau as well as northern philanthropists and religious groups for his "missionary work" targeting newly freed slaves and Indians. From 1878 to 1912, Hampton received funding from the federal government to educate Indian children. The institution at first included elementary and secondary schools, agricultural and industrial training, as well as a normal school to train teachers. Religious training permeated all divisions of the school and was part of a plan to civilize and socialize students. Hampton, along with Tuskegee Institute in Alabama, was the epitome of the industrial-vocational education opposed by DuBois and at the heart of the Washington-DuBois debate about the future of the Negro race.¹⁰

¹⁰ Booker T. Washington became the spokesperson for industrial education as the vehicle of racial progress for blacks. DuBois argued and worked for a classic

Hampton did not offer college degrees until the early 1920s, although “sociology” was incorporated into every program at Hampton (see Table 13.3). As early as 1900, the Normal College offered a course entitled *Negro and Indian Society*:

A study of the social and economic principles which condition survival and progress in the Negro and Indian races. The desire for and the acquirement of wealth; individual ownership, industrial and frugal habits, good schools for an extended term, a practical religious life—all depend upon established laws which the present civilization imposes upon the individual. The teacher must be the leader . . . and the public school must be the centre of popular educational activity (*Catalog of Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute 1900–1901*, 42).

The following description appeared in the 1902–03 *Catalog* under Academic Courses (high school and college preparatory) labeled as Civics:

The study of the general principles of society and economy upon which our American civilization depends, with special attention to such principles as condition, survival and progress in the Negro and Indian races. Fairchild’s *Rural Wealth and Welfare*, Gidding’s *Elements of Sociology*, DuBois’ *The Philadelphia Negro*, and Washington’s *The Future of the American Negro* constitute the principal reading of the course (39).

Jefferson’s explanation of Hampton’s affinity for sociology was that it was understood in the South as the science of social reform (Jefferson n.d. (a), 29). “Hampton Institute was unique in expressing in this new language [sociology] the project of scripted racial development to which the schools were committed” (n.d. (a), 8–9). Hampton marketed industrial education as a solution to the “Negro problem” and gained white support. The origin and impetus of this plan is not entirely clear. If it came from African Americans, the argument could be made that what appears to be scripted racism was indeed subversive text, designed to gain white support while educating and empowering blacks. However, it appears that the leadership of Hampton was white, as were its generous supporters¹¹ and the sociologists who legitimated the argument for industrial education.

liberal arts education. Washington was Hampton’s most illustrious graduate. Sociology courses were not offered at Tuskegee until after Washington’s death.

¹¹ A report by Butler Jones on funding for black colleges and universities, 1935–36, shows that Hampton had the largest budget of any of the institutions, including Howard (1974, 126–127).

Hampton may be one example of the suggestion by Butler Jones that it was relatively easy to establish faculty competence in sociology (1974, 122), especially when it was scripted for self-improvement and marketed to students as "Civics." Jefferson credited Alice Bacon, instructor in Civics at Hampton from 1893 to 1899, and Charles Bartlett Dyke, who succeeded her, as instrumental in explicating the idea that industrial education was an applied social science that would lead to the physical, intellectual, social, moral, and religious adaptation of the races (Jefferson n.d. (a), 12–14, *Hampton Catalogue 1899–1900*, 37–41). By the turn of the century, sociology at Hampton was multidimensional: industrial education, community service, extension work with students and graduates, monthly publications of the *Southern Workman*, and the annual Negro Conference. Graduates and former students were inspired to be part of Hampton's applied research known as "doing good after a plan." The "plan" involved gathering information directly from the surrounding communities. Graduates and former students were given minimal instructions through the medium of the *Southern Workman*,

... to study the conditions of the communities in which they live and send us the information they acquire. . . . If properly directed these graduates . . . throughout the South might obtain statistics that would be of great interest and value to all interested in race study (Jefferson no date (a), 10–11).

Although a number of faculty before him taught Civics, it was Thomas Jesse Jones who articulated and activated the multi-faceted Hampton sociology project. Jones offered an explanation and a solution to the "race problem." The explanation was that Negroes and Indians were less evolved than the white race. External forces, presumably, emancipation of slaves and government confiscation of Indian lands, had pushed these groups into a later stage of society for which they were as yet unsuited. The solution was to bridge this cultural and biological lag by bringing backward people up to the level of social advancement needed to function in society at the turn of the century. The method of doing this was social science, or more specifically sociology, in the form of industrial education (Jones 1905, 1906). This argument also explains why sociology initially appeared in the curriculum under Civics and at other times under Religion or Bible.

Jones' faculty appointment in 1904 was for History, Civics, Economics, and as Associate Chaplain. He was an immigrant from North

Wales who worked his way to Columbia, where he studied with Giddings. He was in the minority of faculty at Hampton who possessed the doctoral degree. After his arrival, course descriptions under Economics and Sociology became more specific and more applied, and DuBois was removed as required reading. Jones reorganized the Hampton Negro Conference and served as Director of Research until he left Hampton to work for the Census Bureau and subsequently the Phelps-Stokes Fund. In 1912 he was selected by the Bureau of Education to chair the Committee on Social Studies and subsequently to produce several reports (Lybarger 1983, 456). *The Social Studies in Secondary Education* became one of the most influential documents of its day, and "Jones was arguably the most influential white theorist in black education" (Watkins 1995-96, 128). Through his position at the Phelps-Stokes Foundation and as a result of the report on the social studies curriculum, Jones' citizenship and work doctrine spread far beyond the South. J.H. Oldham of the World Missionary Conference took the Hampton plan to South Africa, and Charles Eliot of Harvard called for adoption of the Hampton model to educate blacks and European immigrants in the North (Watkins 1995-96). Indeed, Hampton was simply a southern, rural adaptation of the "philosophical pragmatism" and "theories of social and moral uplift" that Vidich and Lyman attributed to Harvard and Columbia (1985, 151).¹² Jones' curriculum package was little more than Americanization and socialization consisting of "citizenship training, character building, vocational-manual training, and worship" (Watkins 1995-96, 127-128). The desired result, according to Lybarger, was that "Hampton students, having studied sociology under Jones, would be less likely seduced by the efforts of W.E.B. DuBois or other Blacks to assert their rights" (1983, 459). After Washington's death, DuBois continued the educational debate with Jones and once charged that Hampton Institute was,

... determined to perpetuate the American Negro as a docile peasant and peon, without political rights or social standing, working for little wages and heaping up dividends to be doled out in future charity to his children" (Lybarger 1983, 461).

¹² Francis Peabody, chair of Harvard's Department of Social Ethics, served as vice-president of Hampton's board of trustees for many years.

It was harsh criticism. Hampton and Atlanta, although with two very different foci, are examples of the interaction of research and reform. Atlanta, under the leadership of W.E.B. DuBois for many years, focused on providing African American students with a classical education and with scientific research to document and remediate the inequities of a racist society. Hampton, on the other hand, was focused on Americanization and socialization and on the kind of industrial education that would enable blacks to "help themselves" while posing no threat to whites (Watkins 1995-96, 127).

Howard University: The Black Harvard

Howard University was founded in Washington, D.C. in 1867, named for General Oliver O. Howard of the Freedmen's Bureau. The first classes were offered in 1868. Unlike most other black schools, Howard was established for those students prepared for collegiate and professional training. Professional programs such as medicine, pharmacy, and law were phased in over several years. Howard's first president was a white Congregationalist minister from Washington D.C. The school did not have an African American president until 1926 (Fullinwider 1969, 93). Howard was something of an exception to other black schools of the post-Civil War era. While founded in the same "missionary spirit," it received some funding from the Federal government through the Freedmen's Bureau and later through Congressional appropriations (*Howard University College Catalogue 1899-1900*; Bullock 1970, 33-34). Fullinwider labeled Howard the "capital of the Negro bourgeoisie" and declared that "sociology at Howard and Kelly Miller were, until 1934, just about identical" (1969, 97).

Kelly Miller, a self-taught sociologist and mathematics professor, was at various times Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, Dean of the School of Liberal Arts, and Dean of the Junior College. He was born in South Carolina to a slave mother and free father. He earned three degrees an A.B. from Howard, an A.M. from Wilberforce, and a law degree from Virginia Union University (Jones 1974, 146-48, *Catalogue Howard University* 1924-25, 15). He gave the first lecture in sociology at Howard in 1895 and introduced the first sociology course for advanced undergraduates in 1903. Sociology was described very simply as "Small and Vincent's *Study of Society*, First Semester. Wright's *Practical Sociology* Second Semester" (*Catalogue Howard*

University 1906–07, 36). The Department of Social Science was formed in 1907, comprised of Economics, Political Science, Commercial Law, International Law, Sociology, and Commercial Geography.

Sociology acquired departmental status in 1915, with two courses offered: Social Origins, and Problems of the Negro. Although Miller headed the department from approximately 1915 until 1924 there was a parallel evolution of sociology courses in the School of Theology (Cunnigen 2003, 367; Jones 1974, 146–148). The first course description in Theology was general: “application of Christian principles to the social questions of today” (*Catalogue Howard University 1908–09*, 83). By 1910, however, a detailed description appeared for Theoretical and Practical Sociology,¹³ apparently a social work course for ministers. The Theology curriculum is an example of the intermesh of sociology and social reform as reflected in the Social Gospel movement. Texts used were similar to those used in courses offered in the Social Science Department, works by Small, Giddings, and Ellwood. As shown in Table 13.4, by 1918 sociology had evolved a full component of courses in the School of Theology. In 1917–18, courses were offered in Principles of Sociology, Outlines of Sociology, The Family, Human Nature and the Social Order, and The Reconstruction of the Church. Although Miller did not teach in the School of Theology, his beliefs were consistent with sociology as practical Christianity or social ethics (Fullinwider 1969, 99). Courses in the Department of Social Science and subsequently in Sociology were, at least by description and title, more secular than those offered in Theology (later Religion). Nevertheless, Fullinwider questioned whether Miller actually taught sociology, noting that if his “classroom proceedings resembled his books and pamphlets they were more like revival meetings than dispassionate discourse on social structure” (1969, 97). Miller thought that the mission of African American colleges was hampered by the public debate between DuBois and

¹³ “. . . to acquaint the student with the social significance of the gospel of Jesus Christ . . . study of the principles of economics and sociology, the discussion of actual conditions and experience in various forms of neighborhood work . . . includes a consideration of the inductive or scientific method of studying society and its problems. With this introduction the students are prepared to take up the economic and sociological problems of their future parishes . . . problems discussed are those of health and sanitation, community pleasures, efficiency of labor, and economic prosperity and religion, the school and the church” (*Catalogue Howard University 1910–11*, 101).

Washington. Although no less ideological, he presented the public persona of a moderate and offered to mediate the controversy. Toward this end, in 1913 he called a "Negro Sanhedrin"¹⁴ at Howard to air all sides of the controversy and to resolve the issues. Fullinwider reported that "The Sanhedrin met and satisfied no one" (1969, 99).

By the mid-thirties, sociology had been dropped from any offerings in the School of Religion and the Sociology Department offered students work in six areas (see Table 13.4). E. Franklin Frazier succeeded Miller as Professor of Sociology and department chair. Within a few years, he was joined by William Brown, with a doctorate, and Hylan Lewis with a master's, both from Chicago. Frazier had earned his bachelors degree at Howard, a master's degree from Clark, and a doctorate in sociology from Chicago (Edwards 1974, 90). He became perhaps the best known African American sociologist of his generation. While at Howard, he directed research for *The Negro in Harlem: A Report on Social and Economic Conditions Responsible for the Outbreak of March 19, 1935* and contributed to Gunnar Myrdal's *American Dilemma* (1944). He also published some of his best-known books on African American youth and on families. Platt, Frazier's biographer, concluded that Frazier's main contribution to sociology at Howard was in curriculum development and in raising educational standards. Between 1934 and 1948 he reconstructed the entire curriculum and increased student enrollment in sociology classes from 200 to about 2000 (Platt 1991, 104). Students and colleagues sometimes referred to him as "Forceful Frazier." His style, according to one former student, was to use the "shock treatment" to get students attention because he "wanted the student to understand that the objective of sociology was to provide a realistic analysis of the world about him" (1991, 104). In 1948, he became the first African American president of the American Sociological Association. Fullinwider credits Frazier and Charles S. Johnson at Fisk, both Chicago sociologists, for bringing a new African American sociology and orientation on race relations to black educational institutions. He attributes the new sociology of race to the influence of Robert Park, who moved the discussion of race from the biological to the social. Park was Frazier's mentor from his days at the University of

¹⁴ The Sanhedrin is a Greek word mentioned frequently in the New Testament referring to the Jewish council of elders.

Chicago, although in later life he disagreed with him on issues about class and caste. Toward the end of his career, Frazier became openly disillusioned with Howard, with academe, and with the United States. His disillusionment with Howard stemmed from the fact that the University never saw fit to make sociology a priority, choosing instead to direct available funds into professional programs such as dentistry and medicine (Platt 1991, 105). In the forties and fifties, Frazier was targeted by intelligence agencies and congressional committees for alleged subversive and communist activities. He was exonerated but was often assumed guilty if only because of his associations and sympathies (Platt 1991, 200–212). For example, he remained constant in his admiration for W.E.B. DuBois, “not only because of his political views but also because he stood up to all kinds of establishments—whether they were racist bigots or anticommunists or the black bourgeoisie or university bureaucrats—and held his ground, no matter how unpopular” (Platt 1991, 196).

Jarmon points out that although the Howard faculty had a deep interest in inequality, they chose to develop a “traditional sociological pedagogy” (2003, 368). He concluded that, unlike some other black schools, Howard was never “devoted solely to understanding and interpreting the unique relationship of African Americans to the American society” (2003, 368). In some respects sociology at Howard looked more like Harvard than Atlanta. Howard offered a balanced curriculum with the only explicit treatment of African Americans in one course, *The Negro in America*. Compared with the more encompassing curricula at Fisk and Atlanta, Howard’s program was limited (See Tables 13.2, 13.4 and 13.5).

Fisk University: Sociology and Praxis in the Black Community

Fisk was established in 1866 as a normal college in Nashville, Tennessee, through the cooperative efforts of the Freedmen’s Bureau, the American Missionary Association, and the tireless work of a number of individuals. A course in sociology first appeared in the Fisk Catalog in 1895 in the Department of Theology, under the subtopic of Practical Theology. “The relation of the ministry to the social problems of our times is made a subject of lectures. The aim is to improve the facilities for study and original work in this line.” Beginning in 1900, senior students were required to take a Sociology

course, although the catalog offered no description. By 1909, senior students were required to take a two-semester course covering Economic History and Economics and Sociology, with social problems "receiving special attention" (*Fisk University Catalog 1909-1910*).

In 1910 the Board of Trustees established a Department of Social Science and hired George E. Haynes, one of the most qualified men of his time, to head it. Haynes received a bachelor's degree from Fisk, an master's from Yale, studied at the University of Chicago, was a fellow of the New York Bureau of Social Research, and was a graduate of the New York School of Philanthropy. He was the first African American to be awarded a doctorate in sociology from Columbia (Jones 1974, 139-43). Haynes arrived at Fisk in 1910 to "develop a department of sociology . . . and to organize a pioneering program for training Negro social workers" (Weiss 1974, 43). Just before coming to Fisk, along with Ruth Standish Baldwin, he founded the organization that became the National Urban League; his first two years at Fisk were split between Nashville and the League office in New York. Haynes was interested in the professionalization of service and the use of scholarly investigation as the basis of reform. He wanted African American educational institutions to train social workers and existing agencies to bring these professionals onto their staffs to work with the newly migrated African American urban population.

By 1914 Fisk had developed a fully integrated Economics-Sociology-Social Service curriculum requiring all social science students to do community work at Bethlehem Center.¹⁵ Fisk was the first black college to develop a joint curriculum in sociology and social service. Lectures on Social Problems and Methods of Social Betterment were also a regular part of the early curriculum, including such speakers as the head of the Young Men's Christian Organization, Booker T. Washington of Tuskegee Institute, and John Hope Franklin of Atlanta University (*Fisk College Bulletin 1914-15*). Paul Franklin Mowbray, with a bachelor's degree from Howard University, joined the social sciences faculty in 1916 and remained at Fisk until 1926. After Haynes left in 1920, Mowbray was the only full-time faculty in social sciences until 1926. President Fayette McKenzie (1915-1925), with

¹⁵ Bethlehem Center was a social settlement house in Nashville modeled after Hull-House in Chicago. Senior sociology students were required to give four hours of field work at the Center each week.

a Ph.D. from the University of Pennsylvania, was also listed as Professor of Economics and Sociology until he resigned in 1925 after a series of student protests (Smith 1974, 165).

During his 11 years at Fisk, Haynes organized and led the department in a program of research on the history and condition of African Americans (Jones 1974, 140). From the beginning there was both an applied or service component in the program as well as a research component (See Table 13.5). In 1917 the Department of Social Science became the Department of Sociology and began offering a certificate in Social Service. Haynes had a strong background in research, having held a government position in the Department of Labor, and understood the importance of quantifying problems. Despite his credentials, he tended toward a spiritual solution to the race problem (Fullinwider 1969, 95). He left Fisk in 1921 to join the Commission on the Church and Race Relations of the Federal Council of Churches. He had come to see the solution to the race problem as in the spread of Christianity among both races. In 1922, he published *The Trend of the Races*, intended to put the race problem in its proper "scientific framework." His critics, however, saw him as reducing the race problem to two opposing forces, greed and charity, "leaving no doubt as to which race had been entrusted with the preponderant share of the latter" (Fullinwider 1969, 96).

The beginning of the 1926–27 academic year saw many changes at Fisk. A new president was in place, and Charles S. Johnson, assumed his position as Research Professor in Sociology along with C. Luther Fry, Social Research Professor (Ph.D. Columbia). Also in that year, Bertram W. Doyle, M.A. and later Ph.D. from Chicago, was appointed Professor of Sociology. Thus began the Johnson era of Sociology that lasted until 1947 when he became the first black president of Fisk. Johnson held only a bachelor's degree from Virginia Union University. He studied sociology at Chicago where his mentor was Robert Park, but he left Chicago for military service in World War I before completing his degree. Upon his return, he assumed a position with the Chicago Urban League and subsequently, at Park's recommendation, directed *The Negro in Chicago: A Study of Race Relations and a Race Riot* for the Chicago Commission on Race Relations (Robbins 1974, 56–59). This work established his credentials as a sociologist and as a researcher. Among Johnson's best known works are *The Negro in American Civilization* (1930), *Shadow of the Plantation* (1934), *The Negro College Graduate* (1938), *Growing Up in*

the Black Belt (1941), and *Patterns of Negro Segregation* (1943). Although he spent much of his professional life at Fisk, Johnson was best known for his writings and for his service on a number of government committees and task forces. As department chair, Johnson was largely responsible for the substance and form of sociology for over 20 years as well for recruiting a productive and high profile faculty. Doyle, for example, spent six years at Fisk, published while there, and he later authored the well-known *Etiquette of Race Relations in the South* (1937). Also teaching for at least one year during Johnson's tenure as chair were E. Franklin Frazier, Horace Cayton, Horace Mann Bond, and John Hope Franklin. Robert Park taught part-time for eight years at Fisk after he retired from Chicago. Park, Johnson's mentor, may have been the only white faculty member in sociology during Johnson's time at Fisk. In 1938, sociology was combined with anthropology. The name change represented not a downgrade for sociology as much as an expansion and elevation for anthropology because the University hired Mark Hanna Watkins in 1935, at the time the only black doctor in anthropology with expertise in Africa (Smith 1974, 169).

For the period under consideration, Fisk represented the kind of academic excellence for which other schools were still striving. Sociology at Fisk was always heavily integrated with social service, which later evolved into social work. They were about solving social problems, but if by self-improvement, it was not at the expense of racial pride. The sociology faculty were known for their scholarship and were the most widely published of any in the black schools of the day, particularly during the Johnson era. Smith (1974, 168) reports that between the years 1926 and 1950, 71 books and pamphlets were published by Fisk faculty, 12 by Charles S. Johnson. The Fisk faculty published 403 articles in recognized professional journals, 146 by Johnson. Sixteen books and pamphlets and 48 articles were written by other sociology faculty during this period. The academic excellence was apparently institution-wide. Smith cited scholarly and creative works from other disciplines that became part of the body of work associated with the Harlem Renaissance (Smith 1974, 168–170). The sociology curriculum reflected awareness of racial problems, with much of the creative-scholarly work bringing positive recognition to the race.

General Trends and Patterns

Sociology programs at black institutions demonstrate that "... modern American sociology emerged out of the intersection of earlier traditions of social reform and social research" (Jefferson 1996, 135). What these schools had in common, in addition to their African American heritage, is that sociology was initially synonymous with the study of race. Hampton and Atlanta, although with very different agendas, are examples of the interaction of sociology and reform. Atlanta under the leadership of DuBois was focused on providing black students with a classical education and involving them in scientific research. DuBois believed that "through sociology a comprehensive understanding of black life could be achieved as well as the defeat of prejudice through the accumulation of knowledge" (Young 2002, 79). Hampton, on the other hand, was focused on Americanization and socialization, on self-help, and on industrial education geared to the post-Civil War position of blacks and posing no competitive threat to whites (Watkins 1995-96, 127). The leadership in all the sociology departments, with the exception of Hampton, was African American: Haynes and Johnson at Fisk, DuBois and Reid at Atlanta, Miller and Frazier at Howard. Jones was the major influence on sociology at Hampton, and the shadow of his influence extended well beyond his years of service.

By the 1940s, the number of courses offered at Fisk, Atlanta, Howard, and Hampton that emphasized black culture varied. At Fisk and at Atlanta, both centers of intellectual discourse on race relations, emphasis became more global and reinforced cultural awareness along with emphasizing race problems. Fisk offered five courses addressing both social problems faced by blacks as well as those (in anthropology) emphasizing African culture. Atlanta offered four courses, also split in their emphases on race problems and black culture. Howard offered only one course, *The Negro in America*, and Hampton offered no such course. Course offerings specific to the situation of African Americans and their culture tend to support an observation by Doyle, that to the extent that black-white curricular differ, it is "in the attention paid to concepts referring to the status and condition of the Negro in America. . . ." (1933, 36).

Bernard suggested that, "women's colleges have been oriented more or less toward the specialized needs of a social class. The same may be said of the colleges especially for Negroes" (1945, 535). Daniel

and Daniel conclude that "Negro colleges give curricula offerings similar to those of white institutions . . ." (1946: 502). Although seemingly contradictory, these statements suggest what our case studies show. Historically black colleges and universities, most with limited resources, attempted to meet the academic standards set by white schools and to meet the needs of the black community. This dual responsibility constituted what Paul Jefferson termed "a project."

[T]he "African-American sociology project" suggests, on the one hand, that there was a common understanding by black Americans of the generic objectives to which they were committed—differences in detail, scope, or degree of understanding notwithstanding. It also suggests that there was a feeling among African-Americans of serving in a common cause—however idiosyncratic or seemingly uncoordinated their particular tours of duty. (Jefferson n.d. (b), 3)

Thus, the Negro Conferences, "doing good after a plan at Hampton," scientific study of "the Negro problems" at Atlanta, and pioneering the first generation of black social workers at Fisk, were all part of a project. Black colleges embraced, cultivated, taught, and applied sociology. While they did it in different ways, it was always their project.

Early Sociology at Women's Colleges

Although coordinate education extended many of the resources of male institutions to women, most coordinate institutions were not pioneers of equal education. They offered a compromise solution to providing women with an education while maintaining resistance to coeducation. In contrast, independent women's colleges pursued education for women in independently administered environments separate from men's and coeducational institutions. Some of the privately funded women's schools began as four-year colleges or, in the New England states, evolved from seminaries. As the case studies of Wellesley, Smith, and Mount Holyoke show, sociology typically found its way into the curricula of these private liberal arts colleges between the 1880s and 1890s. Beginning in the early 1900s, state and private industrial and professional schools prepared women for marketable professions or trades. These schools included liberal arts and sciences courses for cultural enrichment, but only as supplemental instruction. Sociology programs tended to develop later, beginning in the

early 1900s. Despite the late start, however, professional training provided unique opportunities in the emergent field of sociology. The applied fields in particular required training in statistical applications and in policy relevant to the growth of social and government agencies. Women's colleges thus provided an important opportunity structure in launching women's academic careers; some provided environments for the development of a humanistic sociology (Deegan 1983; 1987a) and cultural feminism (Palmieri 1995).

Radcliffe: Coordinate Education in the Shadow of Harvard Men

Nichols (1997) examined "coordinate education" at Radcliffe College and Harvard University from 1879–1947. He found social science education of Radcliffe women disadvantaged relative to that of Harvard men in the pre-sociology years, but over time women gained relative parity. Radcliffe was established as the Harvard Annex for women in 1882 by the Society for the Collegiate Instruction of Women, with the aim of preparing women to be teachers (Schwager 1982). The society formalized an arrangement where "Harvard faculty repeated lectures and administered examinations [for women] comparable to those taken by the men" (Nichols 1997, 6). The Harvard Annex, thus, represented a compromise strategy to coeducation and a covert "campaign to infiltrate a male institution" that had denied women access since before the Civil War (Nichols 1997, 6).

Chartered as a college in 1894, Radcliffe had no buildings of its own; its courses were held in a small house, and its funding was from private sources. It maintained an administration separate from Harvard, although degrees were awarded only with the approval of Harvard authorities. The benefit to Harvard faculty who voluntarily participated in the education program was supplemental pay for courses repeated at Radcliffe (Schwager 1982; Nichols 1997). Nichols captures the covert nature of Radcliffe's strategy in a letter written by mathematics professor William Byerly to President Charles W. Eliot dated April 17, 1894. Byerly forcefully states his vision for women's future education at Harvard (cited from Nichols 1997, 7):

I think that the position occupied by the "Annex" or by Radcliffe College in so far as it is absolutely dependent upon the willingness of the Harvard teachers to devote their spare time to its service . . . is indefensible and untenable except as a temporary makeshift . . . in spite

of the change of name, Radcliffe is no more a college than the Annex was, but is, like the Annex, an unacknowledged department of Harvard. . . .

Believing this it seems to me that our policy is to go on quietly and carefully. . . . We should strengthen our instruction as much as possible, and gradually and cautiously work our way into the small graduate courses in Harvard University, and then wait patiently until the Harvard Corporation and their constituents come to see that we are . . . a credit as a source of strength to Harvard. Then at last we will become what we have always aimed to become, a recognized department of the University. . . .¹⁶

This unusual Harvard-Radcliffe arrangement was largely in place until 1943, when a legal agreement gave Radcliffe women access to many of Harvard's advanced courses.¹⁷ However, as Nichols notes, "during its formative period, Radcliffe's courses were more a potluck supper than an integrated program" (1997, 8). Similarly, Schwager indicates that the program at Radcliffe "reflected the special interests and subjects of the professors who would agree to participate. Curricular considerations and students' precise needs were, as a result, often compromised" (1982, 211). Whereas all 53 faculty were invited to participate in the Annex in 1879, only 13 (24%) taught courses in the first semester, and about a quarter of courses offered at Harvard were offered at Radcliffe. Overall, the quality of women's education at the Annex as reflected in faculty time, course offerings, and in library and laboratory resources represented only a fraction of that provided to Harvard men (Schwager 1982, 211–23). Despite these limitations Radcliffe women were able to gain over time a relatively high quality education.

Table 13.6 provides an overview of the historical development of courses containing sociological content at Radcliffe and a summary of faculty involved in the delivery of courses in early sociology. It reflects the general growth of courses at Harvard, which developed in two separate disciplinary contexts, economics and social ethics,

¹⁶ President Eliot Correspondence File, Letter Byerly to Eliot April 17, 1894, Box 128B, Folder 621, Harvard University Archives, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

¹⁷ In 1963 Harvard's Graduate School of Arts and Sciences was opened to women and Radcliffe Graduate School was closed. In 1975 limits on the number of women undergraduates admitted to Harvard were abolished, and in 1977 an agreement between Radcliffe and Harvard was signed governing "their innovative educational partnership." However, not until 1999, did Radcliffe and Harvard officially merge (*Radcliffe Quarterly*, Summer 1999).

prior to sociology's becoming an independent department in 1931 under Pitirim Sorokin (Church 1965; Potts 1965). By the 1930s women were offered a diverse set of courses, and although access to faculty was uneven Radcliffe women were able to take theoretical and substantive courses with Pitirim Sorokin, Talcot Parsons, Carle Zimmerman, Robert K. Merton, and Sheldon Glueck. Whereas Contemporary Social Theory was taught equally at Radcliffe and Harvard, Parson's advanced course on theory, and statistics were not offered at Radcliffe. In the ten years between 1933 and 1943, Radcliffe awarded 16 masters and four doctorates in sociology. The first master's degree was earned by Alwina Jane Moore in 1933. The first doctorates were awarded to Florence Rockwood Kluckhohn, Margaret Thekla Cussler, and Norma Olive MacRury in 1941, followed by Mary Lewis DeGive in 1943 (Nichols 1997).

Wellesley: An Adamless Eden

From its founding in 1870, Wellesley was unique among colleges of comparable status in its sustained commitment to staffing faculty and administrative positions with women. Wellesley appointed only women to its presidency, and most faculty have been women. Palmieri notes that the world of women at Wellesley formed "a cohesive community that incorporated selective aspects of women's culture with intellectualism, feminism, and reform" (1995, xiv). From the 1870s to about 1920, the Wellesley community nourished scholarship, activism, and social reform among its female social scientists and launched the careers of a number of women earning graduate degrees at a time when prospects for academic employment for women were grim.¹⁸ Most notable among the female pioneers whose academic careers began at Wellesley are Mary E.B. Roberts Coolidge, Katherine Coman, Emily Greene Balch, and Edith Abbott.

Just as American pre-sociology in the early years reflected a distinctively European influence with roots in labor problems, socialism, and issues related to the redistribution of wealth, the two women

¹⁸ Fitzpatrick reported that only one woman in the United States had earned a Ph.D. before 1880, 24 received the doctorate in the years between 1880 and 1890, and about 200 women received doctorates in the 1890s. However, during the 19th century only 15 doctorates were earned by women in political economy, political science, and sociology. One third of these were earned at the University of Chicago.

responsible for developing courses with sociological content at Wellesley in the 1880s had European connections (Church 1965; Deegan 1983). Katharine Coman's early scholarship in literature, for example, was largely focused on England, but her lifetime work was the study of labor and industry.¹⁹ Her *Industrial History of the United States* (1905) was reprinted for many years and translated into German. Other publications dealt with contract labor in Hawaii and the Negro as a peasant farmer. Her research on social insurance in Europe was published posthumously in 1915. Emily Greene Balch, winner of the Nobel Peace Prize in 1946 and graduate of the first class of Bryn Mawr in 1889, studied political economy at the University of Paris, the University of Chicago, and the University of Berlin.²⁰ Her early publication, *Public Assistance of the Poor in France* (1893), documented the development of poor laws and social assistance programs. Deegan (1991) cites *Our Slavic Fellow Citizens* (1910) as Balch's most important sociological work and one predating the more widely recognized, *Polish Peasant* (1918–1920). Like Thomas and Znaniecki, Balch used a multiple data collection design in her comparative analysis of the immigrant experience in Europe and the United States. In 1915 she co-authored *Women at the Hague* with Jane Addams and Alice Hamilton, a book that brought public recognition (and much scorn) to the international conferences for peace during World War I. Additionally Balch published over 100 articles on women, labor, and social settlements as well as a number of articles on international peace (Deegan 1991, 57–58). Balch and Coman, along with colleague Vida Scudder, founded the Denison Settlement House in Boston in 1892 (Horowitz 1984). The emphasis on social reform and activism reflected in the works of Coman and Balch was readily adapted to a curriculum that promoted university social settlement work, activism in women's trade union organizing, and other political and social organizations.

The first courses offered at Wellesley with sociological content were in political economy offered by Katharine Coman, who was named

¹⁹ With her lifetime companion, poet Katharine Bates, Coman co-edited *English History as Told by English Poets* (1902). The selected poems illustrated the working conditions of laborers, including Browning's "The Cry of the Children," a poem describing child labor in coal mines and factories.

²⁰ Biographical Files, Katharine Coman and Emily G. Balch, Wellesley College Archives, Wellesley, Massachusetts.

Professor of History in 1883 when Alice Freeman, a cohort from the University of Michigan, was chair of the department.²¹ Coman's job title changed many times over her 33 years at Wellesley. In the History and Political Economy Department, between 1883 and 1886, she taught Political and Social Institutions, described in the *Wellesley College Bulletin* as including "discussion of important questions in social science." For three years, 1887–1890, Mary Elizabeth Burroughs Roberts,²² with a Master's degree from Cornell, taught Economic and Social Problems. After serving a year as Dean, in 1890, Coman headed the newly-formed department of Economics and Sociology with the title, Professor of Economics and Sociology. Between 1890 and 1896, Coman was the sole faculty member teaching four courses in political economy: Economic Theory, Industrial History of England and America, Statistical Study of Economic Problems, and Historical Development of Socialism. In 1895–96 a new course entitled Social Pathology was added to the curriculum as well as an additional semester in Statistics. Beginning in 1896–97 Emily Balch joined Coman, teaching courses in Social Economics, Evolution, and Present Conditions of Wage Labor, and Socialism.

Table 13.7 provides a summary of courses offered and faculty in three distinct periods of Economics and Sociology at Wellesley. Between 1901 and 1918 early sociology reflected its pre-sociology beginnings in Political Economy. The blend of sociology and economics courses in this period looks not unlike the subfield of modern day industrial or economic sociology. In 1900–01 Emily Balch developed the first course on the Introduction to General Sociology. Other courses added in this period by Anna Prichett Youngman (Ph.D. Chicago)²³ and Edith Abbott (Ph.D. Chicago) concentrated on economics. Balch's Socialism course was described as "A critical study of modern socialism, including the main theories and political movements. Special attention will be given to Karl Marx, and selected parts of *Capital* will be read by the class" (*Wellesley College Bulletin*

²¹ Freeman became Wellesley's second and youngest President at the age of 26.

²² She used the various names of Mary Elizabeth Burroughs Roberts Smith Coolidge.

²³ Youngman taught Economics courses at Wellesley from 1908–1919. After a short stint with the Federal Reserve board, she wrote financial and business editorials for the *Journal of Commerce* in New York, from 1924–33 and for the *Washington Post*, from 1933 to 1952. She died in 1974 at the age of 91 (Faculty Biographical Files, Anna P. Youngman, Wellesley College Archives, Wellesley, Massachusetts).

1910–11, 66). The “social questions of the day,” labor, trade unionism, immigration, and poverty, clearly occupied the minds of these early teachers and scholars at Wellesley. However, with faculty changes, the department began shifting emphasis in the following decade, roughly 1920 to 1930. Coman became ill in 1912, and after fighting cancer for three years died in 1915 at age 60. Shortly thereafter, Emily Balch took a one-year sabbatical followed by another year’s leave of absence. During that time Balch was a member of the American delegation led by Jane Addams to the International Congress of Women at the Hague (later the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom). As a result of her war resistance activities, the board of trustees at Wellesley refused to renew her contract in 1918.²⁴ In the 10-year period that followed, between 1919 and 1929, economics and sociology courses were programmatically separated, corresponding to the divergent backgrounds of new faculty.

Jane Isabel Newell joined the faculty at Wellesley after teaching in Economics and Sociology at Smith from 1915–1919, and completing her doctorate at the University of Wisconsin (1919). Her academic interests were in social welfare and industrial history. Newell assumed responsibility for the sociology curriculum and taught introductory courses in sociology and economics as well as Family, Social Economics, Industrial History, and Statistics. She served as chair from 1920–24, leaving Wellesley in 1927 to teach sociology at Yenching University in Peking, China.²⁵ During the decade of the twenties the department took on a distinctively economic flavor, particularly with the hiring of Elizabeth Donnan (B.A.) in 1920 and Henry Raymond Mussey (Ph.D.) in 1924. Donnan chaired the department, with considerable faculty turnover, the better part of the decade. As early as 1917 annual reports to the president indicate that certain members of the department wanted economics and sociology to separate as the teaching faculty in sociology expanded. Over the twenties, these sentiments appear to intensify.²⁶

²⁴ Faculty Biographical Files, Emily Balch, Wellesley College Archives, Wellesley, Massachusetts.

²⁵ Faculty Biographical Files, Jane Newell, Wellesley College Archives, Wellesley, Massachusetts.

²⁶ President’s Office, Academic Departments, Economics and Sociology Annual Reports, 1914–1940, Wellesley College Archives, Wellesley Massachusetts.

In 1929 Mary Bosworth Treudley²⁷ (Ph.D. Clark University; A.M. University of Chicago) was hired as an Instructor of Economics and Sociology after teaching in China for five years. Treudley quickly made her place in the department, and upon the hiring of her colleague, Leland Jenks, in 1930 (Ph.D. Columbia University; M.A. University of Kansas), the sociology program took on greater stability and a new direction.²⁸ Jenks continued the Wellesley tradition in the history of the economy although the courses he added suggest a shift toward a more institutionalized, functionalist sociology. His theory courses, for instance, emphasized Comte, Darwin, Spencer, and Sumner, but made no mention of Marx. He published regularly in economics, history, and sociological journals, including "The Study of Political Theories" published in *Social Forces* (1940). Over the following 21 years Treudley became the "work horse" of the department, making significant contributions to the development of a stream of courses that broadened the scope of sociology offerings. Between 1929 and 1945, she taught as many as 15 different courses. Her Criminology course, first offered in 1939, was particularly popular and helped the chair, Jenks, make the case for sociology's becoming an independent department.²⁹ Treudley also developed a strong record of publication in such journals as *Social Forces*, *American Sociological Review*, and the *Journal of Educational Sociology*. In 1940 sociology separated from economics after the unexpected death of Henry Mussey the previous year. Chairman Jenks wrote of the separation in his annual report to the president dated June 10, 1940, stating,

former differences of opinion have not been pressed, and all members have cooperated loyally in carrying through the initial steps in the establishment of the new departments and concluding the work of the present one.³⁰

²⁷ Mary Treudley died Professor Emeritus at Wellesley at the age 100 in 1985.

²⁸ Faculty Biographical Files, Mary B. Treudley and Leland Jenks, Wellesley College Archives, Wellesley, Massachusetts.

²⁹ President's Office, Academic Departments, Economics and Sociology, Annual Reports, Jenks to Mildred McAfee, June 6, 1939, Wellesley College Archives, Wellesley, Massachusetts.

³⁰ President's Office, Academic Departments, Economics and Sociology, Annual Reports, Jenks to Mildred McAfee, June 10, 1940, Wellesley College Archives, Wellesley, Massachusetts.

Smith: A Stepping Stone for Male Sociologists

If the founding and early years at Wellesley were distinguished by support of women's careers in the academy, a different path was taken by Smith, where the founders placed emphasis on hiring credentialed faculty, most of whom were men. Smith College was founded in 1875 in Northampton, Massachusetts, by Sophia Smith, in the same year that Wellesley was founded, less than 100 miles away. In her will Smith expressed her desire that the College would be

an Institution . . . with the design to furnish for my own sex means and facilities for education equal to those which are afforded now in our colleges to young men . . . It is my opinion that by the higher and more thorough Christian education of women, what are called "their wrongs" will be redressed, their wages adjusted, their weight of influence in reforming the evils of society will be greatly increased, as teachers, as writers, as mothers, as members of society, their power for good will be incalculably enlarged.³¹

Smith was designed on a "cottage system" where female students lived in common homes emulating small families (Horowitz 1984). The men who shaped Smith were largely trustees appointed by Sophia Smith's pastor John M. Greene. The majority were "Amherst men" and,

[a]s alumni and powerful faculty, they knew the standards for admission and the curriculum of a New England college. While they were unusual in that they wanted to make college education available to women, they were thoroughly conventional in their desire to protect nineteenth-century femininity (Horowitz 1984, 69).

Under the Smith plan, men and women were to serve on the faculty and administration, forming a community where men and women worked together with mutual respect. An examination of early faculty appointments reveals, however, hiring practices that favored men with established educational credentials whereas women held secondary positions as "house mothers." Similarly, Smith followed the pattern of hiring male presidents and female principals (Horowitz 1984, 75). This pattern was also reflected in appointments in the social sciences with prominent sociologists holding faculty positions.

³¹ Smith College: Smith Tradition www.smith.edu/about_smithtradition.php 2/29/04.

Smith, for example, was the first women's college to have a faculty member serve as President of the American Sociological Society (ASS), Frank H. Hankins in 1938. Two other men on Smith's faculty, F. Stuart Chapin and Harry Elmer Barnes, are today well known for their publications and leadership in sociology. Chapin also served as President of the ASS in 1935, after he left Smith to become chair of Sociology at the University of Minnesota (Odum 1951).

From its founding years Smith's course of study included a degree requirement in social science and in political economy, taught by Sarah W. Humphrey, Teacher of Social Culture and History until 1877. By 1878 credentialed male faculty had replaced most of the early women teachers, except those holding secondary positions. Senior year courses included Perry's *Elements of Political Economy* and Herbert Spencer's *First Principles* and were taught by male faculty in History and Political Science. In 1892 and 1893 the first appointments in sociology were made, first of the Rev. Samuel W. Dike (LL.D.), a lecturer and nonresident teacher, and in the following year Harry H. Powers (A.M.), Professor of Economics and Sociology. Sociology included Principles, The Family, and Labor and Labor Problems. By 1894 Economics and Sociology comprised a sequence of ten courses. This broad differentiation of courses is no doubt one of the earliest programmatic developments in sociology among women's colleges. In 1898 a second professor, Charles F. Emerick (Ph.D.) was added to the faculty, and by 1900 the Department of Economics and Sociology was formed.³² Table 13.8 provides a summary of Smith sociology courses and faculty for three departmental periods beginning in 1901.

Emerick was a strong force on the faculty, serving for 24 years, 1896–1919. Though primarily teaching courses in Economics, he supported sociology as a unique discipline and social science as informing methods for social reform. In 1903, while serving as chair, Emerick hired Georgia White (Ph.D.) as an instructor, and by 1906 White was promoted to Associate Professor, specializing in courses in both theoretical and practical sociology. The course description for Some Modern Social Problems reflects the emphasis placed on sociology as a science in addressing social questions of the day:

³² Smith, *College Annual Circular 1874–1900*.

A study of the social conditions resulting from immigration and changed industrial relations. Emphasis will be placed on statistical methods and their practical application to the study of social problems (*Smith College Annual Circular* 1906, 50).

This dual emphasis on theory and practice left an imprint on future programming in sociology. By the late 1920s a tension between theory and practice and sociology's relationship to the other social sciences became the subject of much deliberation prior to sociology's becoming an independent department.

Upon Georgia White's departure in 1912, two new faculty were hired, Esther Lowenthal (Ph.D.), Instructor in Economics, and F. Stuart Chapin (Ph.D.), Instructor in Sociology. Both provided leadership in strengthening economics and sociology in the department. The Training School for Social Work was established in 1915 under Chapin's direction. Prior to Chapin's resignation in 1922, sociology courses, including two in social work, had grown to 10, taught by Chapin, Associate Professor Chase Going Woodhouse (A.M.), Assistant Professor Julius Drachsler, and other instructors. Woodhouse offered courses in social legislation in relation to Children, Women, Work and Welfare and some years later became State Secretary of Connecticut and a member of Congress.³³ Prior to Chapin's resignation, Charles Emerick made a case for sociology's separating into an independent department under Chapin's leadership. In a letter dated October 29, 1918 to the President and Trustees of Smith College, Emerick set out the differences between sociology and economics:

I heartily approve Mr. Chapin's petition for an independent department of Sociology under his leadership. Economists and Sociologists have such opposing points of view that they should not sit in judgment upon each other's courses. Economists think that the economic order conditions social organization. Sociologists are inclined to think that social organization is more fundamental than the economic order. With the development of sociology these opposing points of view have become more pronounced. The establishment of an independent department of sociology should, of course, carry with it the complete separation of the teachers in sociology from economics.

The preponderance of students in the department at present is in sociology, as Mr. Chapin points out. It is only fair, therefore, that their

³³ Office of President Files (Neilson, *Smith College: the First Seventy Years*, Chapter 8), Departmental History, Economics and Sociology, Smith College Archives, Smith College, Northampton, Massachusetts. Used by permission.

leadership and direction should be placed under someone who has the sociological view point . . . sociology has grown rapidly in subject matter in recent years and among those who have contributed by his teaching and writings to its growth is Mr. Chapin himself.³⁴

Apparently the recommended action was not taken, and after the departures of Emerick in 1919 and Chapin in 1922, the department was faced with considering "a radical revision of our whole sociological side."³⁵

In 1922 Frank H. Hankins (Ph.D.), who had studied under Giddings at Columbia and served on the faculty of Clark University from 1908–1922, was hired to replace Chapin. Hankins offered courses in Research Methods, Population, History of Social Theories, and Cultural Evolution. According to Odum, Hankins completed "more than a quarter of a century of vigorous teaching and study including a few years of tempestuous criticism by Smith alumnae because of some of their studies of sex" (1951, 187). The "studies" solicited attitudes from senior students about women's career goals and double standards for pre-marital sexual activity for men and women³⁶ and would be considered innocuous by today's standards. Hankins not only survived at Smith but went on to become the 28th president of the American Sociological Society, and also served as the first president of the Eastern Sociological Society in 1930–31. He was a contributing editor of *Social Forces* and the first editor of the *American Sociological Review* (ASR). He published *The Racial Basis of Civilization* in 1926, *An Introduction to the Study of Society* in 1928, and his numerous articles appeared in the *American Sociological Review*, the *American Journal of Sociology* and *Social Forces*. Hankins' interests included "the heredity-environment problem, the inheritance of human traits, race and population questions, and problems of sex and family life" (Odum 1951, 189).

During much of his tenure at Smith, Hankins served as chair and, with his colleague Harry Elmer Barnes, who joined the Smith faculty

³⁴ Office of President Files, Economics and Sociology Department, Letter, October 29, 1918, Emerick to President and Board of Trustees, Box 45, Smith College Archives, Smith College, Northampton, Massachusetts. Used by permission.

³⁵ Office of President Files, Box 45, Economics and Sociology, Letter, July 26, 1922 to Miss Esther Lowenthal; Smith College Archives, Smith College, Northampton, Massachusetts. Used by permission.

³⁶ Frank H. Hankins Papers, 1922–68, Sex and Marriage Survey, Smith College Archives, Smith College, Northampton, Massachusetts. Used by permission.

in 1923, worked to strengthen sociology and to define the role and place of sociology among the social sciences. In 1928 Hankins and Barnes served on the Joint Conference Committee on the Social Sciences at Smith, a committee made up of faculty in Sociology, Government, Economics, and History and headed by trustee and alumnae Mary van Kleeck.³⁷ The primary purpose of the committee was to define the relationship of sociology as an "integrative social science" to the other social sciences in the college. The report, prepared by Hankins and Barnes, set out a plan for "well-rounded" courses in sociology, as well as a discussion of the relation between economics and sociology, history and sociology, and government and sociology. Hankins and Barnes prepared statements on the nature, objectives, and general viewpoint of sociology. Excerpts reveal tensions, and perhaps new directions in which Hankins and Barnes hoped to take sociology. Hankins wrote, for example:

It is now just a hundred years since the French philosopher August Comte coined the term sociology. Nevertheless the subject appears still to be in its formative stage. . . . Perhaps it is easiest to state what sociology is not. It is not a study of crime, delinquency, poverty and other social evils; nor is it a study of programs of social reform. Most sociology departments deal with these topics, primarily, I think, because of historical and academic accidents. There doubtless has been in the historical development of sociology a considerable interest in problems of social betterment and in the large questions of social reform. It is quite feasible, however, to organize a department of sociology in which courses on these subjects do not exist . . . (Joint Conference Committee Report 1928, 4).³⁸

In describing his own courses, Barnes discussed a course devoted to the study of social maladjustment, emphasizing the scientific nature

³⁷ Van Kleeck graduated with a bachelor's degree from Smith College in the class of 1904 and served on the Board of Trustees from 1922 to 1930. She was the Director of Industrial Studies for the Russell Sage Foundation intermittently between 1909 through 1937. In 1919 she directed the Woman's Bureau of Industrial Service. She held memberships in the American Statistical Association, American Economic Association, and the American Sociological Association. She authored at the Russell Sage Foundation several studies including, *Miners and Management: A Study of the Collective Agreement between the United Mine Workers of America and the Rocky Mountain Fuel Company*. Other publications by Van Kleeck include those for *Charities and the Commons* and the *Journal of the American Association of University Women*. (Mary van Kleeck Papers, Sophia Smith Collection, Smith College, Northampton, Massachusetts).

³⁸ Frank H. Hankins Papers, 1922-68, Box 4, Joint Conference Committee on the Social Sciences, Report to Board of Trustees, June 16, 1928. Smith College Archives, Smith College, Northampton, Massachusetts. Used by permission.

of his approach stating that, "It is in no sense propaganda for social uplift" (p. 7). Hankins also provided a discussion concerning plans to add a cultural and anthropological component to course offerings. Apparently a concern of the committee was the encroachment of sociology by way of course titles and content into more established disciplines. The appropriate home for the urban course was among topics debated. "The difficulties of co-ordination, due to the wide scope of sociology, are brought out. . . . As expressed by one of the faculty members of the committee, 'either we must all be sociologists or else sociologists must set limits to their subject'" (p. 12).

The committee also addressed "the immediate problem of criticism[s] at Smith College . . . directed against the teaching of sociology." The report concludes,

It was recognized that because the social sciences have to do with the institutions of society they must inevitably be controversial in character. Objective scientific treatment is likely to arouse the antagonism of those who would maintain unchanged all of the institutions of society and government. Against this type of attack, however, Smith College stands firm in its own traditions of seeking truth and opening to students access to knowledge and to scientific methods. Such a pursuit of truth demands freedom of thought, inquiry and teaching for members of the faculty. (p. 14)

There is little question that some of the committee's deliberations were in response to the criticisms leveled at the, now infamous, sex and marriage survey. The survey had brought written complaints by parents, the business community, and even appeared as a topic of reprimand to the college from a Kiwanis address given by Frank A. Goodwin, and published in the *Manufacturers Record* entitled "Sacco-Vanzetti and the Red Peril" on August 18, 1927.³⁹

³⁹ The section on Smith on page 70 states: "Let me read you a few of the questions submitted to a senior class of girls at Smith College, and I understand it was also sent out to others. After you hear these questions I would ask you if it is not time either to clean out those responsible for this filth, or for parents to keep their daughters out of such an unclean atmosphere. Would you wish to have such questions as these asked of your daughters? [Editor's note—The questionnaire quoted by Mr. Goodwin is so objectionable because of the obscenity of its suggestions, that while it was entirely appropriate for use by Mr. Goodwin in his address to a group of business men, it is not suitable for publication in the MANUFACTURERS RECORD and it is therefore omitted.] No wonder promiscuity is increasing among college girls!"

It was not until 1937 that sociology was granted administrative approval to establish an independent department. By that time Barnes had left Smith, but Hankins remained and served as chair. In the 1930–40 era, after the Joint Committee's deliberations, course offerings reflect the plan outlined by Hankins and endorsed by Barnes. Essentially the program moved away from a social reform or practical leaning and developed more in the area of the Expansion of Western Culture, Democracy and Dictatorship, the Modern Family, and Immigration and Assimilation. Assistant Professors Gladys Eugenia Bryson (Ph.D.) and Margaret Alexander Marsh (Ph.D.) were hired to add these courses. Marsh, who had earned her Masters at Smith in 1916, remained on the faculty until her retirement in 1959. Among her publications are *The Bankers in Bolivia: A Study in American Foreign Investment* (1928) and articles on Latin American economics. After the resignation of Barnes, Associate Professor Howard P. Becker (Ph.D.) and a few years later, after Becker's departure, Neal B. DeNood (M.A.) taught Theory, Theory Development, and Social Maladjustment. The program became strongly marked with a functionalist framework during this era, emphasizing the scientific, evolutionary, and integrative components of society.

Mount Holyoke: Promoting Women in the Social Sciences

Founded by Mary Lyon in 1837, an early crusader for women's education (Green 1979), Mount Holyoke Seminary and College emphasized a rigorous classical education. In a *Centennial Bulletin* published in 1937, Professor Ethel Barbara Dietrich writes of the origin and history of the Economics and Sociology Department:

Political economy was one of the eleven "studies" of the first senior class of Mount Holyoke Seminary in 1837. While it was startling enough to offer young women educational opportunity equal to that of their brothers, inclusion of this newest subject in the curriculum is eloquent testimony of the progressive spirit of Mary Lyon. As a science worthy of academic pursuit, the study of economics was then only just appearing in the universities of England and the men's colleges of the United States.⁴⁰

⁴⁰ Economics and Sociology Department Records, Department History Files, *Centennial Bulletin* 1937, Archives and Special Collections, Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Massachusetts.

First teachers during the pre-sociology years included Sarah D. Stow and Vida Frank Moore (Ph.B.), instructors in Political Economy and Government. The first text used was *Elements of Political Economy* by Francis Wayland (1837). In 1896, Holyoke hired Annah May Soule (M.L., State University of Ann Arbor) as chair of History and Political Economy. Soule's strong leadership in the social science areas of political economy and history mark her as the "first mother" of sociology at Mount Holyoke and among the earliest female teachers of sociology in the United States. Dietrich writes of Soule, "a woman of broad, social sympathies and a teacher of rare influence, a course in Socialism and Communism was introduced in 1897-98, which was then a subject of challenging interest to American economists" (*Centennial Bulletin* 1937, 6). As reflected in Table 13.9 the first course with sociology in its title was offered in 1898-99, Principles of Sociology. The course substituted in that year for Socialism and Communism and was initially taught by Franklin Giddings and later by Soule. As a teacher Soule was described as "embodying life." She died on March 17, 1905, less than 10 years after arriving at Holyoke. At her memorial service President Wooley made the following statement,

She was the embodiment of life; that was the secret of her power as a teacher. For her the past lived, and she had the rare gift of making her students enter into that life. Questions industrial, social, economic, were never to her purely academic; they were living problems, as vital to the individual student as a personal interest could be. The atmosphere of her classroom was always charged with life and her classes and students reflected the buoyancy and enthusiasm which were so characteristic of her.

Students characterized Soule as follows:

Miss Soule believed in free discussion, independent thinking, action based on conviction. But the freedom she loved and lived in was a freedom in which there was the deepest reverence for law or principle. She would go straight to the heart of a matter with her question, "What's the principle of the thing?" The college life has felt the joy Miss Soule had in her work. Her unbounded delight in the success of a student in college or after graduation was in itself enough to repay the student for months of hard work.⁴¹

⁴¹ Annah May Soule Papers, Box 3, Folder 3, Archives and Special Collections, South Hadley, Massachusetts.

The archival records also include correspondence from Soule to Susan B. Anthony and W.E.B. DuBois, expressing appreciation for their work. On yet another level, student Frances Perkins (class of 1902) was influenced by Soule's courses on Socialism and Labor and went on to become Secretary of Labor under Franklin Roosevelt (1933–1945).

After 1905, Amy Hewes (Ph.D.), an equally energetic and resourceful woman, was hired to chair the department and to teach political and social economy. Hewes received her bachelor's degree from Goucher College in 1897 and subsequently studied at the University of Berlin, "then the center for much that was stimulating in philosophical, political, and social thought" (*Centennial Bulletin* 1937, 6). She received her doctorate in sociology and politics at the University of Chicago in 1903. Deegan recounts the difficulties Hewes experienced, in the years 1903 and 1904, when she sought an academic position in the social sciences. Despite the fact that she held the highest degree from one of the best centers of sociology of the day, she wrote Albion Small, discouraged at her job prospects. In her letter, she declined an offer to pursue an academic position in Florida teaching German. She was apparently working for a publishing company in New York, perhaps in a free-lance type of position:

I want very much to teach. I know that unless I do it next year, the chances are I never will, for I must settle down to something permanent. In political science—civics, constitutional and diplomatic history, elementary economics and sociology—or something within hailing distance of these I should not hesitate—but German is a sight too wide of the mark (Deegan 1991, 165).⁴²

Dietrich described the appointment of Hewes at Mount Holyoke as the beginning of the modern era. Under her administration the Department of Economics and Sociology was formed and flourished. Between 1910 and 1937 majors numbered 1,043 (*Centennial Bulletin* 1937, 1).

As times have changed the curriculum has changed. Whereas in the first years the emphasis was primarily on social problems and economic history, courses in economic problems and statistics were added and a statistical laboratory installed, as opportunities for women widened

⁴² Hewes to Small, Small Papers, Box 1, Folder 6, University of Chicago, Regenstein Library, Department of Special Collections.

in the business world and in Government. To meet the awakened interest in the “new internationalism” as well as the “new revolutionism,” European Economic History, International Trade, and the work of the International Labor Office have been incorporated in the curriculum, while in the Seminar the economic and social problems of the U.S.S.R., Germany, Japan, and Sweden, have been made the subjects of special study during the last four years. The course in Criminology is characteristic of the “new” sociology (*Centennial Bulletin* 1937, 6).

A new statistics laboratory in the 1918–1920s positioned Mount Holyoke as a leading institution for the development of the social sciences and in the education of women. The department’s determination to provide a place for women in the social sciences is well documented and reflects a student-centered and practice-oriented culture. Chair Amy Hewes and Professor Alzada Comstock enumerated in the *Centennial Bulletin* the successes of their students in the statistics lab, an “experiment” apparently funded by Mrs. Willard Straight. In a letter soliciting a five-year endowment for the lab (apparently written by Mary Taylor) dated December 29, 1922, the work of Hewes and Comstock are lauded.

The Department of Economics and Sociology at Mount Holyoke has been a pioneer in developing a thorough training course in statistical method applied to industrial and social research. Despite limitations of equipment and funds, it has achieved unusual results in the training of students and in the publication of original studies in scientific journals. . . . *We want the Department to be known in the women’s collegiate world as the best place for training in economics and the social sciences* [emphasis added].⁴³

Beginning in 1922 students declared majors on only “one side of the department,” economics or sociology. During this period Professors Dietrich and John Lobb contributed additional strengths, Lobb adding The Family and an applied sociology course that concentrated on criminology. Dietrich added Business Organization and Industrial Organization and shared in the teaching of Statistics and the upper level Research Seminar. Comstock continued teaching economic history and statistics, and Hewes continued offering two courses in labor and advanced statistics. Perhaps because the economics and sociology components of the department remained well integrated,

⁴³ Economics and Sociology Department Records, Correspondence Files, Letter Mary Taylor to Richard Childs, December 29, 1922, Archives and Special Collections, Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Massachusetts.

with several instructors teaching in both areas, the curricular emphasis at Mount Holyoke remained grounded in labor issues with statistical applications to social policy. Courses increasingly emphasized the bureaucratic organization of society and the professional use of statistics. Holyoke, however, did not follow the path of Smith, Wellesley, and Radcliffe in the 1920s and 1930s, with their growing functionalist emphasis on social institutions, social evolution, and culture.

It is no wonder that Hewes remained loyal and committed to Mount Holyoke and to the education of women in the social sciences, given her initial struggle to secure an academic position. She also remained active in labor activities throughout her tenure, serving as the Executive Secretary of the Massachusetts Minimum Wage Commission and as Chair of the Committee on Women in Industry, Council of National Defense (1917–19) while on leave at Mount Holyoke. In 1920 she was Supervisor of the Industrial Service Section of the Department of the Army. In 1931–32 she again served on the State Commission on the Operation of the Minimum Wage Law. Hewes authored three books: *Industrial Home Work* (1915), *Women as Munitions Workers* (1917), and *Contributions to Social Work* (1930). She published articles in the *American Economic Review*, *American Historical Review*, *Journal of Political Economics*, *Monthly Labor Review*, *Quarterly Journal of Sociology*, *Social Forces*, *American Political Science Review*, *Social Service Review*, *Current History*, *Survey*, and the *Bulletin of the Women's Bureau*. Since much of her professional work was focused on economics, labor relations and work, it is fitting that in 1962 she received the Award for Merit from Arthur J. Goldberg, Secretary of Labor.⁴⁴

In concluding her departmental history for the 1937 *Centennial Bulletin*, Dietrich cites “the hope,” quoting from the once required 1837 Political Economy text, that the laws of political economy confer “some degree of skill in forming opinions upon many of those practical questions which meet a man every moment in the scenes of every day life.” She states that in looking back over the 100 year history of the department, the teachers of political economy had no doubt,

taken this statement as a mandate. Though many are the problems to which no ready answer has been found, there has been a constant

⁴⁴ Faculty Biographical Files, Archives and Special Collections, Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Massachusetts.

endeavor both to give rigorous, intellectual discipline and to keep the curriculum responsive to the changing demands of our economic and social life (1937, 6).

Looking back at the growth and development of the program at Mount Holyoke from the pre-sociology to early sociology eras, her characterization appears to remain true.

Simmons College: Women's Educational and Industrial Union

Simmons College broke the mold of elitist liberal arts education. Founded by provisions in the will of John Simmons, who was survived in 1870 by two daughters and two granddaughters, the mission of Simmons College was to prepare women for independent employment in traditionally feminine professions. In the 1899 charter, Simmons was established "as an institution in which instruction in such branches of art, science, and industry might be given as would best enable women to earn an independent livelihood" (1902 *Preliminary Announcement*, 5). The courses of study offered certificates in Household Economics, Secretarial Studies, Library Studies, and General Science preparatory to Medicine, Nursing, and Teaching. Over the years Simmons added schools of Social Work, Landscape Architecture, Public Health Nursing, Physical Therapy, and the Schools of Library Science, Publication, and Social Sciences.⁴⁵

Table 13.10 provides a summary of course offerings at Simmons in three periods. Although Simmons did not develop an independent Department of Sociology prior to the 1940s, sociology was nonetheless a high priority in the general education of Simmons students. Moreover, in conjunction with the Social and Economic Research center sponsored by the Women's Educational and Industrial Union of Boston (WEIU), graduate study in economic and social research was extended to students with backgrounds in history, economics, government and social work. This graduate-level training is largely attributed to the influence of two of Giddings' students—Susan Myra Kingsbury and Lucille Eaves—who received their doctorates at Columbia and pioneered a tradition of statistical research in areas related to social policy, social welfare, and social legislation.

⁴⁵ Simmons College Archives, Boston, Massachusetts.

Sociology first appeared in the curriculum as a series of lectures delivered by John Graham Brooks (Cambridge) from 1902 to 1905 as an extension course in Household Economics entitled Social and Industrial Organization.⁴⁶ In 1905, two professors were hired to teach sociology and economics, Susan Myra Kingsbury (Ph.D.) and Jeffrey Richardson Brackett (Ph.D.). Although the first President of the College, Henry LeFavour (Ph.D.), had a background in physics,⁴⁷ he joined with Kingsbury and Brackett in teaching a first course in Sociology, forming a unit in Household Economics, Ethics, and Social Science. He later offered a course in Social Legislation. Not incidentally, during LeFavour's term as president, until 1930, Sociology was a required course of all students in the fourth year of study. Lefavour's personal interest in sociology apparently privileged its place in the curriculum relative to the other social sciences. Unfortunately, after his retirement in 1933 sociology was taught by various professors in History, Government and Sociology, and in this period much of the program's early strengths were lost.⁴⁸ During his time, Brackett taught what became the foundation courses for social work. In 1904, with the help of President Lefavour, he established and headed the Boston School for Social Work in collaboration with Harvard University.

The growth of the social sciences was brought to Simmons with the hiring of Kingsbury, a pioneer in economic history, women and industry, and research methods. Kingsbury received a Master's in History in 1899 from Stanford University, influenced there by the sociologist George Howard. She then earned a doctorate in sociology at Columbia University in 1905, after teaching and completing studies in England (1903–04), where she developed interests in factory conditions and the home. Returning to the US, and under the influence of the work of Beatrice Potter Webb, Kingsbury studied the relationship of women and children to industry, serving as the senior investigator for a report for the Massachusetts Commission

⁴⁶ Lectures were entitled 1) Introductory 2) What Social Science Means 3) The Best Things Done by Employers 4) The Work of Labor Organizations 5) The Functions of Voluntary Associations 6) The Duties of the Consumer 7) The Co-operation of the Future and 8) General Summary of Results. (*Simmons College Catalogue 1903–1904*, 69)

⁴⁷ Perhaps Lefavour's interest in sociology developed during his studies in Germany at the University of Berlin from 1888–1890.

⁴⁸ Henry Lefavour, First President of Simons College 1901–1933, Simmons College Archives, Boston, Massachusetts.

on Industrial and Technical Education (Keith 1991). Kingsbury taught courses in Principles of Economics, Economic History of the United States, Practical Economics, and Special Subjects for advanced research. In 1907 she became the Director of the Social and Economic Research unit sponsored by the WEIU. The organization funded research scholarships, often leading to a master's degree for Simmons' graduates. During her years at Simmons Kingsbury published *The Economic Position of Women* (1910) and several articles related to her interests in the historical evolution of labor legislation and women's work. She left Simmons in 1915 to accept a position on the faculty of Bryn Mawr, where she remained until she retired in 1936. Other publications included several articles on women and industry and on social welfare in the wartime U.S. and Russia. Her books included an edited volume, *Labor Laws and their Enforcement* (1911), and two co-authored volumes, *Licensed Workers in Industrial Homework in Massachusetts* (with M. Moses, 1915) and *Factory, Family, and Women in the Soviet Union* (with M. Fairchild 1935) (Keith 1999).

Lucille Eaves was hired to replace Kingsbury in 1915 as instructor of sociology and director of social and economic research with the WEIU. Like Kingsbury, Eaves had done graduate work at Stanford and Columbia and had interests in labor legislation, applied sociology, and issues related to women's and children's labor. After obtaining her Bachelor's degree at Leland Stanford, Jr. University in 1894, she held teaching positions in high schools, industrial schools, at the University Extension of the University of Chicago, and as instructor in history at Stanford. She studied with Giddings at Columbia, where she received her doctorate. Eaves taught for a time at the University of Nebraska, but resigned due to dissatisfaction with pay and opportunities for promotion (Deegan and Hill 1991b).

At Simmons College Eaves taught The Family, Educational Sociology, Statistics, and Research. By 1925 she was promoted to Full Professor of Economic Research, directing graduate research in the WEIU. Eaves remained at Simmons College until her retirement in 1935. She published several reports for the WEIU, most having to do with working women. She also published articles in the *American Journal of Sociology*, *Social Forces*, the *Journal of Applied Sociology*, the *American Labor Legislation Review*, *Survey*, and *Family*. Her two books *History of California Legislation* (1910) and *Old Age Support of Women Teachers* (1921) were reviewed by Howard and Ross respectively, in the *American Journal of Sociology* (Deegan and Hill 1991b).

The structures of professional support at women's colleges are no more evident than in the overlapping career paths of Kingsbury and Eaves. Both women, having received doctorates from Columbia, discovered at Simmons College the support of the WEIU. Thus Simmons provided an important niche for early scholarship and teaching in the methods of economics and sociology. While Kingsbury experienced at Simmons an environment conducive to gaining leadership experience and a launching pad to greater achievements at Bryn Mawr, Eaves was drawn to Simmons in the face of the forces of institutional discrimination at the University of Nebraska. When Kingsbury left to take a position at Bryn Mawr, her Columbia contemporary succeeded her at Simmons, taking up her work as the Director of Social and Economic research and continuing the tradition begun by Kingsbury in training graduate students in social research methods. Deegan reports, for example, that Eaves mentored more than sixty students through the graduate program at Simmons that operated through the WEIU. Both Kingsbury and Eaves continued a tradition begun by Annie M. MacLean (a Hull-House resident) and Amy Hewes, who also worked with the WEIU (Deegan and Hill 1991b).

General Patterns and Trends

Women's colleges provided an important opportunity structure of social support in launching women's academic careers, and some provided an environment for the development of a distinctively humanistic sociology (Deegan 1983; 1987a) and cultural feminism (Palmieri 1995). Independent women's colleges provided an alternative to coordinate educational institutions like Radcliffe, where educational and professional opportunities were often treated as secondary to men's. The earliest privately funded women's colleges of high academic standards originated in the New England states. As the cases of Wellesley, Smith, and Mount Holyoke show, sociology typically found its way into the curriculum of these colleges in the 1880s to 1890s. In the case of Smith, however, and not unlike the pattern of coordinate education at Radcliffe-Harvard, a sociology that promoted men's agency and the male sociologists' career was the general pattern.

By the 1930s a growing international and global focus was observed in each of the five college cases reviewed. Similarly, new courses in

culture and anthropology were common, particularly at those colleges that moved toward the adoption of a functionalist paradigm—Radcliffe, Smith, and Wellesley. But at Mount Holyoke this shift toward a functionalist framework was not evident given the continued union of economic sociology under the leadership of Hewes and later, Comstock. Among all of the women's colleges in the pre-sociology and early sociology years, what Deegan referred to as a humanistic "critical pragmatism" clearly infused the discipline under the leadership of women. This no doubt stemmed from an epistemology of marginality and concern for the issues of the day that affected women's opportunities for higher education, employment, and the conditions of their employment. Social reform, social legislation, women's and children's labor, and the education and status of women were all concerns reflected in the early curricula and scholarly applications. Practical applications as outgrowths of course work and faculty interests are easily observed in research and reports published by faculty and engaged by students. It is important to note that the infusion of "objective" research methods through the use of statistics in the building of sociology as a social science was not only fully embraced, but in many respects, was pioneered at women's colleges and institutions of research. This was particularly evident in research sponsored by the WEIU of Boston, settlement houses, and government committees. Certainly the tensions of the day did shape intellectual developments at women's colleges, particularly those surrounding the "appropriate roles" of women in the academy, the home, and work place. Interestingly, however, the ambivalence reflected at men's universities about the appropriate uses of sociology as described in the early histories of American Sociology (Vidich and Lyman 1985; Buck 1965) were conspicuously absent at women's colleges. Sociology and social science were easily united in theory and practice. The traditions of social activism, social reform, and policy applications were well integrated into the curriculum. Perhaps the one exception to this general pattern was Smith, the only college led, in the later years, by professional academic men who were well integrated in mainstream sociology.

Some Conclusions

The case studies reviewed here establish that the scholar-teacher-activists of women's and black colleges were indeed present at the

founding. These institutions pioneered in developing a sociology that addressed the social problems of the day with the most sophisticated methods available. A common thread defining the early sociologies at women's and black colleges is the use of a critical "praxis" in addressing the problems of social inequalities in a changing society. The wider pattern in the discipline of sociology appears to reflect a process of formal institutionalization accompanied by a functionalist paradigm shift—a general trend also present, but perhaps to a lesser degree, at women's and black colleges. However, the important contributions of scholars, teachers, and activists such as Annah Soule, Emily Balch, Amy Hewes, Susan Kingsbury, W.E.B. DuBois, Charles Johnson, and Franklin Frazier kept issues of social and economic inequality at the forefront of education and research. The collective biographies of the men and women studied document that while women's and black colleges provided an institutional environment and opportunity structure for professional development, these were not without limitations. Both black and women's colleges, necessarily mindful of outside funding and support, were limited in accommodating the radical stances of those with highly critical perspectives. This was particularly evident in the careers of Balch and DuBois and to a lesser degree in the careers of other sociologists who lived their convictions with integrity, despite the consequences.

Women's colleges and black colleges came into being because of gender and racial exclusion. Interestingly, however, most of the women and men who pioneered sociology in these institutions were educated in the best schools of the day. At Atlanta, DuBois was trained at Harvard and at the University of Berlin. Jones at Hampton, Haynes at Fisk, and Eaves and Kingsbury at Simmons were all Columbia-trained by Franklin Giddings. Balch and Youngman at Wellseley, and Hewes's at Mount Holyoke each studied at the University of Chicago as did Johnson at Fisk and Frazier and his colleagues at Howard. Thus the same early influences shaping American sociology in general were present at women's and black educational institutions. However, the specific ways in which these influences were adapted to programs for research, teaching, and social practice also reflected the conditions, and political interests of their black and female constituencies as well as those of a gendered and race-stratified society.

A critical revisionist perspective on the history of the discipline suggests that female and black institutions are not easily characterized

by broad generalizations as institutions designed simply to address the needs of “a particular class of people.” The rich diversity of these citadels of learning—trade schools, private colleges, and graduate centers—reveals much complexity in the unique ways that they were shaped by and shaped the discipline. The varied and complex pathways of sociological expression in the institutional contexts of women’s and black colleges have yet to be fully explored or appreciated. This work is offered as a contribution to a larger community effort to recover the history of female and black institutions of learning and the works of those marginalized by their race and/or gender. As Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley (1998) have so eloquently stated and demonstrated, the history we tell about our discipline is important, for it is an indication of who we are as sociologists, those subjects we view as worthy of study, and the contributions we choose to canonize.

Table 13.1. Growth of Sociology in the United States, 1909-Early Forties

| <i>Schools</i> | | <i>Sociology Courses 1909</i> | | <i>Sociology Courses 1940–41</i> | |
|----------------|---------------|-------------------------------|-------------|----------------------------------|-------------|
| <i>Type</i> | <i>Number</i> | <i>Number</i> | <i>Mean</i> | <i>Number</i> | <i>Mean</i> |
| All | 219 | 815 | 3.7 | 3,420 | 15.6 |
| General* | 174 | 713 | 4.1 | 2,683 | 15.4 |
| State | 6 | 8 | 1.3 | 168 | 28.0 |
| Catholic | 8 | 13 | 1.6 | 158 | 19.7 |
| Women’s | 20 | 63 | 3.2 | 245 | 12.3 |
| Black | 8 | 12 | 1.5 | 135 | 16.9 |

Source: Bernard, Luther L. 1945. “The Teaching of Sociology in the United States in the Last Fifty Years.” *American Journal of Sociology* 50(6): 534–48. Data were corrected by removing three colleges incorrectly reported as women’s colleges. Means were computed based on corrected totals.

* General refers to private coeducational or men’s colleges and universities.

Table 13.2. Early American Sociology at Atlanta University

Sociology and History 1897–1910*W.E. Burghardt DuBois Ph.D.***Classical Education**

Citizenship

Wealth, Work and Wages

History

Social Reforms

Sociological Laboratory

General Sociology and Social

Conditions of the Negro

Graduate Study and Research on
social problems of the south as
part of the Atlanta Conference***Sociology and History 1911–1933****Augustus Grandville Dill A.M., J.A.**Bigham A.M., Thomas I. Brown**A.M., Hersey H. Strong A.M.,**B.D., James A. Davidson A.B., B.D.*

US History and Civics

European History

Sociology

General Sociology and Social

Conditions of the Negro

Sociological Laboratory

Graduate Study and Research on
the Social Problems of the South
carried on by the Atlanta Conference
(Reference to the
Atlanta Conference was dropped
in the early 1920s.)

Social Work

The Family

Nationalism and Imperialism

Social Problems and Research

Criminology

Contemporary Civilization

Contemporary Social Thought

Social Pathology

Sociology 1933–1944*W.E. Burghardt DuBois Ph.D.,**Hersey H. Strong A.M., B.D.,**Ira DeAugustine Reid A.M.***Instructional Courses**

Introduction to Social Sciences

Anthropology

Statistics

Human Ecology

**Social Organization and
Disorganization**

Social Control

Social Institutions

The Family

The Negro Family in US

Social Conflict

Race Problems

Culture and Society

African Culture

Asiatic Culture

American Negro Culture

Problems in Population

Population Problems and Policies

Urban Sociology

Sociology of Rural Areas

Sociology of the South

Social Legislation

Social Theory

Social Theory

Society

European Sociology

History of Sociology in US

Social Research

Social Research

Field Studies

Seminar in Sociology

Other Courses

Society Structures and Changes

Sociology of the American Negro

Principles and Methods of Statistics

Social Psychology

History of Social Thought

Contemporary Social Theory

Personality and Social Adjustment

Karl Marx and the Negro

Seminar in Sociological Problems

Social Pathology

Techniques of Social Investigation

Source: *Atlanta University Bulletin and Catalogue*, 1885–1940, Atlanta, Georgia.

Courtesy Atlanta University Archives.

Table 13.3. Early American Sociology at Hampton University

Pre-College Work, before 1920*Leroy C. Cooley*, Economics*Thomas Jesse Jones*, History, Civics, Economics**General Education** in Agricultural Science, Physics, First Aid (for girls), Mathematics, Literature and English, Civics, History, Vocal Music, Drawing, Gymnastics, Manual Training (for girls), Manual Training (for boys), Normal Work Civics—Economics and Sociology**Normal School**

Negro and Indian Society

Sociology (for girls)¹**The Academy**Civics—Sociology²

Social Sciences and Bible-Sociology

College Curriculum, 1920–1940*F. Raymond Jenkins*, Sociology, Academy and Teachers College, Extension Work, Director of Academy; *Allen B. Dogett, Jr.*, Rural Sociology, Teachers College; *Richard S. Huff*, Economics and Sociology, Academy; *Otto F. Mathiasen*, Vocational Guidance and Sociology, Normal School**Agricultural School**

Rural Sociology 1 and 2—Study of the Rural Community

Normal School

Sociology I—Introduction to Sociology

Sociology I and 2—Study of the Rural Community

Collegiate Division**Sociology³**

Introduction to Sociology

Social Problems

Urban Sociology

The Family

Social Psychology

Rural Sociology

Industrial Sociology

Source: *Catalogue of the Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute and of Hampton Institute*, 1900–1940, Hampton, Virginia. Courtesy Hampton University Archives.

¹ Sociology for Girls was introduced in the Normal College in 1914, “to show them the place of the individual, the home, and the community, in the social whole” and using the same texts as indicated for other sociology courses in the catalog as well as Ellwood’s *Modern Social Problems*.

² Sociology as described in the catalog had four aims. To understand race differences: (1) as shown in physique, health, birth rate, death rate, literacy, economic conditions, and crime; (2) mental and moral, as shown in the efficiency of such organizations as the home, the church, and the club; (3) the relation of these differences to the progress of the Negro and Indian races; and (4) the danger of impulsive social action or uncontrolled emotion. *Annual Catalogue* 1909:30–31).

³ This curriculum was in place beginning in 1930 and changed very little over the decade. Course descriptions were general, made no mention of race, and left much flexibility in teaching content.

Table 13.4. Early American Sociology at Howard University

Social Science, Theology and Social Ethics, 1907–1919**Social Science**

*Kelly Miller A.M., LL.D., Thomas
Jesse Jones B.D., Ph.D.*

Sociology

Sociology
Theoretical and Practical Sociology
Social Statistics and Social Welfare
Social Origins
Problems of the Negro
Social Pathology and Theories of
Social Reconstruction
History of the Family

School of Theology**Christian Sociology**

*John L. Ewell A.B., D.D.
Pezavia O'Connell Ph.D., D.D.
Butler Pratt, A.B.*

Christian Sociology
Theoretical and Practical Sociology

School of Religion: Sociology and Ethics

*Kelly Miller, David Butler Pratt B.B.,
D.D., Martha MacLear S.B., A.M.,
Ph.D.*

Principles
Social Pathology and Theories of
Social Reconstruction
Biblical Sociology
Social Survey Methods
The Negro Church
Social Service (offered in School of
Religion)
The Family
The Ethics of Jesus (offered in
School of Religion)

***Department of Sociology
1920–1934***

*Kelly Miller, Martha MacLear,
William Henry Jones A.M., B.D.*
Principles
Population

Labor Problems
Race Problems
Charities
The Family
The Social Survey
Educational Sociology
African Social Institutions
Introduction to the Study of Social
Attitudes
Criminology
Social Psychology
Municipal Sociology
Social Pathology
Social Origins
Rural Sociology
Social Evolution
Anthropology
Field Studies
Advanced Sociological Theory

School of Religion

Principles
Social Pathology
Biblical Sociology
The Negro Church
Social Service
Current Social Problems
Social Service

***Department of Sociology
1934–1940***

*Edward Franklin Frazier Ph.D.,
William Oscar Brown Ph.D.*

General and Historical

Introduction to Sociology
Development of Sociological
Theory and Society
History of Sociology
Introduction to the Social Sciences

Social Psychology

Introduction to Social Psychology

The Community and institutions

Social Institutions
The City
Rural Sociology

Table 13.4 (*cont.*)

| | |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------|
| The Family | Statistics and Population |
| Social Pathology | Introduction to Statistics |
| Criminology | Population |
| Social Maladjustments | College of Education |
| Theory of Culture | Educational Sociology |
| The Negro in America | |

Source: *Howard University Catalogue*, 1899–1941, Washington, D.C. Courtesy Howard University Archives.

Table 13.5. Early American Sociology at Fisk University

| | |
|---|---|
| Early Sociology 1895–1910 | Social Service Training Courses |
| Practical Theology | Principles of Religious Ed |
| Sociology | Social Ideals of the Bible |
| Classical BS and BA | Principles of Sociology |
| Sociology | Playground and Recreation |
| Social Science and Social Work 1910–1924 | Practical Sociology |
| <i>George Edmund Haynes B.A., M.A.,</i> | Statistics and Methods |
| <i>Ph.D., Ellie Alma Walls M.A.,</i> | Problems of Negro Life |
| <i>Paul Franklin Mowbray B.A.</i> | Home Economics for women |
| Sociology | Manual Arts for men |
| Industrial History and Organization | Department of Sociology |
| Elementary Economics | 1925–1940 (and Anthropology, after 1939) |
| Advanced Economics | <i>Charles Spurgeon Johnson Ph.B.,</i> |
| Sociology and Social Problems | <i>Bertram W. Doyle M.A., Luther Fry</i> |
| Principles of Sociology | <i>Ph.D., Mark Hanna Watkins Ph.D.</i> |
| History of the Negro in America | General |
| Problems of Negro Life | Introductory Survey: Experience of |
| Advanced Practical (added 1918) | Europe |
| Family and Childhood Welfare | Introduction to Sociology |
| Social Research | Social Theory and Social |
| Community | Research |
| Mental Hygiene and Psychiatry | Social Theory and Social |
| Criminology | Research |
| Statistics and Methods (added 1918) | General Sociology |
| Playground and Recreation (added 1918) | Methods of Social Investigation |
| | Research Problems in Sociology |

Table 13.5 (*cont.*)

| | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| Social Psychology | Human Geography |
| The Negro in America | Rural Sociology |
| Personality and Culture | Social Problems |
| Collective Behavior | Social Pathology |
| Personality Problems | Child Welfare |
| Research Problems in Social Psychology | Criminology and Penology |
| Application of Methods | Forms of Social Work |
| Culture Conflicts | Problems of Negro Rural Communities |
| Seminar on Race and Culture | Recent Social Changes |
| Social Organization and Social Institutions | Statistics |
| Urban Community | Introduction to Statistics |
| Social Institutions | Problems in Statistics |
| The Family | Advanced Statistics |
| | (Also anthropology courses) |

Source: *Fisk University Bulletin*, 1867–1940, Nashville, Tennessee. Courtesy Fisk University Archives.

Table 13.6. Early American Sociology at Radcliffe College

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>Economics 1891–1930</i> | <i>Social Ethics 1905–1930</i> |
| 1891–1900: <i>Edward Cummings A.M., John Cummings Ph.D., William James Ashley A.M.</i> | 1905–1921: <i>Francis G. Peabody A.M., Litt. D., LL.D., James Ford Ph.D., Robert F. Foerster Ph.D.</i> |
| 1901–1930: <i>Thomas Carver Ph.D., LL.D.</i> | 1921–1930: <i>Richard C. Cabot M.D., James Ford Ph.D., William T. Ham Ph.D., Floyd H. Allport, Ph.D., Paul J. Pigors Ph.D., Sheldon Glueck Ph.D.</i> |
| Principles of Sociology | Social Ethics |
| Economic History of Europe and America | Methods of Social Investigation |
| Statistics: Theory, Methods, and Practice | Criminology and Penology |
| Social and Economic Condition of Working Men in the US and Other Countries | Social Problems and Social Policy |
| Workingmen's Organizations in the United States | Social Amelioration in Europe |
| Ethnology in its Application to Economic and Social Problems | Immigration and Race Problems |
| Methods of Social Reform | Rural Social Development |
| Problems of Labor | Child-helping Agencies |
| | Personality and Social Amelioration |
| | Poor Relief |

Table 13.6 (*cont.*)

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Recent Theories of Social Reform | Principles of Sociology |
| Community Organization | Contemporary Theory |
| The Housing Problem | Social Organization and Structure |
| Human Relations | Problems of Sociological Method |
| The Kingdom of Evils | Institutions and Culture |
| Ethics and Psychology of Leadership | Sociology of Family |
| Human Ideals, Conflicts, and Integration | Criminology and Penology |
| | Sociology of Professions |
| | Social Dynamics |
| | Social Pathology and Policy |
| Sociology 1931–1940 | Problems of Population |
| <i>Pitirim Sorokin Ph.D., Talcot</i> | Rural Social Organization |
| <i>Parsons Ph.D., Carl C. Zimmerman</i> | Social Institutions |
| <i>Ph.D., Sheldon Glueck Ph.D.,</i> | Urban Sociology |
| <i>Edward Hutchinson Ph.D., Carl S.</i> | Evolution and Progress |
| <i>Joslyn Ph.D., Robert K. Merton</i> | Proseminar |
| <i>Ph.D.</i> | |

Source: *Official Register of Harvard Annex of the Society for the Collegiate Instruction of Women*, 1879–1894; *Official Register of Radcliffe College*, 1894–1940, Cambridge, Massachusetts. Courtesy Schlesinger Library Archives.

Table 13.7. Early American Sociology at Wellesley College

| | |
|--|--|
| Economics and Sociology | Immigration |
| 1901–1918 | The Trust Problem |
| <i>Katharine Coman Ph.B., Emily Greene</i> | Selected Industries |
| <i>Balch B.A., Edith Abbott Ph.D.,</i> | Municipal Socialism |
| <i>Anna Prichett Youngman Ph.D.</i> | History of Economic Theory |
| Elements of Economics | Consumption |
| Industrial History of the US | The Distribution of Wealth |
| Industrial History of England | |
| Socialism | Economics and Sociology |
| Statistical Study Economic Problems | 1919–1929 |
| Social Economics I, II | <i>Jane Isabel Newell Ph.D.</i> |
| Labor Movement 19th Century | Sociology |
| Introduction to General Sociology | Introduction to General Sociology |
| The Family | Industrial History of the US |
| Modern Labor | Statistical Study of Economic Problems |
| Practical Problems in Economics | The Family |

Table 13.7 (*cont.*)

| | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| Immigration | Social Origins |
| Social Economy | Social Organization |
| Municipal Sociology | History of Social Institutions |
| History of Social Theories | Modern Social Institutions |
| Social and Economic Investigation | Theories of Social Reconstruction |
| Economics | Urban Sociology |
| Introduction to Economics and | Social Welfare |
| Sociology | The Prevention of Poverty |
| Socialism and Social Reform | Railroads and Trusts |
| Economic History of the US | Modern Labor Problems |
| Economic History of England | Introduction Social and Economic |
| Industrial and Social Legislation | Statistics |
| The Modern Labor Movement | Advanced Social and Economic |
| Topics in History of American | Statistics |
| Economic and Social | International Trade and Invest |
| Movements | History of Social Thought |
| | American Social Ideals |
| <i>Economics and Sociology</i> | Topics in History of American |
| 1930–1940 | Economic and Social |
| <i>Mary B. Treudley Ph.D., Leland H.</i> | Movements |
| <i>Jenks Ph.D.</i> | Population Problems |
| Introduction to Economics and | Problems of the Family |
| Sociology | |

Source: *Wellesley College Bulletin*, 1901–1940, Wellesley, Massachusetts. Courtesy Wellesley College Archives.

Table 13.8. Early American Sociology at Smith College

| | |
|---|---|
| <i>Economics and Sociology</i> | Socialism and Social Reform |
| 1900–1912 | Some Modern Social Problems |
| <i>Charles F. Emerick Ph.D., Georgia L.</i> | Municipal Problems |
| <i>White Ph.D.</i> | |
| Principles of Sociology | |
| Charities and Corrections | |
| Some Problems of Poverty | |
| Practical Sociology (Rural) | |
| Practical Sociology (Urban) | |
| History of Social Theories | |
| Social Statistics | |
| American Industrial Development | |
| | <i>Economics and Sociology</i> |
| | 1913–1930 |
| | <i>Charles Emerick Ph.D., F. Stuart</i> |
| | <i>Chapin Ph.D., Chase Going</i> |
| | <i>Woodhouse A.M., Frank H.</i> |
| | <i>Hankins Ph.D., Harry Elmer</i> |
| | <i>Barnes Ph.D.</i> |

Table 13.8 (*cont.*)

| | |
|--|--|
| Social Economy and Social Work | <i>Economics and Sociology¹</i> |
| The Social, Economic, and Political Status of Women | <i>1931–1940 (Sociology after 1937)</i> |
| The Family I, II | <i>Frank H. Hankins Ph.D., Margaret Alexander Marsh A.M., Gladys Eugenia Bryson Ph.D., Howard P. Becker Ph.D., Neal B. De Nood Ph.D.</i> |
| Social Legislation/Women and Child Welfare | |
| Integration of Women's Activities (taught 1928–30 by Mrs. Ethel Puffer Howes a lecturer from the Smith class of 1891, as part of the Institute for the Coordination of Women's Interests established in 1925.) | Introduction to the Study of Society |
| Problems of Population I, II | Problems Population Quantity |
| Immigration & Assimilation | Problems Population Quality |
| Social Maladjustment | Development of Social Thought |
| Rural Sociology | Develop of European Sociology |
| Urban Sociology | Social Maladjustment |
| Methods of Social Research | Primitive Society |
| Social and Economic Statistics | History of Social Institutions |
| History of Social Theories: Beginnings | Expansion of Western Culture |
| History of Social Theories: Modern | Immigration and Assimilation |
| Social Evolution | Urban Sociology |
| Evolution of the Social Mind | The Modern Family |
| Theories of Cultural Evolution | The History of the Family |
| Socialism and Communism | Scope and Problems of American Sociology |
| Scope and Problems of American Sociology | History of Social Theory |
| | Proseminar: Biological Aspects of Social Life |
| | Proseminar: Social Theory |
| | Social Institutions |
| | Democracy and Dictatorship |
| | Independent Study: Theory and Research |
| | Thesis for Masters |

Source: *Smith College Bulletin*, 1900–1940, Northampton, Massachusetts. Courtesy Smith College Archives.

Table 13.9. Early American Sociology at Mount Holyoke College

***History and Political Economy
1896–1905****Annah May Soule M.L.***History**

English Constitution
 Civil Government
 American Colonial History
 Teacher's Course
 Political Institutions

Political Economy

History of Industrial Society in
 England and the United States
 Elements of Political Economy
 Socialism and Communism
 Principles of Sociology
 English Social Reformers 19th Cent.
 Communism and Socialism
 The Labor Problem in England &
 the United States
 The Evolution of Industrial Society
 Race and Immigration Problems
 Advanced Study
 Statistics

***Politics and Social Economy
1906–1921***

*Amy Hewes Ph.D., Alzada Peckham
 Comstock M.A.*

Civil Government
 Introduction to General
 Sociology
 American Cities
 Charities and Corrections
 Public Opinion

***Economics and Sociology
1922–1940***

*Amy Hewes Ph.D., Alzada Peckham
 Comstock M.A., Ethel Barbara
 Dietrich Ph.D., John Lobb Ph.D.*

Introduction to Sociology
 Business Organization
 Applied Sociology I, II
 Statistics I, II
 Labor I, II
 Seminar
 Economic History of England
 Economic & Social History
 of US
 Industrial Organization
 The Family
Graduate Courses:
 Studies in Trade Union History
 Sociological Theory

Source: *Annual Catalogue of the Mount Holyoke Female Seminary and Catalogue of Mount Holyoke College*, 1896–1940, Mount Holyoke, Massachusetts. Courtesy Mount Holyoke College Archives.

Table 13.10. Early American Sociology at Simmons College

| | |
|--|---|
| <i>Economics, Ethics, Social Science 1902–1915</i> <i>Susan Myra Kingsbury Ph.D., Jeffrey Richardson Brckett Ph.D., President Henry Lefavour Ph.D.</i> Sociology Principles of Economics Economic History of United States Practical Economics Special Subjects I Special Subjects II Philanthropic Problems & Methods I Philanthropic Problems & Methods II | Social Services II Political, Social and Economic Conditions in South America (Taught by Reginald Rusden Goodell A.M., Professor of Romance Languages.) Statistics I, II Research in Fields of Social Service Professional Research |
| <i>Social and Political Science 1916–1929</i> <i>Lucille Eaves Ph.D., Jeffrey Richardson Brckett Ph.D., President Henry Lefavour Ph.D., LL.D.</i> Sociology The Family Educational Sociology Social Legislation Social Services I | <i>History, Government, Sociology 1930–1940</i> <i>Horace Bancroft Davis Ph.D. Katherine Davis Hardwick A.B. Lucille Eaves Ph.D.</i> Introduction to Sociology Applied Sociology Labor Problems Family Social Resources and the Community The Introduction to Social Work Statistics I Statistics II Research in Fields of Social Service Professional Research |

Source: *Simmons College Catalogue and Preliminary Announcement*, 1902–1940, Boston, Massachusetts. Courtesy Simmons College Archives.

CHAPTER FOURTEEN

SOCIOLOGY IN AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION

ANTHONY J. BLASI

Historians of American sociology should be able to present a narrative of when academic professors began to publish works in the field and teach courses in it. Such a narrative is not straightforward, however. The very nomenclature used in course titles was inconsistent. Sometimes professors used the title “Social Science” but used texts that were clearly sociological. Sometimes the term “Sociology” was used, but the course was deductive and philosophical in style. Such important figures as William Graham Sumner and Frederick J. Teggart avoided the term “Sociology” when they taught and wrote sociology—the former inconsistently and the latter consistently. On occasions a course named “Christian Sociology” was largely quantitative in nature, even if taught in a divinity school. Professors of sociology held degrees in an array of fields—literature, religion, anthropology, philosophy, economics, history, and once in a while sociology. Many nineteenth century doctorates appear to have been honorific conferrals based on service and reputation rather than on research.

A general narrative of the field is not only important as a tale in itself but a context for the careers of individual sociologists. When a given individual moved from one institution to another—as did Edward A. Ross when he graduated from Johns Hopkins and then worked at Indiana, Cornell, Stanford, Nebraska, and Wisconsin—historians of sociology should be able to identify his colleagues in the various stages of his career who helped comprise his intellectual environment. Moreover, it would help to know where those colleagues themselves had studied and worked.

To these ends, I have endeavored to assemble a database on early American professors who taught or published sociology. This paper presents descriptive information from the database in the first year of its development. As of July 2004, the data have been derived

from such secondary sources as American Sociological Society/Association membership directories, university histories, department histories that have been posted on departmental web sites, works in the history of sociology (*inter alia* Fulcomer 1894; Tolman 1902–03; American Sociological Society 1906a and 1906b; Ellwood 1907; Bernard and Bernard 1943; Bernard 1945; Odum 1951; Martindale 1960; Faris 1967; Mullins 1973; Crane 1992; Johnston 1995; Young 1995; Deegan 1998; Hill 1999; Howard 1999; Blasi 2000; Eaves 2000; Hill 2000a and 2000b; Blasi 2002), past professional association meeting programs that have been posted on the web, and responses by college and university archivists to e-mail inquiries. Information was also garnered from personal searches in the archival materials from a limited number of institutions in Kentucky, Tennessee, and the District of Columbia. Because the secondary literature emphasizes major graduate departments, the searches in archival materials focused on liberal arts colleges and non-flagship state universities. Admittedly this does not follow the guidelines of random sampling, but that would have been impracticable, given the geographic dispersion of American colleges and universities. Also, I limited the database to institutions founded before 1950 and individuals who earned their highest degrees before 1960. There were and are sociologists who do not hold professorial positions, but the database does not include them.

Degrees of Early American Academic Sociologists

Sociology, under one title or another, was taught in a number of the liberal arts colleges in the country at the end of the nineteenth and early in the twentieth century. College presidents—whatever their training—frequently taught the course. Many professors at the time had undergraduate preparation in classics, philosophy, and mathematics. They frequently earned bachelor's and master's degrees at a small college and stayed on to teach at the same institutions from which they graduated. The master's degrees were often conferred after a year or two of teaching. When publishing widely or when receiving an administrative appointment, they might receive a Ph.D. Thus the Ph.D. was not necessarily an indicator of bringing a research project through to completion. If we search in the database for the institutions at which the earliest Ph.D.-holding professors of sociol-

ogy earned their degrees and eliminate those who received doctorates from the same liberal arts colleges at which they were teaching, we still encounter some of these non-research doctorates. For example, Robert E. Thompson, the first professor of sociology at the University of Pennsylvania (1874) received a Ph.D. from Hamilton College in 1870. Jason N. Fradenburgh, who taught sociology at Adelphi University in 1900, received a Ph.D. from Syracuse University in 1873. At the same time, some of the earliest professors of sociology did not hold doctorates at all. Francis Greenwood Peabody, who taught sociology in the divinity school at Harvard, earned a bachelor's degree at Harvard in 1872. Samuel Franklin Emerson, who first taught sociology at the University of Vermont in 1891, had a Yale bachelor's degree from 1872 and a Union Theological Seminary B.D. from 1878. Franklin B. Sanborn, the inspiration of the social science movement, visited Cornell University to teach sociology in 1884; he does not appear to have had a degree at all. Lester Ward, who gave a lecture about sociology in 1891 at Catholic University and taught at the University of Pennsylvania in 1893 and at Brown University from 1905, earned a master's degree at Columbian College in the District of Columbia in 1872. Franklin Giddings, who first taught sociology at Columbia University in 1894, earned a B.A. from Union College (1877). Other Columbia professors who taught sociology include Richmond Mayo-Smith and John Bates Clark, both of whom earned bachelor's degrees at Amherst in 1875.

The research doctorate came to American sociology from Europe, primarily the new nation of Germany. Most significantly, Herbert B. Adams and Richard T. Ely went to Heidelberg for their studies, Adams earning the Ph.D. in 1876 and Ely in 1879. Both joined the faculty of Johns Hopkins University, which was founded in 1876 as a graduate research institute; and both taught sociological courses. Nineteen scholars would earn Ph.D. degrees at Johns Hopkins before 1915 and teach sociology at one time or another, four of them doing so at Johns Hopkins itself. Most of these had degrees in history conferred between 1886 and 1902. The most notable of the Johns Hopkins graduates were John Dewey (Ph.D. philosophy 1884), who taught sociological courses at the University of Michigan; Albion W. Small (Ph.D. history 1889), who established the sociology department at the University of Chicago; Frank W. Blackmar (Ph.D. history 1889) who established the field at the University of Kansas; and Edward A. Ross (Ph.D. economics 1891), who spent most of his career

at Wisconsin. John Rogers Commons, who studied at Johns Hopkins under Ely but never completed his degree, taught sociology mostly at Syracuse before going to Wisconsin in economics in 1904.

Another Heidelberg Ph.D. was earned by Robert Park (philosophy 1906), who became a mainstay of the Chicago department after 1916. Simon Nelson Patten and Samuel McCune Lindsay, both of the University of Pennsylvania, earned their doctorates at the University of Halle (1878 and 1893 respectively). Two more Halle doctorate holders were on the faculty at Cornell—Jeremiah Whipple Jenks (Ph.D. 1885) and Frank Albert Fetter (Ph.D. 1894). Other overseas degrees were held by William Kerby (Louvain 1897) of Catholic University; Florian Znaniecki (Krakow 1910) of Chicago, Columbia and later Illinois; and Robert M. MacIver (Edinburgh 1915) of Columbia. The percentage of foreign degrees in the American sociological professorate was 12% ($N = 8$) of those conferred in the 1890s, only 3% ($N = 5$) of those conferred in the 1900 decade, 7% ($N = 10$) of those in the 1910 decade, and 10% ($N = 18$) of those conferred in the 1920s. Thereafter it went down to 4% or below.

Chicago and Columbia had Ph.D. degree programs in sociology early on and thus contributed the largest number of sociology professors to the profession in the U.S. Yale also contributed a significant number, and Wisconsin contributed a number despite not having a sociology program early on. Again focusing on scholars who earned the Ph.D. degree before the end of 1919, Chicago graduated 39, 27 of them in sociology. Columbia graduated 69, 35 of them in sociology. Wisconsin graduated 16, only three of which were in sociology. Yale graduated 14, 7 of them in sociology.

First Sociology Courses

Identifying who first taught a sociology course at any given college or university is not a simple matter. As noted above, course titles can be misleading. Moreover, more than one person could be identified as the “first” sociology professor at a given institution because of the problem with course titles. Sometimes archival information is insufficient to ascertain who taught a course or when it was offered. Catalogs sometimes announced courses years before they were actually taught. Sometimes catalogs indicate what department a sociology course is to be offered in, but not which member of the department faculty

would teach it. The very first sociology course in the U.S. appears to be that taught by Robert E. Thompson (the holder of a Ph.D. from Hamilton College, 1870) at the University of Pennsylvania in 1874. William Graham Sumner's course at Yale in 1875 is frequently cited as the first. Another from the 1870s is that of John Putnam Gulliver at Andover Newton Theological School in 1879; Gulliver held an 1840 bachelor's degree from Yale. The first sociology course taught by someone holding a research doctorate was that offered by Herbert B. Adams at Johns Hopkins in 1888.

The first large cluster of "first" courses, seven of them, came in 1891—Walter H. Bradley (M.A. Princeton) at Blackburn College, David Collin Wells at Bowdoin, George F. Wilson at Brown, Mattoon M. Curtis at Western Reserve, John Rogers Commons at Oberlin (B.A. Oberlin), and Samuel F. Emerson at Vermont (B.D. Union Theological). The sparseness and diversity of degrees is indicative of the field's lack of institutionalization in the early 1890s. The biggest cluster of "first" courses, some fifteen of them, came in 1894 with a similar sparseness and array of degrees, at Bucknell, Columbia, Cumberland College, DePauw University, Elmira College, Goucher, Midland College, Northwestern, Ohio Wesleyan, Radcliffe, Stanford, Union College, North Dakota, University of the Pacific, and Willamette (contemporary names of the institutions are used). The most notable of the "first" professors in this cluster were Franklin Giddings at Columbia and George E. Howard at Stanford. A cluster of eight came in 1897, which included W.E.B. DuBois's course at Clark Atlanta, and another cluster of seven came the next year. There were no holders of a Ph.D. in sociology teaching a "first" course until 1900 when Annie M. Maclean (Ph.D. Chicago 1900) taught one at Stetson University and Charles A. Ellwood (Ph.D. Chicago 1899) taught one at the University of Missouri. As early as 1888 a future holder of a Ph.D. in the field, John F. Crowell (Ph.D. Columbia 1897) taught at Duke University.

Degrees of Professors across the Decades

Table 14.1 shows the percentage distributions of professors with different kinds of degree across the decades, from the mid-nineteenth century to the mid-twentieth. Judging from the database in its present state, it appears that divinity degrees were common as the highest

degrees among professors of sociology prior to 1880 but uncommon after that year. Doctoral level degrees in some field were preponderant among academic sociologists in the 1880s and two decades later. The Ph.D. in sociology became common in the first decade of the twentieth century, but preponderant only in the 1930s. The number of academic sociologists crested in a minor way at 80 highest degrees conferred in the 1890s, and then grew steadily from the 1910s and after. While these trends are likely indicative enough of the real situation, the percentages of doctoral-level degrees and of Ph.D.'s in sociology would probably be somewhat smaller if all the small liberal arts colleges not taken account of in the secondary literature were somehow added to the database.

Table 14.1: Percentage Distribution of Different Graduate and Professional Degrees, by Decades*

| When Degree Conferred Decades | Ph.D. in Sociology | Other Doctoral Degree** | M.A. in any Field | Degree in Law | Degree in Divinity | Total Number |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|---------------|--------------------|--------------|
| 1850-79 | — | 30% | 15% | 8% | 46% | 13 |
| 1880-89 | — | 64% | 14% | 14% | 7% | 14 |
| 1890-99 | 9% | 67% | 13% | 5% | 5% | 75 |
| 1900-09 | 32% | 50% | 10% | 4% | 4% | 74 |
| 1910-19 | 39% | 27% | 29% | 1% | 5% | 101 |
| 1920-29 | 50% | 27% | 20% | 1% | 1% | 211 |
| 1930-39 | 61% | 17% | 20% | 1% | 1% | 396 |
| 1940-49 | 62% | 10% | 27% | — | 1% | 557 |
| 1950-59 | 88% | 6% | 5% | — | — | 591 |

* Based on Early American Academic Sociologists Database as of July, 2004; doctorates of unknown major not included.

** Excludes law and divinity degrees, and degrees the major of which is unknown.

CHAPTER FIFTEEN

CHICAGO IN 1930: MAURICE HALBWACHS' OUTSIDER VIEW OF THE CITY AND ITS SOCIOLOGISTS

SUZANNE VROMEN

With the increasing prominence of the Chicago School of sociology after the end of World War I, a number of invitations for visiting appointments were extended by the University of Chicago to foreign sociologists. Few of these visitors have published impressions of their visits. Maurice Halbwachs, however, is the exception, leaving us not only a lengthy article but also a lively and reflective private correspondence with family members, mainly with his wife.

Maurice Halbwachs was a collaborator with Emile Durkheim before World War I and an eminent professor of sociology at the University of Strasbourg after the war. In fact, he was the first faculty member in France to have the title of Professor of Sociology. By the time he was invited to teach at the University of Chicago in the fall semester of 1930, he had published in 1925 a path breaking book on the social context of memory, *Les cadres sociaux de la mémoire* (*The Social Frameworks of Memory*), and early in the year of his visit a reexamination and critique of Durkheim's concepts of suicide entitled *Les causes du suicide* (*The Causes of Suicide*). He was also a sophisticated statistician, an urban sociologist who had analyzed growth and expropriation patterns in Paris, and an expert on working class budgets. After his visit, he published a vivid reaction to Chicago both as a teeming city of immigrants and a leading center of American sociology. The essay, "*Chicago, une expérience ethnique*" (Chicago, an ethnic experience) was published in 1932 in *Annales d'histoire économique et sociale*, the well-known journal launched by Halbwachs' colleagues at the University of Strasbourg, historians Lucien Febvre and Marc Bloch.

Though this account has generally been overlooked in the history of the discipline, the essay merits analysis as an encounter between a leading French Durkheimian and a major American sociological tradition. Points of convergence and divergence between these two

sociological traditions deserve to be delineated and discussed. For the perspective of this volume it is worthwhile considering what Halbwachs as an outsider and as a kind of “sociological tourist” saw as the shortcomings and the accomplishments of the Chicago sociologists. The essay is not only a reaction to Chicago sociology, it also explicitly compares the growth of the city to the development of Paris that Halbwachs had examined in detail in 1909 and updated in 1928,¹ in the process of expanding aspects of Durkheim’s social morphology.²

Before discussing the article itself, let us proceed chronologically and consider Halbwachs’ immediate reactions in 1930 as detailed in the available correspondence, for these give a vivid, unmediated, candid and sometimes amusing outsider’s view about the University’s sociology department and some of its personalities.

What did Halbwachs expect from his visit to the University of Chicago? Formally he wrote to Ellsworth Faris on April 1930: “I would find it very rewarding to study the organization of your department of sociology. There is much that we can learn from you” (Craig 1983, 282). Clearly, besides the appropriate flattery, his statement attests to the international prestige enjoyed by Chicago sociology at that time. As a result of negotiations, Halbwachs was asked to offer two courses during the fall semester, Modern French Sociology and Suicide, both to be taught in English (Craig 1983).

Informally, Halbwachs experienced much more than he expected; he suffered a veritable culture shock. The letters translated and examined here were written between October 2nd and December 18th 1930, and addressed mostly to his wife Yvonne, with a few to other family members.³ Initially he felt lonely, frightened and overwhelmed by the size of the city and its swarming inhabitants, enduring racial inequalities, gangs, rackets, and prostitution networks. He reacted at first by intensive reading, “sometimes even a book a day,” remark-

¹ See Halbwachs, Maurice. 1928. *La population et les tracés de voies à Paris depuis un siècle*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France. He is the only Durkheimian to have focused his work on modern societies.

² On Durkheim’s social morphology see his *Division of Labor in Society*, *The Rules of Sociological Method*, and “*Morphologie sociale*” in *l’Année sociologique* 2 (1897–98), 520–521.

³ These letters have been deposited in the archives of IMEC (Institut Mémoires de l’édition contemporaine) and are cited by J.-C. Marcel (1999). The letters discussed here were all selected by Marcel and translated by me. Many letters remain to be brought to light and analyzed.

ing that he was reading about the city but without specifically mentioning title or author. Only at the end of November did he admit liking the United States and sniffing an air of freedom in the city. On the whole his letters oscillate between defiance and admiration, with all the moods in-between. They contain vignettes of some of the personalities he met, expressions of anxiety about his command of the English language and his ability to be understood, and concern about his relationships to students. Most interesting from our perspective are his views on the organization of the department, of the university in general, and on the value of the Chicago sociological tradition. Not only is he often astonished by that tradition, he also consciously distances himself from it.

Meeting Robert Park, Halbwachs at first deplored his terrible nasal accent and later depicted him as follows:

To-day I was eating by myself when a sociologist by the name of Park came to sit at my table. This Park is a guy nearing the sixties, with a surly look, but not lacking in zest. He looks like a German philosopher . . . But he is one of the guys that I have the most difficulty in understanding. He works in urban sociology. When I went back to my room, I was exhausted (Nov. 16, Marcel 1999, 51).

By his last letter, however, Halbwachs expressed his liking and appreciation for both Park and Burgess.

Halbwachs' concern about his command of English was a constant. He took lessons before his arrival, yet feared not be understood by students. The efforts to translate his thoughts were intense; he reported that he felt as if they emptied his brains. The first dinner with the whole department of social sciences counting some 80 graduate students and 15 professors turned out to be a real rite of passage in which Halbwachs thought he made a good impression (October 15, Marcel *ibid.*, 51). He monitored the attention he received from his audience, and went from dissatisfaction with his performance to cautious reports of progress: "I think that I conquer little by little my student public. They listen to me with more and more interest, at least I think so." (November 8, Marcel *ibid.*, 51). He was invited to give conferences to the Society for Social Research and was very anxious at the idea of speaking to a larger audience. By December 12th he proudly wrote: "My departure is nearing. I am told that it is a pity because I am beginning to speak English 'like an American'" (Marcel 1999, 51).

The Society for Social Research was created by Park in 1920 to encourage scholarly collaboration between faculty and advanced graduate students and to encourage serious research. Its main activities consisted of evening meetings, a summer institute open to Chicago-trained sociologists across the country, and an extensive news bulletin fostering and maintaining collegiate ties. It greatly encouraged interdisciplinary contact and provided an interactive setting. According to Bulmer (1984, 114) the Society "helped to generate and sustain the lively spirit of Chicago sociology during the 1920s and early 1930s."

When he became more confident in his ability to lecture in English, Halbwachs accepted the invitation to speak at meetings sponsored by the Society for Social Research. He gave one conference on statistics, and others on suicide, on the social frameworks of memory, and on the psychology of dreams in France (Marcel 1999, 51). The variety of subjects is remarkable. Halbwachs had uncommonly broad interests, many avenues of inquiry, and an engagement both with quantitative and qualitative methods. He was proficient in mathematical statistics and had co-authored a book on probability with a mathematician colleague. He had revisited Durkheim's thesis on suicide, criticizing and reinterpreting the data. In elaborating his sociological theory of memory, he had studied the subject of dreams. The Society for Social Research was well served by finding such wide expertise in a single person.

What kind of teacher was Halbwachs? In the course of writing my dissertation on him I consulted a number of sociologists who were his students in Chicago. By far the most helpful one was Professor Robert E.L. Faris who remembered that as a graduate student he took a course with Halbwachs on suicide. According to him, there were only three students left by the end of the course. In his personal communication he said: "I greatly appreciated the exposure to this first-class scholar. I regretted that more students did not take advantage of the opportunity to know Halbwachs, but because of his weak command of English, they found it hard to follow. I think my father was disappointed in the same way" (Vromen 1975, 7). Faris further commented that socially Halbwachs was kind and gentle company. For Professor Helen McGill Hughes the course was simply an attempt to say in English what was in Halbwachs' book on suicide, and Professor Ruth Shonle Cavan remembered nothing

at all (but Halbwachs wrote a lukewarm review of her book *Suicide*)⁴ (Vromen 1975, 8).

Whether he taught in French in Strasbourg, or in English in Chicago, Halbwachs was not a great teacher; he was first and foremost an original thinker and researcher. In his letters from Chicago he complained to his mother about the time devoted to teaching in these terms: “these Americans know how to exploit you” (Oct. 9, Marcel 1999, 50), and to his wife he wrote that in two months he had to give 95 classes of 50 minutes each, “more than in a year in Strasbourg. They have the superstition of quantity” (Dec. 6, Marcel 1999, 50). His calculation seems highly exaggerated; it cannot be checked since he did not provide details how he arrived at that figure of nine and a half classes per week for the ten weeks of the trimester. His tone was mean, as if he were a member of a downtrodden proletariat. In these private letters he could be candid and vent his feelings.

While Halbwachs’ teaching held few rewards either for him or for the department, when he discovered the Social Science Research Building his enthusiasm knew no bounds. Here were resources unknown in France—a dozen calculating machines, and the instruments of the social sciences which are “the heart of their laboratory” and where Halbwachs was fascinated, and “works all the possible operations” (Oct. 17th, Marcel 1999, 53). He wrote on November 14th:

The number of offices, racks, filing cabinets, and of young women wearing glasses who catalogue, file, draw up statements and reports etc. is unprecedented. The University is really a college, animated and buzzing all day.

A few days later he added: “Chicago is really a large research center, pushed unto a mercantile city” (Nov. 26, Marcel 1999, 53). The Social Science Research Building had just opened in 1929, planned by William Ogburn, who was a friend of Halbwachs and his mentor during the Chicago visit. Ogburn taught statistics and was forceful in promoting quantitative methods. The building was used for all research activities and was designed to encourage interdisciplinary cooperation. It had many specialized rooms, for example card-sorting machine rooms, a statistical laboratory and statistical data

⁴ *Annales sociologiques* Série C (1935): 181.

rooms, and it was lavishly equipped with the most modern machines available, such as an expensive harmonic analyzer, electric adding and multiplying machines, and a planimeter (Bulmer 1984, 195, 196). No wonder Halbwachs was fascinated and operated all the machines he could; it was his opportunity to access modern affluence, and he seized it eagerly!

These technical resources affected the kind of sociology that was taught, and here also Halbwachs was impressed. Students were considered future professionals; their whole education was directed to this goal. Recruitment, retention, and usefulness were central agendas. Soon after his arrival, writing on October 9th, Halbwachs was surprised that the sociology faculty called student representatives to

present them with the new programs and to ask them what they would like added or modified. They argued for two hours, unheatedly, very naturally, and they will do it again next month. . . . Their University is only 30 or 40 years old, nevertheless new buildings are going up on the campus.

He insisted on this pragmatic aspect further in his letter of December 18th, shedding light in a striking way on university policies:

They treat their universities just as their cars, which means that after they have worked them for a certain time, if they find out that they are not satisfactory, they do not hesitate to repair them, to transform them, and even to rebuild them according to a new model. Thus they abolish specialization for the first two years.

It is not surprising that Halbwachs was struck by the relative ease of fundamental modifications to the educational agenda. He was used to the highly centralized French academic system, though the University of Strasbourg, given back to France in 1919 after World War I, had many young faculty members and an academic climate more committed to reform and to interdisciplinary work than any other French institution of higher learning (Craig 1983, 265). Student satisfaction was not a priority concern in French academia. In reporting on the student consultations in Chicago, Halbwachs failed probably to distinguish between undergraduates and graduates; otherwise it is difficult to reconcile his statements about professionalism with lack of specialization for two years.

Not only was Halbwachs struck by the organization and the resources of the department of sociology, he was also impressed by the desire for social action fueled by sociological knowledge, a kind

of applied and practical sociology. On November 16 he reported to his wife on his visit to Hull-House headed by Jane Addams, whom he pictured as "an American woman rather lively, all social worker," and he explained:

These settlements (he used the English word) this is applied sociology. There are 75 residents who all more or less have taken sociology courses. And each week on average 5,000 inhabitants from the neighborhood come there, most of them immigrants. It is an instrument of assimilation.

In a later letter he returned to the meaning of applied sociology by relating that his friend Ogburn told him the history of American sociology; we can presume that Ogburn discussed its reformist origin. According to his friend, Halbwachs tells us, in Chicago besides the sociology of culture, quantitative sociology, psychological sociology in whose midst his book on memory is much appreciated, there is a branch of sociology which examines social problems in the field, in particular those created by large cities; and he expands:

That is Park and Burgess, delinquent children, the disorganized areas of large cities, the Hobo (which I have never understood what it is, a wild world I think. But they added: hemia, a play on words: hobo-hemia, the bohemians, the social rejects). You see how funny (rigolo) this is (Dec. 5th, Marcel 1999, 55).

Halbwachs stated repeatedly that all these monographs on the ghetto, the gangs, the slums, the areas of deterioration were of interest to him, and he wrote early to his mother that: "I will take with me the atmosphere of their large intellectual factory. I will not be able to neglect or to ignore them" (Oct. 20, Marcel 1999, 55). In fact he later assisted his friend Celestin Bouglé in directing in France a center for empirical research of contemporary events financed by the Rockefeller Foundation since 1932 and inspired by the American model. (Marcel 1999, 55).

While he admired resources and organization, he distanced himself from the sociologists' work, for they operated in a tradition and a methodology foreign to him at the time. Not only was this tradition foreign, he thought it comical. He treated the monographs as entertainment, more as journalistic productions, and did not relate to them with seriousness. In his first letter, on October 2nd, he called the American sociologists "funnier than Mark Twain," daring and inventive perhaps, but of doubtful scientific validity. A few days later

he was both attracted and ambivalent: "I have read today a study entitled *Middletown*, by Lynd, which is often comical sociology, but meticulous and lively . . ." (Oct. 14, Marcel *ibid.*, 56). On another occasion he expressed his disdain, or rather his fear of fieldwork, in the following terms: "They are afraid of nothing. Burgess wanted to take me to a place where one meets assassins. I found that stupid, and I refused. It is perhaps I who am an idiot . . ." (Nov. 14, Marcel *ibid.*, 56). As for mapping, a basic tool for the Chicago sociologists in urban research and ecological analysis, among the letters analyzed here only the following reaction is recorded:

This morning, have been to McKenzie, in his office . . . Mc Kenzie was busy sticking thumbtacks of varied colors in a United States map. The same number of thumbtacks as there are counties, and there were more than a thousand counties! All this in order to "visualize," "to visualize" (in English in his text), the results from the latest census. If his wife does not leave his office, it is probably because she helps him in this intelligent task. Besides, they are both exquisite. I think that the idea that they are really doing science is going to their heads. They even looked tipsy. I had no problem in feigning an unlimited admiration (Dec. 5, Marcel 1999, 56).

The last letter Halbwachs wrote from Chicago on December 18th best resumes his ambivalence, a mixture of admiration and distance. He concluded his thoughts on Chicago sociology by evoking Park and Burgess:

It is this couple who give to Chicago sociology its picturesque and singular character . . . They are fully original and, immersed in life, in tight contact with groups, they seem to ignore totally all our theories, they are in the same situation in that respect, as explorers and missionaries were in relation to Durkheim. I like them very much, and admire them a little.

As Marcel (1999, 57) quite rightly concludes, Halbwachs found the sociology picturesque but definitely unscientific. In ten weeks Halbwachs developed warm feelings towards his colleagues, but their works remained for him too exotic and superficial. The comparison of sociologists to explorers and missionaries in relation to Durkheim is insightful. Innovation and passion alone do not generate sociological knowledge. Halbwachs at that point in time did not see fieldwork and case studies as likely to yield valid findings, the particular could not be generalized, and the field studies failed to be theoretically based. What he admired was the daring and the innovation. Some

of his later work bears the influence of what he learned from the Chicago studies.

One additional point needs to be made before passing on to the published article. The remarks about exploitation, about cars and obsolescence, about the "intellectual factory," all candid personal remarks, should be seen as originating from a man who was a socialist since his days as a student at the Ecole Normale, the prestigious elite school where most of the great French teachers are educated. One of his doctorates was a thesis on the standards of living and the needs of the working classes (Clark 1973; Vromen 1975). In Chicago he saw himself immersed in a frenetic capitalist society, and he slipped easily in a familiar stereotypical socialist language.

In the published article mentioned at the beginning of this essay, "*Chicago An Ethnic Experience*" (my translation), Halbwachs begins by providing a statistical description of Chicago's rapid population growth and its spatial dispersion, noting similarities with growth patterns in Paris, but emphasizing the greater dispersion made possible by railroads and automobiles.⁵ What strikes him is the sheer magnitude of the growth, and also the relative low density marked by the prevalence of industrial buildings, single family homes and empty building lots.

He proceeds to a capsule description of what can be seen as specifically urban problems, for example ethnic diversity, the processes of invasion and succession, homeless men, gangs. In effect he wants to inform his readers about the work of Chicago sociologists, and he gives a summary of their major studies, remarking that these observers have but to look around them to find objects of study and that

their works are rather descriptive than scientific, uneven, sometimes disappointing, more often very picturesque, capturing slices of reality and life as it is lived, unexpected and valuable documents, a mine of facts unearthed by explorers not afraid of descending into and probing the bottom of the deepest galleries (Halbwachs 1932a, 18, my translation).

We are reminded here of his concluding letter cited above, where the Chicago sociologists were seen in the same situation as explorers and missionaries in relation to Durkheim.

⁵ Halbwachs refers to the use of automobiles by workers cited in the Lynds' *Middletown*. See 1932a, 17.

Halbwachs draws sympathetic sketches of Park and Burgess. Park he sees as an intellectual personality, provider of ideas, frameworks and guidance. As for Burgess, Halbwachs describes him as linking in his research theoretical concerns and practical applications. They complement each other well, Halbwachs remarks, and their joint book, *The City*, is suggestive:

an essay and like a sketch necessarily still imperfect. This type of work is so difficult, it requires a combination of qualities so diverse, it is so entirely devoid of the help that a tradition of research and scientific analysis can provide . . . that one must here be more curious than critical, at least for the moment (Halbwachs 1932a, 19).

What is Halbwachs critical of? He criticizes in particular the lack of a general sociological theory, the failure of articulating hypotheses and testing them, and what he sees as the inability of going beyond the description of Chicago particularities.

In spite of his critical tone, Halbwachs does not hesitate to reproduce these particularities at length. He reprints the concentric zone theory of Burgess as representative of Chicago and not as an ideal type, and at the same time he indicates which areas have been studied by Harvey Zorbaugh, Nels Anderson, Frederic Thrasher and Clifford Shaw. He describes the Black Belt and the process of invasion, he quotes at length from *The Ghetto* by Louis Wirth and cites Jane Addams' *Twenty Years at Hull-House* for a description of ethnic areas. Then Halbwachs praises the direct contact with the lives of groups, and remarks that the Chicago sociologists and the residents of the settlements have made a remarkable effort in depicting this city in which there are "so many combinations and reactions of social chemistry that are only observable there" (Halbwachs 1932a, 29). Halbwachs emphasizes repeatedly, while mentioning works in progress, that these are all particular cases.

Abruptly shifting the tone of his essay in the middle of a paragraph, Halbwachs then argues that statistical data are available to formulate hypotheses and shed light, for example, on conditions conducive to immigrant assimilation and on variations in attitudes about it. He clearly gives the impression that now the time has come to deal with serious matters. With figures, he declares, "it will be possible to penetrate a bit more into the social structure of the city". He examines data on the degree of ethnic concentration in census tracts, on foreign-born and American parentage, on length of resi-

dence in the country, on intermarriage between foreign-born and Americans, all this in order to give a sense of the rapidity of assimilation of the various national groups and to create indices of assimilation. Clearly, he wants to show the use of demographic facts as social facts and to demonstrate that quantitative methods are useful tools in the analysis of social structures and processes.

In the conclusion of his essay he diverges most from the Chicago School. As he compares the development of Paris and Chicago, he sees Paris as forced to adapt an irregular, capricious, and historical framework to a growing homogeneous population, while the planned streets and blocks of Chicago impose an artificial and brutal urban structure on a heterogeneous population. The difference, however, is deceptive, he argues, and Chicago's regularity is an illusion. Elevated railways and factories have divided sections, created separate neighborhoods, isolated districts. In spite of a great ethnic heterogeneity, he sees rapid Americanization, the increasing use of English, and religion adapting itself quickly to the new milieu. The distinctions that matter are those of wealth and social standing, as in Paris:

... there are few urban landscapes where a particular social class has not left its imprint. More jarring and richer in colors, the picture presented by Chicago is finally the same as that of any modern center, ... classes create between men divisions as profound and sometimes as outwardly picturesque as the diversity of types and ethnic lifestyles (Halbwachs 1932a, 47).

What matters is the type of occupations. Halbwachs denies the need for an analysis of an ethnic mosaic or a juxtaposition of neighborhoods; what ought to be studied is the succession of social layers superimposed one over the other, well-established occupations obscured by those more mobile, more on the surface, more marginal. In the conclusion of his article Halbwachs wishes to generalize and to show that Chicago with its marginal population is no different from large European cities. Transitory men, homeless men, are also known in European cities in periods of unemployment. It seems to me that he means here a population that would probably be labeled *lumpenproletariat*. The masses of foreign workers who commute daily to their factories live among foreigners, work among foreigners, know little of American life and hardly interact with Americans except through work. It would be the same in Europe, where workers, isolated in their public housing, wouldn't be any different from the Chicago

immigrants. Generally, all over, the more groups earn, the faster they assimilate. Chicago's problems, Halbwachs argues, are consequences of industrialization, and its inhabitants will cease to be foreigners and dwellers of deteriorated zones as salaries improve and working conditions become more stable. Though the framework appears rigid, in reality a constant economic reclassification occurs.

In conclusion, in what ways do Halbwachs' views differ from the Chicago School? While he notes the interest in social disorganization and social problems, his own interpretations avoids entirely this perspective.⁶ He does not conceptualize a breakdown of values or pathology. He conceives of diversity, not of disorganization. It is occupation and class that have a lasting impact on the urban landscape. The reason that Halbwachs discounts the importance of ethnicity may well be that he takes a stand against the Chicago School's description of the particular. Through his comparison of Paris and Chicago he allows for diversity, yet searches for universal patterns applicable to all modern cities.

While he recognizes explicitly the sociological processes of competition, invasion and succession described by the Chicago sociologists, he is at the same time a faithful Durkheimian in his intent to avoid environmental determinism and in stressing that it is the group that puts its imprint on space; no form can be imposed on the living reality of the city. He argued in the same vein in his 1928 work on Paris (Vromen 1975, 172).

The essay's title is misleading in view of the importance he attributes in his conclusion to class and social standing. As the only Durkheimian who studied social classes in modern societies, Halbwachs does not conceive of an ethnic heterogeneity of vast dimensions irrespective of class differences. Social class, however, does not seem an especially important analytical concept in Chicago sociology at the time of Halbwachs' visit. It is completely ignored in the index of Zorbaugh's *The Gold Coast and the Slum* as well as in those of Wirth's *Ghetto* and Park and Burgess' *The City*. The term does not appear in the titles of the doctoral dissertations produced between 1920 and 1935, except for one on class conflict in Japan. (Faris 1970, 137-140). This does not mean that a common sense definition was absent;

⁶ For a cogent discussion of the social disorganization paradigm, see James T. Carey (1975, 95-120).

what it does indicate is that it was not considered and did not serve as a significant analytical tool. Ogburn, directing the Committee on Recent Social Trends, responded to a query whether terms such as “the masses”, “the middle-class,” and “the upper-class” were applicable to American conditions by saying that these were terms applicable to Europeans and were generally not used for Americans (Chapoulie 2000, 58, citing Gilkeson 1995, 33). In our contemporary sense, the term was at that time politically incorrect. It could be replaced, as Chapoulie argues, by status and position. (Chapoulie 2000, 61). It was not that Halbwachs had a Marxist view of classes. In fact he expected a future erosion of class distinctions with progressive democratization; but in universalizing his view of Chicago, he preferred to privilege class over ethnicity.

The same year that Halbwachs published his article, he also wrote two book reviews in which he offered a short comparison between German and American sociologies (Halbwachs 1932b). The comparison summarizes one of his major critiques. While German sociology seems to him to be abstract philosophy, American sociologists give an impression of scattered activity. More specifically, “while the German sociologists hardly ever leave theorizing behind, the Americans perhaps are not sufficiently concerned with guiding ideas and perspectives” (Halbwachs 1932b, 81). This is a relatively gentle critique, especially when compared to what Karl Mannheim had to say about the Chicago School around the same period:

we must admit a very marked and painful disproportion between the vastness of the scientific machinery employed and the value of ultimate results. The subject and title of most contributions evoke the highest expectations; yet, after having reached their conclusions, one is tempted to ask disappointedly: “Is this all?” (Bulmer 1984, 273)

Halbwachs does not express such outright condescension, but he has his own blinders.

Halbwachs’ judgments of the Chicago sociologists’ works, though far from unique, seem superficial and hasty. In view of the diversity of his own work he could have tried to find theoretical commonalities with some of the Chicago sociologists. Marcel (1999) points out that Park’s concept of moral area and Halbwachs’ definition of urban lifestyle (*genre de vie*) share the notion of a social space defined by a high frequency of social interactions. Furthermore, in his early work on the social nature of memory he already focused on the concrete

facts of everyday life and on the meanings individuals attached to it. This emphasis on the concrete and the familiar differentiated him fundamentally from Durkheim and could have drawn him nearer to another perspective. But at the time of his visit, Halbwachs placed the debate on methodological grounds, considered himself a defender of Durkheimian sociology, opposed fieldwork and case study, and sought in the use of statistics an official sociological identity. There is no doubt, however, that he was influenced by what he learned in Chicago. As Jaisson (1999) remarks, traces of that influence appear in his book *Morphologie Sociale (Social Morphology)* published in 1938, in which he develops the concept of social space as a frame which unifies the social group. The chapter on migrations, in particular, shows this influence. Further, as he later linked this concept of social space to the development of his theory on the evolution of memory, he abandoned his opposition to case studies, researched the legendary topography of holy places in the Holy Land, and accepted that a particular case may yield important general insights.

Through the analysis of personal correspondence and a published article, this essay has attempted to stimulate the sociological imagination by describing the meeting of two traditions, by highlighting some features of the University of Chicago in 1930, and by drawing a sketch of Maurice Halbwachs as a sociological tourist.

PART FOUR

NEGLECTED ISSUES AND TRAJECTORIES

Various reasons have been given for the neglect of issues and trajectories in a field earlier in this volume. Applied work has been marginalized, in favor of “pure” science. The sociological work of women and that of minorities have at times simply not been taken into account. In Chapter 16, it is a matter of disciplinary boundaries and nationality; Ross Mitchell looks at the relationship between the thought of Thorstein Veblen, usually identified as an American economist, and Harold Innis, usually identified as a Canadian economist and student of communications. Some dimensions of the work of both scholars were sociological; to continue to neglect this trajectory would be arbitrary.

In Chapter 17, the late Jeffrey L. Crane provides an account of the origins of sociology in Hawaii, a branch of sociology that actually carried out part of the comparative program of study intended by Robert E. Park. Hawaiian society has been the object of much mythology, even among social scientists in the Islands. Crane sought to use the history of sociology to make a case for objectivity and good social science in a setting where he worked for much of his career.

Finally in Chapter 18, Joyce E. Williams and Vicky M. MacLean, whose work we have already seen earlier in the volume, describe the trajectory of community studies in American sociology. It can be difficult to get work in community studies published because it frequently requires more space than a journal article can allow yet is not attractive to book publishers because it is thought not to have a nation-wide market. Moreover, it is in danger, purportedly, of being absorbed into the subfields of social problems and urban sociology. Nevertheless, as Williams and MacLean demonstrate, it is a field that has evinced vitality and creativity, even up to the present.

CHAPTER SIXTEEN

VEBLEN, INNIS, AND THE CLASSIC TRADITION: A NORTH AMERICAN ECONOMIC SOCIOLOGY

ROSS E. MITCHELL

The classic tradition in sociology was served well by its penetrating scope of critical inquiry.¹ The classics continue to provide orientation for pressing societal issues and problems, providing a useful counterweight to post-modern relativism and other contemporary trends. Classic theory need not be discarded simply because our interests and demands have shifted. According to the late sociologist C. Wright Mills, for innovative and integrated social theory, we only need to return to the works of the classics:

The sociological imagination enables us to grasp history and biography and the relations between the two within society. . . . To recognize this task and this promise is the mark of the classic social analyst. It is characteristic of Herbert Spencer—turgid, polysyllabic, comprehensive; of E.A. Ross—graceful, muckraking, upright; of Auguste Comte and Emile Durkheim; of the intricate and subtle Karl Mannheim. It is the quality of all that is intellectually excellent in Karl Marx; it is the clue to Thorstein Veblen's brilliant and ironic insight . . . no less than of the profundity and clarity of Max Weber. (Mills 1959)

Mills later followed with a related piece on what makes a classic in the social sciences:

[C]lassical sociologists provide conceptions about society, about history and about biography, and in their work these three are usually closely linked together. The structure of society and the mechanics of history are seen within the same perspective, and within this perspective changes in human nature are also defined. (Mills 1960:4)

Mills also decried the contemporary focus on facts and methodologies as mainstream academe increasingly embraced narrow empiricist

¹ The genesis of this paper is owed to P.A. Saram and our conversations on the subject matter. Gordon Laxer also deserves my gratitude for his insight on Harold Innis and his contemporaries.

approaches. The advancement of political economy was no exception. Dissenters quickly found themselves consigned to academic backtiers.

American sociologist and institutional economist Thorstein Veblen (1857–1929) and Canadian political economist Harold Innis (1894–1952) were two such dissenters who possessed irrefutable sociological imagination. For instance, as noted in the quotation above, Mills placed Veblen among a handful of key classic sociologists and considered Veblen as “the best social scientist America has produced” (Mills 1960:13).² Veblen and Innis examined the North American tradition of political economy from a critical outlook that merged history with biography—a “cyclonic” appreciation of capitalist growth and progress. In their unique ways, both continue to influence and inspire critical thinkers.

The two scholars share similarities in their non-conformist nature. Veblen bounced from institution to institution, accompanied by popular acclaim and notoriety but disdained by many of his peers. Conversely, Innis was extremely influential in Canada within his lifetime, both politically and academically. Yet as a prolific writer and public intellectual, he not only was Canada’s foremost interdisciplinary social scientist, but he also achieved notoriety as one of Canada’s most marginal and radical academics (Heyer 1993). In this latter aspect, Innis may share some of Veblen’s claim to fame (or disdain), although Innis’s academic accomplishments and approval from his peers were beyond doubt. Regrettably, Innis has been largely overlooked by academics outside of Canada. In contrast, one of his former students, Marshall McLuhan, received international attention for his work on communication and media studies.³

In this chapter I compare the early contributions of Veblen and Innis to a North American political economy. Although they never met, Innis was quite familiar with Veblen’s writings, as will be shown below. By connecting Veblen with Innis, I also examine Canadian

² A radical scholar himself, Mills questioned the suitability of determinism and empiricism for sociological theorizing, thus taking a perspective similar to Veblen’s anti-positivist stance.

³ McLuhan frequently acknowledged his debt to Innis. As the “Oracle of the Electronic Age” during the Warholian 1960s, McLuhan posited that “what” we say is trumped in importance by “how” we choose to deliver it. His well-cited aphorism “the medium is the message” suggested that the visual nature and mass reach of television so overshadowed oral language as to make virtually irrelevant anything spoken on TV.

natural resource and agricultural development, dependency, and advocacy. It is among these areas of study where Innis has probably left his greatest mark, thanks in part to what Mills termed a classical inspiration, which was derived from Veblen.

Thorstein Veblen: Marginalized Scholar

Thorstein Veblen was born in Cato, Wisconsin, in 1857. He first studied at Carleton College in Northfield, Minnesota, and later at Johns Hopkins, Yale, and Cornell universities. He taught political economy at the University of Chicago (1892–1906), then economics at Stanford University (1906–1909) and at the University of Missouri (1911–1918). He was a founding member and affiliate of the New School for Social Research in New York from 1918 to 1926. Veblen then retired to a cabin near Stanford until his death in 1929.

Veblen not only anticipated the anti-positivist attack on social science, he provided an interpretation of the stability of unequal class relationships that was highly original, provocative and has stood the test of time (Diggins 1978). Veblen's work has begun to attract renewed attention in fields such as environmental sociology, political economy, and consumer theory (e.g., Mitchell 2001).⁴ His best-known book was his 1899 classic *The Theory of the Leisure Class: An Economic Study of Institutions* (1967). Over 100 years since its publication and still in print, *Theory of the Leisure Class* has been considered as "the only work of nineteenth century American sociology still widely referenced" (Fine 1994:461). In it, Veblen outlined the tenets of conspicuous consumption and emulative behavior that had begun to define "modern" society and to erode traditional values of self-reliance, workmanship, and community spirit. From Veblen's perspective, the middle and working classes emulate the honorific waste and consumption styles of the upper classes. Thus, waste and consumption broaden out from the leisure classes to become a defining feature of the whole culture of capitalism, not just that of its leisured strata.

⁴ Another example of this resurgence in Veblenian thought is demonstrated by the five times that the International Thorstein Veblen Association (ITVA) has met since 1994, including most recently at Carleton College in Minnesota (June 3–5, 2004).

One of the original founders of the “institutionalist” school, Veblen believed that economics must not be studied as a closed system but rather as an aspect of a culture whose customs and habits constitute institutions that are rapidly changing.⁵ He believed that industry demands diligence, efficiency, and cooperation among businessmen. What he saw instead were companies run by selfish “Captains of Industry” interested in making money, and the gentry displaying their wealth or status through conspicuous consumption. Some have noted that his analytical separation of industry and business, and his piercing commentary of how large corporate interests employed advertising, speculation, and other market workings to their pecuniary advantage, was unparalleled in its time. For example,

Veblen, unlike [Marx and Schumpeter], makes the sharpest kind of distinction between business and industry—the realm of pecuniary values on the one hand and of material production on the other. In his view . . . *both* absentee owners and captains of industry operate exclusively in the sphere of business; their relation to industry is at best permissive and at worst destructive. (Sweezy 1958:181, original emphasis)

Veblen was also the first theorist to achieve a comprehensive vision of monopoly capitalism and its long-term consequences (Baran and Sweezy 1966:132; Foster and Szlajfer 1984:13).

Veblen’s last book, *Absentee Ownership and Business Enterprise in Recent Times: The Case of America*, was published in 1923 but failed to generate much attention. The optimistic fever of the 1920s was no time for skeptics of capitalism and its presumed widespread benefits. At any rate, Veblen’s unstable career was mostly finished by then. In *Absentee Ownership*, Veblen (1964) examines the historical development of a property structure in which landlords were distant from their holdings. This structure introduced bureaucracy and alienation into land use practices. Veblen believed that absentee ownership had become most developed in the United States, and that rural poverty and loss of community identity had begun to increase along with urban wealth and power.

[Absentee ownership] is not particularly American, except in the sense that it has been worked out more consistently and more extensively

⁵ As a field of study, institutional economics incorporates value judgments and draws on other fields, such as political science and sociology, to develop a more comprehensive approach to the study of economic problems.

here than elsewhere, and that it has been worked into the texture of American life and culture more faithfully. . . . This American plan or policy is very simply a settled practice of converting all public wealth to private gain on a plan of legalised seizure. (Veblen 1964:168)

As Veblen described it, the absentee landlord may have been technically defined by economic ownership, but such allocations of goods (e.g., property rights) and services can never be irrelevant to governance—and vice-versa.⁶ The sense of “outsiderism” intrinsic to absentee ownership was, and likely still is, contrary to any perception that the one who governs most locally, governs best. Veblen viewed absentee ownership as very much related to external power over communities. America’s absentee owners knew little and cared even less about the community at stake, preferring instead a situation of weak local governance to be able to impose their policies of sabotage (Veblen 1919). He generalized absentee ownership to the entire national economic system, referring both explicitly and implicitly to the rapid concentration of control by powerful pecuniary-industrial actors and nation-state bureaucracies. Unscrupulous “massive vested interests” manipulated socio-economic arrangements to their favor, placing profits ahead of community wellbeing. Workmanship and solidarity had come to be devalued by shrewd entrepreneurship and speculation.

Veblen’s theories became somewhat popular once again during the American Depression of the 1930s, even influencing the federal administration’s New Deal land management policies (Vaughn 1999). While Veblen was mostly ignored or highly criticized in decades to follow, his legacy as a founding member of the institutional economics school of thought was firmly established. In short, these selected observations reveal that Veblen had developed a theory of American political economy with ramifications for analyses of consumerism, international relations, and business-industry linkages.

Harold Innis: Pioneer in Canadian Political Economy

Throughout the nineteenth century and the first half of the twentieth, Canadian social scientists usually adapted their respective

⁶ This paragraph is based on Levy (1998), whose account of Veblen illustrates how he applied “absentee” as a criticism on the entire system of economic ownership, and introduced alienation as a defining characteristic.

approaches to either European or American classical literature.⁷ Canadian political economic scholarship was no exception. Prior to World War I, most Canadian scholarship in this genre had largely borrowed on European sources. But one ambitious academic changed everything by putting a Canadian spin on North American economic history: Harold Innis, “the shibboleth of erudition in Canadian economics” (Neill 1972:3), and perhaps “the most brilliant scholar produced” in the Canadian social sciences (Watson 1977:45). Yet, as Innis himself pointed out, “[p]erhaps the most serious obstacle to effective work in Canadian economics and economic history is the lack of a philosophy of economic history applicable to new countries” (Innis 1956:10). For years, Innis almost single-handedly took pains to correct this theoretical deficiency from a Canadian perspective, and has become something of a Canadian legend in staples theory and core-peripheral economic development.⁸ Like Veblen, Innis stressed the use of historical traditions in evolving economies. Innis, too, can be considered as “classic” in the sense that he was a great Canadian pioneer of the political economy tradition.⁹ However, akin to the marginalization of Veblen among mainstream academe, Innis would be largely forgotten in the post-modernistic wave that came to orientate most Canadian social science departments.

Harold Innis was a native of Oxford County in southern Ontario. After graduating from McMaster University in 1918 with an M.A. in economics and obtaining his Ph.D. in economics at the University

⁷ This extensive body of work includes Durkheim, Smith, Spencer, Marx, Mead, Mill, Weber, Ricardo, Pareto, Simmel, Sombart, and many other notable economists, political scientists, and sociologists. Also worth noting here is Canadian-born political economist, John Kenneth Galbraith, who taught at Harvard and is renowned for his work *The Affluent Society* (1958). Galbraith has attributed much of his understanding of society to Veblen.

⁸ Scottish-born classical economist John Rae, in Canada from 1822–34, influenced both Veblen and Innis to some extent (Neill 1991:57–71). Another important early Canadian economist and a contemporary of Innis was W.A. Mackintosh, an economist at Queen’s University, but who stood in stark opposition to Innis’s negative view of Canada’s dependency on staple exports. Other significant Canadian economic historians of the time include Adam Shortt, the first to depict Canadian development as being shaped by reliance on a few primary exports, and O.D. Skelton, responsible for the first economic history of Canada, and who had studied under Veblen during the latter’s Harvard lectures (Neill 1991:122–124).

⁹ According to Bakker (1987), “Innis is considered the leading contributor to the Canadian Political Economy Tradition. More than any other single scholar/administrator, he is responsible for having made political economy into something other than merely an off-shoot of the British tradition.”

of Chicago in 1920, Innis taught in the Department of Political Economy at the University of Toronto until his death in 1952. Innis is one of the few Canadian social scientists known outside of Canada and was president of the American Economic Association in 1951.¹⁰ Indeed, “probably no other Canadian social scientist has ever had as strong as international reputation as Innis” (Hiller 1982:14–15). He authored some fourteen books and dozens of articles. At the University of Toronto, he eventually became head of the Department of Political Economy (1937) and dean of the School of Graduate Studies (1947). Among the many accolades and honors that Innis received, two institutions were named in his honor—the Harold Innis Research Institute and Innis College, both located at the University of Toronto.

Innis is probably best known for his writings on the staples approach to the study of Canadian economy and society. A staple refers to any raw, or unfinished, bulk commodity product sold for export markets. Canada’s major staples were originally cod, fur, and forest products, and later wheat, gas and oil, minerals, and pulp and paper. The staples model suggests that these products strongly influence the direction of political and economic development in countries with abundant natural resources. In his highly detailed classic *The Fur Trade in Canada*, Innis (1956) skillfully explains how certain key staples such as fur were basic to the history of the North American continent. Although perhaps somewhat outdated in today’s globalized marketplace, the staples model continues to draw scholarly attention (e.g., see chapters in Laxer 1991).

Throughout much of his writings, Innis struggled to resolve the challenging problem of integrating into a single account the many diverse relations common to resource industries: physical geography, markets, institutions, transportation, single industries communities, and a core-periphery regional structure. As Innis concluded in *The Fur Trade in Canada*, the creative center of Canada’s development was the metropolitan centers of central Canada—the Laurentian Shield country—not the open prairie land of the West (Innis 1956:383–402). Innis described how Canada began largely as a rentier nation exporting its abundant natural resources and buying back the finished

¹⁰ In 1925, the American Economic Association offered Veblen the nomination for its presidency, but he refused since for him it came too late.

goods. In Innis's view, the geographic boundaries of Canada, the nature of the economy, the nature of government, and even some aspects of its social organization, were all strongly determined by the nature of the staple product.

Although Innis was an economic historian, "he had something of the presentist in him: he sought to understand his own country in his own time, to connect . . . biography to history" (Carey 1999:83). As a historical geographer, Innis "understood the combined leap of England, Spain, and France as an episode in which a distant 'back-tier' controlled a frontier along routes of commodities and culture, transportation and communication" (Carey 1993:439). While Innis wrote innumerable essays on economic history, his later writings were concerned with the societal implications of communication technologies. Two of his last books were wide-ranging explorations of civilizations in contrast to his careful detailed studies of staples: *Empire and Communications* (1950) and *The Bias of Communication* (1951). Since he had come from a study of paper to a study of what was written on the paper, he never lost sight of the importance of the medium—whether transport in the case of staples, or oral, written, and visual techniques in communication. Innis studied various civilizations by the surfaces on which they chose to write their words and draw their images. If a civilization chose to use stone tablets, then they would conquer time—note that much Egyptian writing is still with us—whereas if a civilization chose to use parchment (animal skin) or paper, then they would conquer space. As civilization advanced, the spatial aspects of communication came to prevail since it was easier to carry around parchment or paper than stone tablets.¹¹

Innis's writings showed how Canadian economic development was both shaped and ultimately depended on an international political economy. Innis, "better than anyone else, understood that Canadian resource industries are a dense complex of relations, rather than a set of disparate separate, components" (Hayter and Barnes 1997:1). Furthermore, Innis "was perhaps the first man to realize that communication was the key to social phenomena of all kinds" (Boulding 1965:268). His later work on communications was interrelated and supportive of his earlier work on Canadian staples. One need only

¹¹ For example, the Romans were able to administer most of the known world using parchment.

turn to his introductory essay in *Empire and Communications* where he notes that his philosophy of civilization adopts the “method” of staples analysis (Innis 1950). Regrettably, many authors consider Innis’s two main bodies of work as separate, unrelated phases. Like Veblen, Innis was misinterpreted long after his passing.

Veblen’s Direct Influence on Innis

After serving with the British army in World War I, Innis went to the University of Chicago as a graduate student, where he was drawn into a small informal group that gathered to discuss Veblen. This group included Frank H. Knight, Carter Goodrich, Morris Copeland, W.B. Smith, and J.W. Angell (Neill 1972:12). Innis was not the first Canadian to be influenced by Veblen, however. Famed Canadian humorist and political economist at McGill University (1908–36) Stephen Leacock, for instance, was so impressed by Veblen’s *The Theory of the Leisure Class* that he decided to pursue graduate studies under Veblen in 1899. Even Canadian Prime Minister McKenzie King (1921–30, 1935–48) studied under Veblen in Chicago (Gordon 2002:98, 113).

That Innis was well aware of Veblen’s major works is most evident by his praise of Veblen in a biographical piece (Innis 1929). In this article, and taking a supportive stance toward Veblen, Innis attacked Frederick Jackson Turner’s frontier hypothesis on economic theory. Whereas Turner felt that “the white man’s conquest of nature was a vital part of America’s manifest destiny, . . . Veblen saw the frontier scene as a study in exploitation, ruination, and disorder” (Mattson and Tilman 1986:229). Moreover, Innis felt that “it was the frontier of the industrial revolution that influenced [Veblen’s] thought and not of American agriculture” (Innis 1929:59). Innis also described several of Veblen’s courses at the University of Chicago—including American agriculture and the history of political economy—and his famous course on the economic factors of civilization taught at Stanford, Missouri, and the New School for Social Research. Likewise, he explicitly recognized Veblen’s momentous contributions to the study of political economy and mentioned the Veblen’s role as editor of the *Journal of Political Economy* (1895–1905).

Innis endorsed Veblen’s “constructive warfare of emancipation against the tendency toward standardized static economics” (Innis

1929:67). In describing Veblen's critique of classical and neoclassical economics, Innis highlighted how Veblen broke with the classic English tradition with its focus on marginal utility theory such as the hedonistic calculus of Jeremy Bentham. Instead, Veblen, according to Innis, was more influenced by the Industrial Revolution and the German Historical School of economic thought, especially Gustav von Schmoller (1838–1917) and Werner Sombart (1863–1941).¹² Innis believed that economic history needed a synthesis with economic theory, as Veblen sought to achieve. His work, according to Innis,

stands as a monument to the importance of an unbiased approach to economics and as an incentive to research in the current problems of the industrial revolution. . . . Veblen has waged a constructive warfare of emancipation against the tendency toward standardized static economics. . . . It is to be hoped that economic theory will not disappear through neglect or through the deadening influence of specialization, and that Veblen's attempts at synthesis may be revised and steadily improved. (Innis 1929:67)

Interestingly, Innis's call for a synthesized approach of economic theory and biography corresponds with Mills plea for an integrated sociological perspective, as mentioned in the introduction. Innis also noted how Veblen attacked traditional economics from two angles—consumption and production—with a particular emphasis on the former.

Aside from this major discussion of Veblen, Innis rarely mentioned Veblen again. One minor exception was in *The Fur Trade in Canada*, where Innis (1956) refers the reader to Veblen's (1892) *Price of Wheat since 1867* for the importance of the machine industry in the United States (Innis 1956:ff. 399). Furthering Veblen's largely empirical findings on fluctuating wheat prices, Innis mentions how wheat was produced, transported, and manufactured on a large scale only through the efficiency of modern industrialism (Innis 1956:398–399). An even earlier citation can be found in "Industrialism and Settlement in Western Canada," where Innis refers the reader to Veblen's *Imperial Germany and the Industrial Revolution* for his concept of "borrowing" technologies from more advanced countries (Innis 1928:ff. 370).

¹² This school prioritized "the historical development of economic institutions and motivations over developing abstract mathematical models that assume a constancy in social-institutional and human social-psychological makeup" (Ashley and Orenstein 1998:416). Other important German influences on Veblen include Immanuel Kant (1724–1804) and Karl Marx (1818–1883).

Several years after Veblen resigned from the University of Chicago in 1905, he applied to the University of Toronto in 1909 but was turned down due to a bad reference (Cuff 1979). What would have happened if Innis and Veblen had actually met? The course of Canadian social thought might have been substantially different “had Veblen subsequently found his way to Toronto instead of to the University of Missouri” (Cuff 1979:347). By the evidence presented here, we can only say that Innis was very much aware of Veblen, having studied and written about him early on.

Veblen, Innis, and a North American Political Economy

Innis would have accepted many of Veblen’s views, especially his dichotomy of business and industry, irresponsible absentee patterns of ownership, and the substitution of consumerism for the “instinct of workmanship.” Both authors rejected the tenets of neo-classical equilibrium analyses. It was the shortsightedness of private capital that vexed both authors. Industrialists thwarted any trend toward responsible government and socially beneficial policy-making. Akin to Veblen’s realization of how the pecuniary bent had come to pre-empt over American society, Innis believed that the dominant Canadian was represented by those entrepreneurs able to extract and move raw materials on a massive scale.

On the other hand, perhaps due to his experience as a Canadian, and having experienced its costs and benefits at the margin rather than the centre of modern empire, Innis was less enthusiastic about industrial progress than Veblen. Innis rejected Veblen’s advocacy of a liberated industrialism, “pinning his evaporating hopes on a revived oral tradition or on modal changes to sensibility that might occur as the unintended result of present or future technological change” (Wernick 1996:139). Unlike Veblen’s apolitical stance, Innis was more politically connected and demonstrated affinities for populist democratic values (Wernick 1996:137). He was not afraid to criticize political forces, however. Referring to the need for responsible government, for example, Innis said that, “[t]he stupidity of nationalism is tempered by the chaos of internationalism” (Innis 1938:318).

It is worth noting here that other authors have compared Veblen and Innis (e.g., see Baragar 1996; Neill 1998; Wernick 1996). Their works have explained how Innis and Veblen’s approaches converged

and diverged in various ways. However, these previous analyses have not explicitly examined Veblen and Innis on areas common to the emergence of a North American political economy.

Natural Resource Development: A Core-Periphery Model

Evident connections between both authors can be found in Veblen's final work and Innis's earliest pieces on the exploitation of natural resources. As Veblen noted in *Absentee Ownership*, the first natural resources to fall under the "American plan" were the fur-bearing animals (Veblen 1964:168). Veblen found that the fur trade, "now a scarce-remembered episode of pioneering enterprise," had been ruined by business interests "with exemplary thoroughness and expedition and has left the place of it bare" (Veblen 1964:168). For Veblen, this period represented the predatory conversion of public resources for private gain, with devastating results for aboriginal populations.¹³ The once abundant community goods had been squandered away without heeding the ensuing social or ecological consequences: "but the Americans have forgiven themselves for the fur trade and its hideous accessories and have nearly forgotten it all" (Veblen 1964:169). After the "despoliation" of wildlife for the fur trade came the taking of gold and other precious minerals, followed by the confiscation of timber, iron and other metals, oil, natural gas, waterpower, and irrigation rights.

In contrast, Innis (1956) was somewhat less critical of the fur trade. Although he recognized its impacts on aboriginal peoples and clearly appreciated their central role in the fur enterprise, it was Innis's larger interest in the societal impact of technological change that drove his analysis. Innis viewed the fur trade as a mechanism with significant socio-political advantages for European traders: "The fur trade permitted the extension of the combination of authority and independence across the northern half of the [North American] continent" (Innis 1956:401), first for France and later for Great Britain. Innis

¹³ In *Absentee Ownership*, Veblen felt the fur trade "was an unwritten chapter on the debauchery and manslaughter entailed upon the Indian population of the country"; he concluded this rotten business was so distasteful that it produced "the sclerosis of the American soul" (1964:168–169).

also saw the fur trade as an evolutionary albeit human-caused process with far-reaching societal implications. Relations developed among trading partners, and material demands changed over time with new technological innovations. Fur and cod fishing were later augmented, if not completely replaced, by the timber, pulp and paper, and mining industries, as well as by the emerging wheat economy.

It was timber, and more specifically, the pulp and paper industry, as the key commodity that changed Innis's inquiry from staples to communication. Here too there are linkages with Veblen, who described how the burgeoning demand of newsprint also fed the spreading promotionalism associated with capitalism (Veblen 1964). Veblen was likely the first economist to write on advertising and marketing as symbols of contemporary aspects of capitalism. Marketing became the new "Propaganda of the Faith," only less efficient as he described religion and salesmanship (Veblen 1964). Veblen deplored the sheer volume of waste (raw materials, labor, and equipment) being generated by newsprint publicity to entice the masses:

It is, accordingly, scarcely an over-statement to say that something like one half of the wood-pulp that goes through the paper mills, together with one-half the man-power and mechanical equipment engaged in the paper industry and the printing trades, is consumed in the making of competitive sales, the net effect of which is to raise the prices paid for goods by the consumers. (Veblen 1964:ff. 317)

Unlike Innis's pessimism toward political-economic dependency as expressed in his writings of the American influence over Canada, Veblen described some positive advantages of lesser-developed countries. In *Imperial Germany and the Industrial Revolution* (1939), he compared the historical development of Great Britain with Germany before, during, and after the industrial revolution. Germany caught up to and surpassed Great Britain in technological and economic strength by the end of the nineteenth century. According to Veblen, this was a direct result of German appropriation of British know-how, but without having to suffer the painful trial and error costs associated with early industrial endeavors. In what he described as the "advantage of backwardness," referring to peripheral regions or states, the less developed country will be able to observe the experience of the core society and thus develop the new technology in a more sophisticated (i.e., systemic and efficient) manner. Veblen's solution was not to revert to a state of backwardness, but to try to

reverse the monopoly control of all societal institutions.¹⁴ Consequently Veblen's contribution here can be classified as modernization theory. He was concerned with the conditions under which a society developed from a backward and dynastic position to a technologically advanced economic system.

Still, Veblen saw that this core-peripheral form of industrial development was not entirely favorable. Absentee ownership was not limited to an American context but had taken on a cosmopolitan character in an international economic order that devalued all civil society and its resources. For instance, Veblen described how American absentee owners protected Cuban ore deposits as "free income" but devalued them after Minnesota iron ores were discovered and technological advancements made in the steel smelting process (Veblen 1964:127). In the "New Order" of business expansion, modern technological knowledge was exported to southern countries and their natural resources exploited, "without increasing the efficiency, wealth, or well-being of any [of these people]" (Veblen 1954:385).¹⁵ Foreign trade was supported by governments of strong nation-states to the pecuniary benefit of a few powerful players, but detrimental to meeting people's basic needs.

This mode of thinking about development from a disadvantaged position paralleled an Innisian perspective. Indeed, Veblen's emphasis on uneven economic development and the transfer of techniques, values, behaviors, and institutions can be found throughout Innis's work (Baragar 1996). Veblen and Innis both had serious concerns over the negative effects of unequal pecuniary or trading relations among and within nations. Veblen focused more on pecuniary and consumption mechanisms, while Innis saw that resources, capital, commerce, transport, geography, and technology were inextricably linked. Yet both were concerned with the asymmetrical capitalist-industrial means of production—and clearly not in a strict Marxist sense.

¹⁴ See Veblen (1939; 1954:361–382) for his discussion of the "advantages of backwardness"; see also Gerschenkron (1962).

¹⁵ Veblen (1954:361–382) proposed that a "Pacific League" should act as guardian over still as yet unexploited natural resources, and that all members would have to abide by free trade rules that would give preference to domestic needs. Yet, in developing countries where forests and other resources have become state property, many local communities do not benefit from conservation efforts. The state may also lack the will or personnel to take care of such resources on a sustainable basis. For his discussion of the "New Order" of business, see Veblen (1964:205–228).

Sharing similarities to Veblen's "advantage of backwardness" and modernization theory, Innis described a hinterland/metropolis model that had its beginnings in colonial times but that had become increasingly sophisticated and almost irreversible. Those astute enough, or at least wealthy and well connected, were in the best position to profit from resource development and subsequent manufacturing. In effect, Innis took a Veblenian critique of modern political economy and shaped it into a model for capitalist development in a Canadian context. This included Canada's growing dependence on its large neighbor south of the border and the willingness of Canadian federal (and later provincial) governments to pursue and enact policies exploitative of cheap, natural resources, as well as agricultural and manufacturing products.

Also both believed that there would be inevitable negative consequences to overexploitation, including resource collapse such as occurred in the white pine forest stands of eastern North America during the nineteenth century (and in the Atlantic cod fisheries in the 1990s, ironically perhaps given Innis's (1940) book on this staple industry). Veblen and Innis's influence in natural resource and land exploitation can also be seen in the writings of sociologist Arthur K. Davis, who taught at the University of Alberta (1968–1981). Among his diverse writings, Davis attempted to popularize the Veblen-Innis approach to core-peripheral development. As he argued, "for the historical review of Canadian and North American society . . . we prefer a metropolis-hinterland perspective. Metropolis continuously dominates and exploits hinterland whether in regional, national, class, or ethnic terms" (Davis 1971:12). Davis integrated some of Veblen and Innis's historical and political economic approaches with a type of Marxism to produce a model of dependence and resistance to that dependence.

Some key differences remain, however, in terms of laying culpability. Veblen's villain was the modern entrepreneur dedicated to realizing profits at the expense of efficient production. Self-interest led such individuals to raise prices through industrial delays and obstructions, which was nothing less than "sabotage" or the "conscientious withdrawal of efficiency" (Veblen 1919:3). Industrial sabotage was carried out to artificially boost prices up while keeping volume down to obtain the largest possible profits. In contrast, Innis did not portray either the entrepreneur or the trader as a villain. Instead, he placed the greatest blame at national governments such

as those of Canada that had allowed themselves to become increasingly dependent on the trade of others.

Both authors wrote of a highly dynamic and individualistic North American political economy. However, while Veblen mainly focussed on the American situation, Innis noted key discrepancies in the development trajectories between Canada and the United States. In his conclusion to *The Fur Trade in Canada*, he states:

The unique character of this development [in Canada] has been largely a result of the sudden transfer of large areas tributary to the fur trade to the new industrialism. . . . With the United States, residuary powers were left with the states whereas in Canada they remain with the federal government or rather with eastern Canada. Canada came under the sweep of the Industrial Revolution at one stroke whereas the westward movement of the United States was a gradual movement. There are no transcontinental railroads controlled by one organization in the United States. In Canada transcontinental roads are distinct entities controlled in eastern Canada. Similarly in financial institutions the branch bank system with headquarters in the east has been typical of Canada but not of the United States. No such tendency toward unity of structure in institutions and toward centralized control as found in Canada can be observed in the United States. . . . Canada has remained fundamentally a product of Europe (Innis 1956:400–401).

These remarks indicate that Innis distinguished the development of political economy in Canada from the United States for the former's "centralizing" administrative and business aspects, along with its rapid progression in trade and industry.

Lastly, both Veblen and Innis's writings focused at least some of their attention on rural areas, including production, trade, and people. They showed us that much of the capital tied up the countryside is not necessarily capital being used to accumulate, but capital being used as a means of providing a stream of (usually private) consumption-related benefits. Both Veblen and Innis took a global view of agricultural production and its impact on society as a whole. Innis described how wheat produced on the Prairie Provinces (Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba) was controlled from Montreal and Ottawa just as effectively as fur production was under the auspices of the Northwest Company and Hudson's Bay Company—see, e.g., Innis's "The Wheat Economy" (1979). Veblen also described wheat in some of the same political economic context that Innis used to describe other staples. In his "The Price of Wheat since 1867," Veblen (1892) noted several factors that affected fluctuations in wheat

prices, including monopoly control of prices, climatic conditions, and production efficiencies due to technological advancements (water and rail transportation, farm machinery, communication, etc.). In *Absentee Ownership*, Veblen also noted that farmers were acquiring more land than they could afford and maintain, inevitably leading to negative economic, social, and environmental consequences (Mitchell 2001). Furthermore, the oversupply of agricultural land was drastically reducing farmland prices. Veblen predicted that this would lead to farm foreclosures and bankruptcies, especially during times of economic recession or depression (Vaughn 1999:720). Such a scenario was to be borne out during the 1930s Dust Bowl and again during the 1980s in Midwest America.

Agrarian Radicalism

Neither Veblen nor Innis tackled the subject of agrarian radicalism, or agrarian socialism at any great length. However, Veblen was interested in socialism, whereas Innis knew of the frustrations felt by western farmers over grain prices beyond their control. While both authors may have influenced certain people interested or involved in radical movements on the Canadian prairies during the 1920s and 1930s, it was Veblen who may have had a greater impact on disgruntled farmers of that time.

The writings of Veblen, Innis, and others provide an historical and political economic background that sociologists and political economists have used to examine regional differences and inequalities. Western Canadian social science scholarship and media reports has been replete with a long tradition of complaints about high costs of consumer goods and farm inputs, low prices for agricultural products, domination by financiers in Central Canada, limited processing of raw materials on the Prairies, extraction of surplus from the West with the benefits going to urban areas in Central Canada, loss of population, and lack of political representation and influence. These elements would find their way into so-called "subversive" farmer's movements (United Farmers of Alberta, Wheat Pool) and political movements (Social Credit Party, Cooperative Commonwealth Federation).

Some of these ideas became expressed sociologically through the metropolis-hinterland argument as discussed above, but also in more

explicit arguments for socialism. While Veblen was not a socialist, his interest in the subject was evident throughout much of his writings. For instance, Veblen's (1919) *Dial* article was reprinted in the *Western Clarion*, a magazine for the Vancouver-based Socialist Party of Canada. Veblen's article had many references to the socialist labor movement and workers rights in general. He described how pecuniary self-interest led entrepreneurs to raise prices through industrial delays and obstruction, which was nothing less than "sabotage" or the "conscientious withdrawal of efficiency" (Veblen 1919:3). Industrial sabotage was carried out to artificially boost prices up while keeping volume down to obtain the largest possible profits. Similarly, he railed against the "commercial sabotage" by a similar group of entrepreneurs, the "predator business tycoons," sabotage that would lead to unbridled market speculation, the stock market crash of 1929, and a decade-long depression (Veblen 1964).

Remnants of Veblen's thought can also be seen in the radical agrarian movement of Western Canada. Although he made no explicit mention of Innis's concern with trading policies unfavorable to peripheral regions, Berkeley professor Seymour Lipset's (1959) *Agrarian Socialism* makes occasional reference to Veblen. This classic study of agrarian radical and populist movements in the prairie hinterlands makes ample use of Veblenesque terminology such as "vested interests," "big business," and "monopolistic distribution." In researching his book, Lipset heaps praise on the help that was obtained by many "lay social scientists," referring to western farmers who drew upon Veblen and others:

The farmers are interested in their society and its relations to the rest of the world . . . There are informal gatherings, also, in which farmers discuss economic and political problems . . . [and] they consider the ideas of Adam Smith, Karl Marx . . . Thorstein Veblen, and others. (Lipset, 1959:xv)

Lipset also suggested that, "[t]he western rural community possesses Veblen's prerequisites for change more than any other group in the United States or Canada" (Lipset 1959:174). This was due in large part to the economic similarities among farmers in places such as Saskatchewan. Not only were most farmers dependent on wheat for income, the majority had to accept some form of government relief in the Depression years due to the extended drought and declining

wheat prices. Saskatchewan farmers suffered more or less equally so, with few of Veblen's "sheltered groups." Thus, they supported the populist movement for change, including having a greater voice in the economic and political decisions that affected them.

Lipset quotes Veblen's analysis in *Absentee Ownership* of the myth of the "Independent Farmer": namely, "that the farmer was too individualistic to be a natural 'joiner' and 'too set in his ways' to become a sustained radical" (Lipset 1959:17). Pointing out the conflict between urban and rural worlds, he cites Veblen's *Essays in Our Changing World* in the way Veblen described "the traditional immediate exploitative relation of the town to its rural hinterland" (Lipset 1959:30). Lipset goes further and states that the Saskatchewan cooperative movement demonstrated the desire to stabilize the rural economy by eliminating the middleman, thus inducing social change. For Veblen, the capacity for social change "depends in large measure on the degree . . . of exposure of the individual members to the constraining forces of the environment" (Veblen 1967:193). Hence, classical theorists such as Veblen aided Lipset in his astute analysis of the prairie-based socialism movement in Western Canada, motivated by mounting dissatisfaction with central Canadian domination of the prairie economy. Both Veblen and Innis's presence are felt in Lipset's account of how big business exploitation, unfair purchasing and export policies, political shenanigans, and organized labor came to converge on the staple wheat economy.

Several others examining the socio-agricultural problematique specific to western Canada also drew upon Veblen and Innis's work. Alberta-born S.D. Clark, who in 1938 became the first sociologist at the University of Toronto, studied with Innis and attempted to relate elements of Canadian social organization to Innis's staple approach. Clark also studied the social gospel, the Social Credit movement, political protest movements and suburban society, and straddled the individualist and collectivist tradition within Canadian sociology. Jean Burnet, another University of Toronto sociologist, also focused significant attention on the West.¹⁶ She considered problems of social

¹⁶ In his acknowledgements for *Agrarian Socialism*, Lipset credited both Burnet and Clark for their knowledge and advice on western Canada.

organization in the rural community of Hanna, Alberta during the severe 1946 drought and drew upon Veblen's distinctions between country and town folk (Burnet 1952). In rationalizing the cleavage that had developed between town and country, she noted that Veblen attributed this to a land system that favored large landholdings and mechanized practices (Burnet 1952:155). Yet another colleague of Innis at the University of Toronto was political economist C.B. Macpherson. In his classic book *Democracy in Alberta*, Macpherson (1953) cited both Veblen and Innis, and expressed his gratitude to the latter. Indeed, the importance of Macpherson's work to "the development and nature of [western Canadian] democratic government" was underlined in the preface by Clark to *Democracy in Alberta* (Macpherson 1953:vii).

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have suggested that Veblen and Innis be reconsidered for their sizable contributions to classical sociology. More specifically, I have illustrated how both figures and their respective works have contributed to a greater understanding of a North American political economy. After briefly describing their respective epistemological positions and a summary of Veblen's direct influence on Innis, I described their distinct yet overlapping approaches to a North American political economy. Two areas of focus for comparative purposes were natural resource development along a core-peripheral model, and the rise of agrarian radicalism.

Veblen elaborated a modernization theory of absentee ownership and pecuniary-industrial dichotomy that formed the basis for an evolutionary institutional framework. Borrowing from Veblen, Innis went much further by articulating a metropolis-hinterland connection of Canada to its southern, more powerful neighbor, and within Canada from west to east, and north to south. Indeed, Canada's "advantage of backwardness" was really its continued resource dependency for trade and domestic development. Their epistemologies converge in several respects, including the development/exploitation of natural resources and agrarian radicalism in a North American political economy. Furthermore, if Innis had the critical foresight and the sociological imagination to make these findings, it was due in large part to the mentorship provided by Veblen. Likewise, as shown above,

the writings of both of them had considerable influence for scholars of the agrarian socio-political and economic circumstances of the Canadian prairies during the early and middle part of the twentieth century.

It is worth noting Mills' primary characteristic of what constitutes a classic sociologist: that "our immediate generation of social scientists is still living off their ideas" (1960:4). Certainly this is true of both Innis and Veblen, even if their work has perhaps lost some of its edge in today's social sciences. There can be no denying that Innis's work in its totality achieves Mill's harmonizing blend of society, history, and biography. In short, much of it can be considered as "classic." It arguably has led to a deeper understanding of how human societies function, especially new, resource-rich countries such as Canada, and how they evolved due to technological advancements, but were manipulated for political and economic ends by a powerful elite. The writings of Innis and those inspired by them have been required readings for generations of Canadian students (unlike Veblen, unfortunately); that is, until the 1980s at least. His elaboration of staples theory has also aided Canadian economic and social planners in developing state industrial and economic strategy. "Innis remains attractive because he wrote theories *of*, and theories *from*, the margins of the empire" (Willems-Braun 1997:109).

Given their combined historical and prophetic understanding of North American society, much value can still be derived from the writings of homegrown social critics such as Veblen and Innis. Undoubtedly, their scholarly influence will continue to lend inspiration to future generations of scholars longing to comprehend an inexorable North American political economy. True, empirically-biased and post-modernist research priorities within social science academe may make it difficult "to follow the classic styles of reflection and inquiry" (Mills 1960:6-7). Yet without a sociological base to which to tether our contemporary analyses, we run the risk of steering a rudderless ship. Those of us who consider ourselves critical social scientists would do well to revisit classical works of Veblen, Innis, and others for sociological reflection in this not-so-new millennium.

CHAPTER SEVENTEEN

SOCIOLOGY IN HAWAII: BEGINNINGS¹

JEFFREY L. CRANE

During the first third of the twentieth century, Hawai'i was an ethnically stratified plantation society whose elite generally opposed social change and condemned ideas that did not support their views. The sugar plantation system in Hawai'i was more than an economic settlement, it was also a political and cultural institution: a source of future community. It was most particularly the formative setting in which Hawai'i's immigrant groups came together in a system of ethnic stratification to form a new cultural reality (Lind 1982; Thompson 1975). By the 1920s, serious challenges to this plantation system had developed. Many laborers left the plantations for the developing communities and cities as their plantation contracts expired. New philosophies and strategies of change emerged and the traditional order faced opposition.

In the early days the planter class believed that secondary education gave laborers inappropriate ambitions (Lind 1938, 289), and indeed the difference between the actual inequality of the plantation and the egalitarian ideas taught in the classroom was a frustration to immigrant children (Adams 1928). Nevertheless, the planters also saw that scientific methods would have to be applied to agriculture if the sugar economy was to remain competitive. They knew that education and research were required, and so in 1907 the University of Hawai'i was established as a land grant institution. While the new university proved useful technically, the plantation elite also viewed it as a source of radicalism and as an outsiders' institution. And, with the University's expansion in the 1920s, suspicions deepened.

"Social science" in Hawai'i up to that point had been a mix of political justifications for elite advantage and romantic notions about

¹ From *Sociology of Hawai'i: Facts and Commentary*, by Jeffrey L. Crane, Alton M. Okinaka, Jan H. Mejer, and Anthony J. Blasi. New York: HarperCollins, 1992, pp. 1-10. Reprinted by arrangement with Pearson Education, Inc.

the uplifting nature of Christian culture. The Social Science Association of Honolulu was founded in 1882 as a club that met monthly to identify and debate important social issues. Elite *Haole*² leaders advocated moral reforms, introduced scientific studies, and urged responsible conduct in government and economy. However, the terms “social” and “science” in the Association’s name give an incorrect impression of its activities. The list of early members included many who were later to overthrow the Hawaiian monarchy in the 1893 *coup d’etat* (Porteus 1962).

The development of academic sociology in Hawai‘i was directly influenced by the University of Chicago. In 1904, Romanzo Adams, the founding sociologist in Hawai‘i, graduated with a Ph.D. in sociology from Chicago. Adams already had a Master’s in economics from the University of Michigan, and after receiving his Ph.D. he became a Professor of Economics and Sociology at the University of Nevada. At the end of World War I, a College of Arts and Sciences was added to the University of Hawai‘i. Adams accepted a position in economics, and began teaching it in 1920. But his most important contribution was the development of a broad social science program. He recommended appointments in sociology, anthropology, and social work. His special research interest was Hawai‘i’s race relations, and he encouraged others to work on this issue also. For an international conference of social scientists and administrators that met in Honolulu in 1925, Adams (1933) prepared a booklet about “the racial situations in Hawaii.”

During the mid 1920s Robert E. Park, of Chicago’s sociology department, presented several lectures in Hawai‘i. He impressed Andrew Lind, who would join the Hawai‘i faculty in 1927. Lind later studied under Park at Chicago; his dissertation, published as *An Island Community: Ecological Succession in Hawaii* (1938), is considered to be the most “Parkian” treatment of Hawai‘i available. Park’s writings on Hawai‘i, centering on the race relations cycle and the “racial frontier” idea, are few—a short essay (1934), the commencement address he made to the University of Hawai‘i (1932), and his introductions to Lind’s dissertation (Lind 1938, ix–xvi) and to Adams’ study of racial intermarriage (Park 1950). His greatest impact on Hawai‘i sociology was through his Chicago students and colleagues

² *Haole*, Hawaiian for “foreigner,” is used colloquially in Hawaii for white people of mainland origin—ed.

who either visited Hawai'i (e.g., Edgar Thompson, Emory Bogardus, Everett Stonequist, Ellsworth Faris, Herbert Blumer), or who taught in Hawai'i permanently (e.g., Clarence Glick, Bernhard Hormann, Jitsuichi Masuoka), and who each used Park's general framework and methodology to interpret social life in Hawai'i.

Park spent the 1931–32 academic year at the University of Hawai'i as a research professor, where he energized the faculty and inspired students. He arranged for some of his Chicago students to make visits and, said one student, the result was that "the most isolated department of sociology became one of the most exciting" (Hormann 1979a, 25). Park's influence was long-lasting. During a 1934 Sociology Club dinner, Everett Stonequist made the casual suggestion that a journal "devoted primarily to the social situation in Hawaii" be started (Lind 1979, 7). The students organized and mimeographed the first issue of *Social Process in Hawaii* in May, 1935. The journal, now in its 32nd volume,³ provides a good picture of early Hawai'i sociology. Of special interest are articles written by visiting Chicagoans, notably: Stonequist's (1935) application of the marginal man idea to Hawai'i, Ellsworth Faris' (1938) discussion of assimilation, and Herbert Blumer's (1939) classic analysis of race prejudice.

As he did in Chicago, Park in Hawai'i encouraged a research program using community case studies. Students went into the community, observed social life, and published essays in *Social Process in Hawaii* with such titles as: "The Natural History of the Chinese Language School," "The Competition of Languages in Hawaii," "The Taxi Dance Hall in Honolulu," and "Assimilation in a Slum Area of Honolulu." Following the outbreak of World War Two, informal research became more organized and was funded as the War Research Laboratory. Its goal was to study the impact of the war on Hawai'i's social relations (see volume 8 of *Social Process*, "Hawaii in the War"), addressing such issues as "The Impact of War on Chinese Culture," and "Notes on Juvenile Delinquency in War Time Honolulu." After the war it became the Hawaii Social Research Laboratory, and in 1955 was renamed the Romanzo Adams Social Research Laboratory commemorating Hawai'i's pioneer sociologist. Although the laboratory no longer exists, it was clearly an influence during the formative years of Hawai'i's sociology.

³ Crane was writing in 1992.

"Park saw Hawaii as the ideal location for a conference on Race Relations in World Perspective" (Matthews 1977, 251), and such a meeting did take place in Honolulu in June 1954 (Lind 1955; Conant 1955). After the meetings, Lind (1955) published *Hawaii's People* (paying homage to Adams' *The Peoples of Hawaii* from the 1925 conference). This account, influenced strongly by Park's model of race relations, became a standard college text on Hawai'i's society which has had many editions. Essays from *Social Process* have also been collected into a text (Hormann 1968).

The ecological model of society and race relations became established at the University of Hawai'i because of Park's personal leadership and the obvious relevance of the approach to Hawai'i. Park proposed that sociologists study Hawai'i as a dynamic environment in which patterns of race and ethnic relations can be seen at the levels of personality and group relations. He was interested in how new social orders had emerged to give Hawai'i its distinctive forms of social organization. In particular, Park thought that Hawai'i offered an "ideal social laboratory" in which the natural history of the race relations cycle of competition, conflict, accommodation, and assimilation could be studied. Papers subsequently appeared by a variety of authors in *Social Process in Hawaii* ranging from "Occupational Succession on the Plantation" (1935) to "The Life-History: An Approach to the Study of Juvenile Delinquency" (1938) and, even much later, "Community Types in Hawaii" (1959). These parallel similar studies done in Chicago. The research plan of Park and his students included natural histories of various ethnic and economic institutions, assimilation processes, ecological succession and immigration, and Hawai'i's marginal personalities.

In attempting a sociological explanation of race and ethnic relations, sociologists in 1930s Hawai'i faced three major difficulties. First was the school of scientific racism, represented by the influential Stanley Porteus. An Australian University of Hawai'i psychologist, his program involved the measurement of hereditary psychological differences among "races." Second were the popular descriptions of life in Hawai'i, which portrayed utopian images of the Islands as a natural, conflict-free paradise. Third, it was undeniable to residents that social problems and conflicts existed in Hawai'i and that some were intensifying. Park's approach found a home in this difficult intellectual situation. In his efforts to understand race, Park had one foot in the biological camp and the other in the sociological, with

an emphasis on the latter. While this duality created later research problems, Park provided a political bridge between those committed to the hereditary view of race and those welcoming a sociological interpretation. This helped to legitimize sociology and permitted social and cultural views of race/ethnicity to be seriously considered.

The ecological model had the important advantage that it did not threaten directly Hawai'i's powerful. The sociologists of the 1930s recognized the contrived character of the "plantation community," but they downplayed it in their efforts to identify social processes that came into being within the system. Conflict was viewed as "natural," and the laws of ecological process pointed to an eventual stability between the cultural histories of plantation community members. Social conflicts developing in the plantations and towns were attributed to processes accompanying the competitive behavior of groups in their unconscious efforts to bring about a new society. Conflicts were also seen as a result of the temporary collapse of stable ethnic group boundaries and related crises of communication. The way that social inequality was institutionally maintained was not a focus of research. These early sociologists were pushed in a variety of directions: reformist efforts championed by missionaries, radical activities proposed by unionizers and activists, and elitist positions that some mainland *Haoles* considered common sense. Under these circumstances it took courage to advocate a scientific sociology.

Park's own analysis of U.S. race relations led him to a deep distrust of liberal *Haole* reformers. For Park, if minorities were to advance, "it would be largely through the struggle and transformation of the peoples concerned," (Matthews 1977, 185). Beginning with the missionaries and continuing to the present, Hawai'i has experienced many reform-minded groups calling for "outside improvements." By adopting a different, ecological approach, Hawai'i sociologists were able to identify many of the conditions for conflict, prejudice, and antagonism without appearing overly political. Naturally, this made them unpopular on all sides. It did, however, unify their intellectual efforts and professional identity.

Park's model was beneficial for Hawai'i sociologists (Fenton 1983). The view of Hawai'i within a comparative international framework, the recognition of power and conflict as vital inter-group processes, the aptness of the race relations cycle as a model, and the ethnic group case studies, were all productive in understanding Hawai'i sociologically. It has also been suggested (Fenton 1983, 95) that in

the pioneering *Island Community*, Lind demonstrated that the Park/ecological model can be used to direct attention to most of the significant social, economic and political processes found today in more recent sociological theories. Lind's classic work is a detailed, critical, and objective report on the conditions faced by residents and immigrants since the arrival of Cook, and can be read today for both its view of social change in Hawai'i and for details of life at earlier historical stages. However, it suffers from the assumption that the processes of conflict and competition will work themselves out and that a natural community of consensual interests will inevitably emerge. This naive view is suggested when Lind (1938, 236) wrote:

Closely interwoven in the web of economic and political bonds which constitute the plantation system, there emerges an interdependence between planter and laborer which is essentially moral in nature.

While Lind analyzes social relations in Hawai'i, he does not analyze institutional processes that might maintain social inequality. Moreover, the absence in Park's model of social structures (other than ecological ones) means that the model is endlessly dynamic, and reduces the sources of change to such social psychological phenomena as personality conflicts among marginal men or situations in which intergroup communication is blocked. The idea that class (or ethnic) conflict might be a more enduring condition was too static for Park and the early sociologists in Hawai'i. For Park the notion of ecology is not merely a metaphor designed to highlight certain features of human society but is a literal summary of processes and relationships, which, when joined with patterns of culture, forms human society. The ecological determinism of the early sociologists failed to recognize how power relations helped create and maintain Hawai'i's social order.

In determining the long-term character of Hawai'i sociology, Park's model also produced some major gaps in research. We have noted the lack of an adequate theory of stratification. If such a concern had been wedded to the observations Park made regarding the international system, then what today is called world-system theory might have been written a generation earlier and in Hawai'i. Park understood the global process. Hughes (1961, 52) points to the recognition of uneven development and imperial expansion in Park's (1926c) essay "Our Racial Frontier in the Pacific": Modern race relations, he in effect says, are the accidental result of the meeting of the active

with the passive peoples. They are thus a product of economic, political, and ideological empire. The kinds of racial frontiers are then a function of the various forms which this expansion has taken. And in one of his last essays, Park (1944a, 178) writes:

The core of this Great Society is naturally Europe. The Great Society and the new world order have come into existence with the continued expansion of Europe and European civilization. European commerce has brought the whole world within the limits of a single economy.

Despite these global observations, it was the "racial frontiers" and their special features that interested Park and his students most. Adams (1937, 62), for example, notes "an uncommon degree of freedom in relation to interracial marriage" compared with other colonial and multi-ethnic societies, a theme he developed in a separate essay (Adams, 1934), and one enlarged upon by Lind.

With the collapse of racism as a public dogma, the definition of elite interests as being the interests of all, and the emergence of a democratic tradition in post-plantation Hawai'i, the time was right for analyzing the structural basis of inequality. But academic sociology in Hawai'i was not prepared to assume a leadership role in terms of this opportunity. Indeed, even later, critical approaches tended to be introduced from the other social science disciplines within the University of Hawai'i such as political science (e.g., Kent 1983) or by outside scholars (e.g., Levine and Geschwender 1981).

Two other reasons also account for the lack of a theory of ethnic inequality. The first was the influence of romantic notions of Hawai'i on the thinking of Park and his followers.

Frequently the natural history approach became, instead of a phase of inevitable disequilibrium, a series of steps toward a utopian equilibrium. Even Park fell into the latter error, contributing to the paradisiacal fantasy about Hawaii with his observation that "Race relations in Hawaii today seem to be approaching the terminus of such a cycle as here described" (Turner 1967, xxiv).

In practice this meant that attention turned from the dynamics of the race relations cycle to its final (potential) phase of assimilation, and of the likely "amalgamation" of the races in Hawai'i.

The Parkian emphasis on a race relations cycle leading to assimilation was attractive ideologically, because of its assertion that groups could change (thus confounding racial definitions of the fixed prop-

erties of such groups), and that Asian immigrant groups that had entered Hawai'i were as capable as any of becoming Americans. The Hawai'i sociologists thus became the liberals of their era, insisting that natural (cultural) processes were already occurring that would guarantee "Americanism," and, therefore, statehood. Yamamura (1938, 5) makes this comment in the fourth issue of *Social Process in Hawaii* when he quotes Romanzo Adams:

There is abundant evidence that the peoples of Hawaii are in the process of becoming one people. After a time the terms now commonly used to designate the various groups according to the country of birth or ancestry will be forgotten. There will be no Portuguese, no Chinese, no Japanese—only Americans.

World War II proved Japanese Americans and other immigrants to be loyal Americans. However, despite the appeal of the "melting pot" idea, distinctive ethnic cultures have persisted in Hawai'i and show few signs of full assimilation. The assimilation point of the race cycle turned out to be a point of cultural convergence that was never reached.

The notion of "assimilation" was also vague since its political, economic, and cultural components were left unspecified. Within Hawai'i's sociology the appeal of the race relations cycle and the inevitability of assimilation gradually declined. Cultures were seen as mere "ways of life," and the manner in which such ways were created and modified by the political or economic order neglected.

The concept of "race" itself was ambiguous. While Park attributed differences among the races to social interactional settings, he believed (argues Matthews 1977, 171) that "races did have 'temperaments' which, once acquired, were relatively resistant to rapid changes." This led some sociologists to believe that processes such as assimilation could be operationalized by studying intermarriage. If the biological supports the cultural, then intermarriage (i.e., biological interactions) between members of different races should result in an assimilated culture. Lind (1935, 47) comments:

The term "race relations" has been broadly defined to include all the relations which are incidental to 'the coming together in a common territory of peoples of varied racial stocks and different cultures.' It was quite natural, therefore, that the plans for a race relations institute first conceived and discussed some six years ago, should center around the problems of miscegenation and interracial marriage. . . . All the other research problems under way or projected, are organized

around and derive much of their significance from the extent to which they facilitate or retard inter-marriage.

Thus Adams produced his classic *Interracial Marriage in Hawaii* (1937), but its impact was less than expected. Hawai'i's high rate of interracial marriage has not led to a disappearance of ethnic diversity.

Park's initiatives encouraged, even while he was a direct influence in Hawai'i, a pluralism of sociological approaches in tandem with his ecological strategy. And, in more recent years, this pluralism has addressed the gaps in Park's theory. A critical social and political history that recognizes power as a social force can be found in the work of Fuchs (1961), and Daws (1969). Attention has also been paid to labor history (Takaki 1983) and the processes by which modern power and wealth have been created and maintained (Cooper and Daws 1985). A feminist sociology has developed (Ruch 1980), and essays concerning ethnicity address the advocacy claims of local nationalist movements (Trask 1983). Other concerns initiated by Park—for instance, deviance and social psychological processes relevant to prejudice—have their own growing literatures. What was once “ecology” has developed into a permanent interest in Hawai'i's demography (e.g., Nordyke 1977; Schmitt 1982).

Robert Park significantly influenced sociology in Hawai'i, inspired a cohort of students to apply and develop the ecological approach, and focused on the study of race and ethnic relations. But the ideological context of Hawai'i in the 1930s, weaknesses of conceptualization, absence of rigorous theory, and inattention to structural forces of inequality, have left modern Hawai'i's sociology a “bits and pieces” affair. Efforts have been made to combine the imminence of Parkian-type descriptions with the external macro demands of economic and social forces such as Linnekin's (1985) study of one Hawaiian community's adaptation to the surrounding “world system” context. Investigations into *Haole* ethnicity (Hormann 1979b; Whittaker 1986) may open a way to the linkages between ethnicity and class. But these research efforts are not unified; sociology in Hawai'i today lacks the conceptual integration it once possessed in the “Park era.” Such unity may not be desirable, and the present diversity may be typical of sociology programs throughout the United States. Consider the following passage from the Presidential Address given by Jeffrey Crane to the Hawai'i Sociological Association in 1987:

In two recent issues of *Perspectives* (the American Sociological Association Theory Section Newsletter), Professor Edward Tiryakian offered his views regarding what thematic concerns ought to interest serious contemporary social theorists. As with most professional sociologists, Tiryakian maintains that the science of sociology progresses only to the extent that it entails the production and reproduction of coherent and systematic theory. In his comments, the emergence of "East-Asia" as a center of modern world power and the dramatic transformation of contemporary sexuality (i.e., gender identity and relations) were two concerns in urgent need of serious theoretical study. I could not agree more with this assessment. However, I would hasten to add the areas of sociocultural change (especially if understood as including, but going beyond, political economy) and ethnic/race studies. These four areas taken together, in my opinion, are both empirically related and form a significant part of the sociocultural matrix of the post-modern world.

To begin with, I would argue that we must not allow ourselves to be misled into believing that the insertion of a few "locale specific" variables, however well operationalized, on ethnicity, change, gender, and culture will suffice to address adequately these important and complex concerns.

For example, when we look at change in Hawai'i and the Pacific Basin, I suggest that we do not limit ourselves to a few narrow political-economic factors. Instead, I believe we need to explore the importance of culture as a variable in itself—autonomous and with its own explanatory integrity. When we consider gender we need to comprehend fully the historical origins, dynamics, and structures underlying gender relationships in Hawai'i and throughout the Pacific. We must do this, moreover, without reducing the histories of either gender to Western based concepts and prejudices. It would be well to remember here that in Hawai'i's own history it was a woman, Kaahumanu, who figured most prominently in the transformation of traditional Hawaiian society.

As for ethnicity and Pacific Basin studies, here, too, I believe we need to risk innovative approaches. Specifically, when exploring ethnicity and race relations, it might serve us well to analyze cultural, social, legal, political, and linguistic factors on an equal footing with the more conventional economic ones.

My call is for good, thoughtful, innovative, and critical empirical inquiry. I am equally adamant in my belief that we should not allow ourselves to be duped by thoughtless rhetoric which insists that, since we are a "unique locale," none of the rigors, conventions, or findings of mainstream sociology apply in our research and teaching. We must, I firmly believe, hold ourselves professionally accountable. And in my opinion we do that by taking advantage of our locale while simultaneously creating and sustaining a dialogue among ourselves and our colleagues throughout the world.

CHAPTER EIGHTEEN

THE LEGACY OF COMMUNITY STUDIES

JOYCE E. WILLIAMS¹ AND VICKY M. MACLEAN

Introduction

Americans have gained the reputation of being mobile, ready to pack up and move when opportunity beckons. Indeed, in the 1990s the average American moved every seven years, and the average number of lifetime moves was 10.5 (Population Reference Bureau 1998). The image of the mobile American suggests that interest in the local community is purely nostalgic or wishful thinking. However, the 2000 census data reveal that an aging population is moving less and that 59 percent of moves are within the same county (Schachter 2004). These facts suggest that most Americans really do have a “place” they consider “home,” although today’s community is perhaps more spatially diffuse than in the past due to rapid transportation and high tech communication. Even as some have lamented the death of community in mass society (Putnam 2000), sociologists continue to find and to study community. The community remains a mainstay of American sociology just as the community remains a mainstay of American life.

This chapter provides an overview of the chronology and legacy of community studies and their shifting trajectories as contributors to the discipline. The traditional community study is a protracted in-depth analysis of a life space that is produced after the social scientist has lived in or been immersed there. Typically the researcher describes the setting and its members in such a way that the reader *experiences* the community through others. The traditional community study evokes admiration for the researcher who can “go native” in order to study a city, suburb, neighborhood, or village, even though such works are often looked upon as less than scientific. Lyon con-

¹ Direct comments and correspondence to Joyce Williams at je25williams@msn.com

tends, however, that “sociology should not strain at being scientific” but instead, should reflect “a ‘conversation,’ attempting to capture ‘the ceaseless activity of human agency and, above all, the active community of the production of the social world’” (Lyon 1984, 257).

For the purposes of this work, community studies will denote empirical works about a place or delimited life space and the quality of collective life and social patterns of organization therein (Keller 2003, 6). This definition assumes that communities are not static, that they exist in time and space, and that they are shaped by and help to shape outside forces. The genre of research known as the “community study” represents a multi-faceted, if unintended, history of the discipline, including: (1) a sociology of the everyday, (2) significant developments in social inequality, stratification, and power, (3) an early and continuing education in cultural diversity and conflict, (4) methodological and ethical maturation, (6) theoretical maturation, and (7) reflexive sociology at work.

Community Studies, Then and Now

The volume of work on community in the U.S. is substantial, spanning more than a century (see Appendix). Although it is not without controversy, clearly the legacy of community studies has endured and includes some of the best-known works of sociology in both the public mind and that of sociologists. Some of the earliest community studies include *Hull-House Maps and Papers* (Residents of Hull-House 1895), *The Philadelphia Negro* (DuBois 1899), a *New York City Block* (Jones 1904), and *Our Slavic Fellow Citizens* (Balch 1910). Although these works have been neglected in mainstream sociology, they were pioneering in their efforts both to define a methodology and a substantive focus for the discipline. Recent works by Burawoy *et al.* (2000, 2003) and Keller (2003) reflect on the present state of the sociological study of community. Burawoy makes a historically-based plea for moving ethnography, which he treats as coterminous with sociology, into the global era. He criticizes ethnography as too local and too provincial, even though it began empirically as a global enterprise with the *Polish Peasant in Europe and America* (Thomas and Znaniecki 1996[1918–20]). That work presented a global community held together by newspapers, letters, personal communication, the exchange of money, and continuing immigration. What the *Polish*

Peasant lacked, however, was a global context about the forces of capitalism that were the backdrop of immigration (Burawoy 2000, 10). Predating the *Polish Peasant* by nearly a decade, Balch's *Our Slavic Fellow Citizens* provided the first sociological look at immigration. While lacking the methodological sophistication of Thomas and Znaniecki's work, Balch's study provided a global context for understanding the transnational forces behind immigration (Deegan 1983, 103–04). After the *Polish Peasant*, other Chicago works in the 1920s tended to be local community studies. Although nothing in Chicago in this era escaped the influences of industrialization, immigration, and urbanization, these forces were largely ignored. Apart from Addams, Chicago sociologists said little about social class or the labor wars of the period. Works by Anderson (1961[1923]) and Zorbaugh (1929) are good examples. Burawoy charges that the Chicagoians' "search for transhistorical laws obscured real history" in the "seismic shifts" of the 1920s and 30s—mass culture, political machines, trade unions, and the beginnings of the welfare state (2000, 12–13).

Blumer's critique (1979[1939]) of the *Polish Peasant*, according to Burawoy, localized that work and changed the course of sociology. Rather than placing Thomas and Znanieski's "well documented transnational processes within their global context," Blumer's critique emphasized their social psychology. He thus led Chicago sociology toward symbolic interactionism, predisposing it to forsake the bigger picture for what became "institutional ethnography" (2000, 10). Institutional ethnography is represented in the works of Howard Becker, Erving Goffman, Fred Davis, Anselm Strauss, Donald Roy, and Everett Hughes, as they studied prisons, asylums, hospitals, and factories. Burawoy contends that institutional ethnographies present "a closed and delimited world, a world taken out of history and out of its American context" (Burawoy 2000, 14). He singled out Kornblum's *Blue Collar Community* (1974) and Suttles' *The Social Order of the Slum* (1968), two traditional community studies, as looking "inward to the primary group" rather than "outward to the economy and state" (2000, 22). Not all community studies ignored the bigger issues. Liebow's *Tally's Corner* (1967) and Whyte's *Street Corner Society* (1943) are cited by Burawoy as examples of the reflexive and extended case study method (2000, 15–24, Gluckman 1940–42).

Burawoy argues neither for nor against the traditional localized community study; he rather argues for a methodology that extends both the role of researchers and the phenomena they investigate.

Keller (2003), on the other hand, makes her arguments in favor of keeping the community front and center in sociological analysis. Her research on a designed community provides some support for the “continuing salience of the local community” and of community study as a sociological enterprise. However, there is no escaping that the community study today and in the future is not the community study of yesterday. Gregory captured the change when he warned a graduate student about the demise of the community study because such studies have become “an interdisciplinary focus for framing and hashing out a wide spectrum of theoretical issues concerning global restructuring,” “new” social movements, the political economy of space, and the transnational migration of people and cultural forms. Gregory acknowledged community research as having “forever changed the way that we think about cities.” He criticized the same research for shedding “far too little light on how urban residents themselves experience and negotiate their place amid this bewildering array of social, political, and economic forces” (1996, 372).

Keller’s most persuasive arguments for the salience of the local community are humanistic and experiential. She emphasized four trends as justifying continuing sociological study of the community: (1) The large influx of immigrants, albeit from different origins, creates similarities between the United States in the beginning of the twenty-first century and at the beginning of the twentieth century. (2) An aging population and increased life expectancy mean an increase in retirement communities. (3) Designed communities are on the increase and are a reflection of the need to create a place of one’s own in an increasingly global society. (4) Alternative life styles or special interest groups will lead to more affinity communities (2003, 247–64).

The community in sociological research has been variously described as a “laboratory,” as a “microcosm” of larger society, and as a case study in social organization and social interaction. While there may not be total agreement as to which community studies are the classics, most would include *Middletown* (Lynd and Lynd 1929), *Street Corner Society* (Whyte 1943), and the *Yankee City* (Warner 1966[1941]) series. These works are testament to a simpler life and to a different, less restrictive era of sociological research. Indeed, one reason for reflecting on community studies is that while the genre survives, it has not survived unchanged or unscathed. Some argue that the day of studying the local community is past because the community as

we knew it has passed (Coleman 1996, Putnam 2000). There is also the reality that renders personal participant-observation studies impractical because of costs, time constraints, and ethical and privacy concerns for human subjects. Other factors that impact community study today are the size and relative anonymity of the "typical" community and the fact that urban sprawl has blurred community boundaries. Any reader familiar with Warner's complex methodology for subjectively identifying social class in *Yankee City* must wonder, given today's anonymity, how the people knew so much about their neighbors. Vidich argues that the passing of the territorial limitations of community means that the "central characteristics of the community are determined precisely because it is neither isolated nor free to develop social cultures independently of society-wide and frequently world-wide tendencies" (1974, 333). Scherer (1972) argued for reconceptualizing community to account for its new forms. Stacey suggested studying the "inter-relations of institutions in a locality" rather than imposing the concept of community on those studied (1969, 137). However community studies are conceptualized or reconceptualized, they evoke nostalgia. It is a personal nostalgia for those who grew up experiencing a small town and a professional nostalgia because it is difficult to match the classical community study today or to articulate its meaning in a global society.

Historical Perspectives

Jessie Bernard credited rural sociologists for introducing the community study and for "the first recognition of the importance of geographical and spatial relations for social organization on a community scale" (1929, 67). She did not acknowledge the work of the residents of Hull-House or that of W.E.B. DuBois, although more recent writers have done so. For example, Chapoulie (1996) cites *Hull-House Maps and Papers* as "one of the first products" of survey research in the United States. Similarly, Vidich and Lyman identify *Maps and Papers* as "standard setting" and *The Philadelphia Negro* as "the first American urban community study" (1985, 127). Both were products of the university social settlement movements. Converse's history of survey research in the United States also treats these early works as community studies, linking them with social surveys in London con-

ducted by Charles Booth (1987:22). Her description of *The Philadelphia Negro* is clearly that of a classic “community study.”

In . . . 1896, the sociologist W.E.B. DuBois undertook, almost single-handedly, a study of the Philadelphia Negro, in a prodigious labor. . . . DuBois acknowledged the influence of both Booth and Hull House. Like Booth, DuBois immersed himself in the life of the city, living in the black section, attending meetings and churches, conducting systematic observations, counting, tabulating, and integrating new data with historical records, vital statistics, and census data. He also obtained field data from a house-to-house canvass of a central district in the city that historically had been the center of the Negro population. Using six different kinds of schedules—for family, individual, home, street, institution, and house servants—DuBois ordered data into many tables and also into many effective colored maps in the Booth manner. (Converse 1987, 23)

Bain (1927) reports that the proportion of theses categorized as community sociology (inclusive of neighborhoods and cities as well as urban and rural communities) increased from 11% in 1920 to 33% in 1924. Among master's students the subject of community ranked ninth in 1920 and fourth in 1924 while for doctoral students it held fourth place for both years. Over 7% of all articles published in the *American Journal of Sociology* between 1894 and 1924 were focused on community, and 12.5% of those published in the newer *Social Forces* between 1922 and 1926 were community-related. The topic ranked sixth in the *American Journal of Sociology* articles and fourth in *Social Forces*.

One insight into how earlier sociologists thought about community studies is provided by Gettys (1934), who tried to provide an overview. He deemed all studies prior to 1914 as “presociological” on the grounds that they focused on one or more social problems for purposes of mobilizing public opinion and legislative action, rather than providing a comprehensive account of a community as a system of inter-related elements. While he does not seem to have been aware of DuBois's rural community studies or *Philadelphia Negro*, he specifically includes *Hull-House Maps and Papers* in the presociological category and acknowledged studies of rural communities (Wilson 1923, Galpin 1915) that he deemed sociological. Because of changes in communications and transportation, he believed communities would disappear and community study would blend into other areas of sociology.

In 1948, August Hollingshead presented a "Summary Report" on community research before the American Sociological Association. He divided research on the community into three periods. The first, from 1895 to 1915, was labeled as *normative-meliorative*, with an interest on social problems (crime, prostitution, alcoholism) and their remediation. He contextualizes the work as influenced by the survey movement, as separating sociology from social work, and as leading up to a more scientific approach to community studies (1948, 136). He cited the works of several of Giddings' students at Columbia: *An American Town* (Williams 1906), *Quaker Hill* (Wilson 1907), and *A Hoosier Village* (Sims 1912). His second period of community studies began about 1915 and ended with the publication of *Middletown* (1929). It is labeled as the *analytical* period when "a few sociologists became interested in looking at particular communities in terms of their history, development, population, and organization in order to determine their extent and nature" (1948, 137). Hollingshead identified works of this period as those coming from the University of Chicago and from Columbia, where rural sociology had its beginning. He cited such representative Chicago community studies as *The Hobo* (Anderson 1923), *The Ghetto* (Wirth 1928), and *The Gold Coast and the Slum* (Zorbaugh 1929). He also cited Park's theoretical essay on the city (1921), which apparently served as a road map for studying Chicago, and Charles Galpin's "Social Anatomy of an Agricultural Community" (1915) as ushering in the analytical era at Columbia. Hollingshead characterized these works as "strongly influenced by the ideas, attitudes, and goals of the reformers" but as "marking a turn" toward objective study of the community (1948, 137). *Middletown* (1929) bridged the last two eras of community studies, marking the end of the *analytic* and the beginning of a more *scientific* approach to the community.

Hollingshead characterized community studies from 1930 to the time of his presentation (1948) as having one of three foci: (1) ecological, (2) structural, or (3) typological. The ecological approach focused on the interrelations of people and the distribution of human activities in time and space. He described the ecological approach to community, represented by Chicago sociology, as on the demise. The structural approach was described as alive and well but aligned with one of two perspectives: that of W. Lloyd Warner and his colleagues (the anthropological approach) or that of the Lynd's (the sociological approach). Hollingshead's distinction was that sociolo-

gists are more objective and see the structure of social relations (i.e. classes) as the essence of community life whereas the anthropologists are more concerned with the nature of classes or castes and their effects on personality (1948, 143). Finally, communities were typed according to a theoretical frame of reference with the underlying assumption that "a given complex of population, culture and communal organization gives rise to a characteristic way of life" (Hollingshead 1948, 144). Typological categories focused on the activities and interpersonal relations of inhabitants such as Wirth's "Urbanism as a Way of Life" (1938) and Zimmerman's *The Changing Community* (1938). Hollingshead's review of community studies is a useful historical referent, and the reader is struck with the similarity between the development of community research and of sociology in general. However, Hollingshead offers no directives for the future, and his conclusion was negative: "the field of community . . . lies on a very low level of scientific development" (1948, 145).

Odum's book on *American Sociology* (1951) represents the state-of-the-discipline at mid-century. He described study of the community as constituting "an appreciable segment of the total story of American Sociology" (1951, 292). He attributed the first community studies to doctoral dissertations written by students of Giddings who went on to publish these and other works in rural sociology (Jones 1904, Williams 1906, Wilson 1907). However, he overlooked the work of Balch (1910), a student of Giddings at Bryn Mawr, as well as Residents of Hull-House (1895) and DuBois (1899). Galpin was mentioned for his definitive work on "The Social Anatomy of an Agricultural Community" (1915). Using the characterization of "general" (theory, methods, and general principles) and "special" (substantive) sociology, Odum treats community as special sociology, "closely related to the study of social problems" (1951, 291). He states that work on the community had been neglected "because *community* and *society* were relatively synonymous" in their treatment as social phenomena. Indeed, this is very evident in a widely used text of the nineteen twenties entitled, *Community: A Sociological Study* and subtitled *Being an Attempt to set out the Nature and Fundamental Laws of Social Life* (MacIver 1917). Contemporary works separate community and society conceptually while acknowledging their interwoven and interdependent complexities. For example, Bellah *et al.* make the point that individuals need both the "spacial rootedness" of community and the "special transcendence" of society (1991, 265).

In 1967, Havighurst and Jansen published a trend report and bibliography on community research inclusive of both sociology and anthropology. Works on the community were categorized as: (1) theoretical: conceptual, methodological, critical; (2) social survey type studies; (3) global studies; (4) special focus studies; (5) social action and social planning works; and (6) restudies. Their annotated bibliography follows these same categories but is more inclusive of works outside the United States. While noting that a local community is not a complete social system but one that must be studied in a wider social context, they viewed the function and value of community studies as two-fold. First, if a society is made up of similar communities, a study of several such communities gives knowledge of the structure and operation of the larger society. Second, community studies, especially if comparative studies exist, can provide a social scientific basis for social policies (1967, 15–18).

Keller summarizes twentieth-century work on communities as having taken three pathways that ultimately come together, full circle (2003, 43). The first pathway is represented by the early work of MacIver and Page (1949) and the more recent work of Bellah *et al.* (1985, 1991). The former acknowledged urbanization and suburban growth but simply assumed the continuing necessity of community as “the permanent background of people’s lives” (MacIver and Page 1949, 292). For Bellah and his associates (1985, 1991) the focus on community evolved as a “fortunate by-product of their endeavor to delineate the attainment of a more just, humane, and morally sound society in the twenty-first century” (Keller 2003, 46). The second pathway is represented in the work of the Chicago sociologists, emphasizing the ecological determinants of community. The third pathway moves away from the traditional community and examines the impact of the expanding metropolis on community formation resulting in expanded, hybrid, affinity, and even symbolic approaches to community (Hunter and Suttles 1972, Hunter 1974, Janowitz 1967).

Jessie Bernard considered four classic community paradigms: ecological, social class structure, community power structure, and the *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft* dichotomy; she subsequently argued for a new paradigm to understand the still viable concept of community. Bernard recognized that changes in communication, television, and transportation “have profoundly changed the significance of space for human relationships” (1973, 181–82). Nevertheless, she concluded that “Not many people seem to be ready yet for complete aban-

donment of locale" (1973, 185). She also agreed with Suttles that "community study remains a basic vehicle for holistic and comprehensive understanding of the metropolitan condition" (1973, 186).

James Coleman divided sociological research into before and after the "watershed" of the early 1950s. The difference in the two sociologies was "the contrast between community studies, which were dominant until [the early 1950's] and survey research, which was dominant after" (1996, 343). He distinguished between the two types of study in terms of unit of analysis (community versus the individual) and methodologies (qualitative versus systematic quantitative data). According to Coleman, Warner's *Yankee City* series was the last work of its kind for two reasons: (1) Society had become too big and too impersonal, our communities too diverse, because of regional, political and economic differences. "Social stratification could no longer be studied in a single community" (1996, 345). (2) Government agencies became prominent sources of funding for social research, establishing a preference for quantitative methods and samples that were generalizable to the population as a whole. Coleman's "vision of sociology" and his interest in both community study and survey research were shaped by his exposure to Paul Lazarsfeld and Robert Lynd at Columbia. He purported to study "social systems by use of new quantitative methods," thus "straddling the watershed sociology and society had reached" (1996, 348).

The Empirical Trail

The community studies summarized in the Appendix, while not presented as comprehensive, are nonetheless indicative of the volume of work in the United States and reflect certain trends in the research.² The table suggests that community studies until the late 1920s were problems-oriented and possibly policy-oriented. They focused on

² In addition to community studies familiar to the authors beforehand, the archives of *Contemporary Sociology* were searched from the early seventies through 2000. From the books reviewed, those appearing to meet our working definition of community studies, and conducted in the United States, were selected. We found community studies between 1972 and 2000 to be included under the subheadings of Urban and Rural Communities; Anthropology, Communities and Culture; Community; Population, Ecology and Community Studies; Population, Ecology, Urban and Community Studies; Urban Sociology and Community Studies; and Community, Environment and Population.

African American migrants to cities, recently arrived European immigrants, and small towns and communities in rural America. The focus began to change with the Chicago area studies, Wirth's publication of *The Ghetto* (1928), and with the first holistic community study, *Middletown* (Lynd and Lynd 1929). In the decades of the thirties and forties, community studies were a vehicle by which social scientists expected to describe the social world as the sum of its parts and also to capture the rapidity of social change. These two decades produced diverse works: more on rural communities, a Middletown revisit (Lynd and Lynd 1937), a study of Greenwich Village (Ware 1935); the small mid-west community of *Plainville USA* (West 1945); the beginning of Warner's mammoth work on *Yankee City* (1941; 1966); and an adolescent subculture shaped by social class (Hollingshead 1949). The fifties reflected changes in the larger society, including the impact of World War II. The scope expanded to include suburbia, exurbia, a mill community of African Americans, and a *Small Town in Mass Society* (Vidich and Bensman 1958).

Commensurate with the beginning of the era of civil rights, the sixties saw a focus on race relations (Burgess 1960, Lee 1961, Hesslink 1968), inner-city slums (Suttles 1968, Liebow 1967), and other ethnic or working-class communities (Gans 1962; 1967). The focus on African American communities was pronounced in the seventies (Rainwater 1970, Williams 1973, Stack 1974, Anderson 1978). However, this decade was also the beginning of multiple or micro community studies (Hunter 1974) and of affinity studies (Spradley 1970, Johnson 1971, Cavan 1972, Hochschild 1973). There was an overlapping interest in poverty and in the study of African American, ethnic, or working-class communities (Howell 1973, Kornblum 1974, Stack 1974) and in communities in transition (Zehner and Chapin 1974). The eighties saw a continuation of multiple community studies (Ellis 1986, Hudson 1987) and of affinity studies (Greenhouse 1986, Baumgartner 1988, Brown 1988). Sociologists showed awareness and interest in the growing African American middle and working classes (Tatum 1987, Rose 1987, Williams 1988). A Middletown revisit attracted interest (Caplow 1982), but the most obvious trend of the decade was the use of multiple sources of data and methodologies to trace the changes in a community over time, a type of extended case study (Faragher 1986, Ellis 1986, Schwieder *et al.* 1987, Shelton *et al.* 1989). The nineties and beyond reflect more

multiple studies (Monti 1990, Hummon 1990, Abrahamson 1995, Ehrenhalt 1995) as well as studies of communities undergoing change (Juliani 1998, Sanjek 1998, Helmreich 1998). Many studies contextualize the community, buffeted by external political and economic forces (Abu-Lughod 1994, Cummings 1998, Lin 1998), and some portray the community as organizing to fight back against these forces (Medoff and Sklar 1994, Stoecker 1994). These cursory data document changes that the community study as sociological work has undergone over more than a century and support the contention that the genre of the community study remains a viable and dynamic part of the sociological enterprise.

The Legacy

A Sociology of the Everyday

Community studies are best known for portraying the every day life of ordinary and unordinary people. This is true for those studies that have described community as if it existed in a time warp and in a vacuum quite apart from any macro-level forces and for those that have described average persons as impacted if not victimized by outside forces. Seeley *et al.* pointed out that community studies can “pin down in time and space,” the “nature of contemporary social life” (1956, 3). Beginning with *Middletown* we learned how the people of Muncie, Indiana, made a living, raised their children, achieved an education, spent their leisure, and worshipped. In another era and in a world apart from middle America, we learned how the men of *Talley’s Corner* lived their daily lives and why. Through the work of Spradley (1970), we entered the world of the nomadic Skid Row alcoholic and left with some understanding of his plight. More recently we learned how the forces of globalization and social change impact the people of Chinatown (Lin 1998), the Winu of northern California (Chase-Dunn 1998), and the steelworkers of Youngstown (Bruno 1999). Community studies freeze daily life in time and space while allowing for comparisons and examination of change, some in worlds that would otherwise remain unknown. The first, and finest, objective of sociologists engaged in community studies is to capture, unaltered, the community experience and the meaning of community for those who live and experience it.

Social Inequality, Stratification and Power

One of the earliest lessons of community studies is that not all communities are created equal and not all people within communities are equal. It is one thing to *know* this truth and quite another to realize it through vivid descriptions and the experiences articulated by the people themselves: working class whites, middle-class African Americans, the rich, the would-be rich, and the very poor. Who could better describe *Hard Living on Clay Street* (Howell 1973) than the people themselves? How else would you capture the poignancy and marginality of the *Black Bourgeoisie* (Frazier 1957) than through the eyes of one of their own, or the ingenuity of the female head-of-household who comprised a survival network in *All Our Kin* (Stack 1974)? The community literature provides comparisons and contrasts of life in the extreme social strata and all the stages in between. Some community studies, such as those out of the Chicago School of the twenties, simply described the differences behaviorally and in terms of life style. *The Gold Coast and the Slum* (Zorbaugh 1929) is a good example. More recently, works such as *Black Baltimore* (MacDougall 1993) and *Houston: Growth and Decline* (Shelton *et al.* 1989) focus on power differentials and the systemic roots of inequality. In *Yankee City* (1941, 1966), Warner posited as reality a six-layered system of social classes. Strata, ranging from the upper-upper to the lower-lower levels of the community, became synonymous with social class and part of the canon of social science, even though controversial. *Deep South* (Davis, Gardner and Gardner 1941) and *Caste and Class in a Southern Town* (Dollard 1937) documented the caste-like position of African Americans vis-à-vis whites and the intricate “etiquette” of race relations in the South. Hunter’s (1953) study of the process of decision-making in Atlanta is not only a study in white community power but also a study of the dual black-white system in that city.

Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Conflict

Long before being labelled as such, community studies provided an education in cultural diversity; Ware’s *Greenwich Village* (1935) is a good example, as is Gans’ *Urban Villagers* (1962). Researchers explored and described groups that differed from surrounding or dominant groups in life-style, age, regional origin, economics, religion, or rural, urban and suburban residence (Wirth 1928, Johnson 1930, Drake and Cayton 1945). Achor’s (1978) description of the everyday lives

of a Mexican-American barrio population is a work in cultural and economic contrast, as was the earlier *Black Ways of Kent* (Lewis 1955). Culturally diverse communities (Watson 1989), religious communities (Greenhouse 1986), rural communities (Brown 1988), and senior citizen communities (Hochschild 1973) have all been the subjects of community research. Not only have readers been exposed to diverse cultures but also to the clash of cultures (Sanjek 1988) as well as to the peaceful coexistence of those with different cultures and life-styles (Schwieder 1987).

Methodological Maturity

Treatment of Human Subjects. Community studies have brought to the forefront issues with regard to the treatment of human subjects and the broader issues of ethics in research. This fact is evident in the publication of new editions of several community studies such as *Street Corner Society* (1981) and *Small Town in Mass Society* (1968) that address methodological issues that arose following the original publications. There are also retrospective "reflections" by such researchers as Frazier, Seeley, and Whyte some years after their works were published (Vidich *et al.* 1964). In a revisit to Plainville fifteen years after the original study, Gallaher (1964) encountered some hostility from residents, still angry about their portrayal in *Plainville USA* (West 1945).

Practicing ethical responsibility toward those studied is more prominent in today's methodologies than in the past, honed by mistakes as well as reciprocity with participants in field research. Most community researchers have lived, at least for a time, in the communities they study. This level of participation is invaluable for experiencing the community along with the regular inhabitants. On the other hand, the researcher becomes involved with those studied and may lose a degree of objectivity or, by just being there, shape the historical dynamics of the group (see Festinger *et al.* 1964[1956]). Researcher involvement can also influence the treatment of key informants in final reports or publications by protecting their identity and in the presentation and use of confidential information. Negative representations, even if honest, can create a hostile environment for informants and, after the fact, for researchers. Community studies have thus raised awareness of the ethical considerations of entering and exiting the field of study. Finally, there is the issue of whether

to identify a community or group by name or use a pseudonym which readers will immediately set about attempting to identify as, for example, Lofland's (1966) study of a now well-known new religion.

Multiple data sources. Community researchers were the first social scientists to use multiple sources of data, and some were among the first to recognize the need for historical and macro-contextualization of data. While the traditional community study is associated with participant observation, this is in reality only one type of data used in most community research. Keil (1988) hardly used participant observation at all, even as he highlighted the first-hand nature of his interviews and historical reconstructions. Community researchers typically combine interviews with participant observation. Other common methods of data collection are focus groups, door-to-door surveys, census, media reports, community resource inventories, archival research, and in-depth interviews. The work of DuBois in *The Philadelphia Negro* is a remarkable example of the use of multiple data sources, remarkable in that it was executed in the late nineteenth century and was largely the work of one man. In Williams' (1973) research in a Black community, multiple methods of data collection were utilized, and at least two sources of data were required for confirmation and inclusion in the findings reported. Vidich and Bensman used multi-data sources, reporting data collection from:

census-type fact-finding surveys, check-list personality inventories, passive non-participant observation, tape-recorded interviews with spouses, depth interviews, participant observation, unstructured and guided anthropological-type interviews, and structured, semi-structured, and unstructured attitude interviews (1968, 363).

Funding. Funding for community research is scarce because of what is perceived as the limited generalizability of its findings. As with most research, however, community studies can be influenced by, and sometimes must be considered as the product of, funding opportunities. Publications from the Chicago sociologists during the era of Robert Park and Ernest Burgess acknowledged funding from the Rockefeller Foundation. The Rockefeller Foundation later supported the work of the Institute of Social and Religious Research that funded the Middletown research. During the depression era, some social scientists did research for the government or had their own research

projects funded through the Federal Emergency Relief Act and later under the Works Projects Administration (Converse 1987, 39; Bowser 2002, 135). The Phelps Stokes Foundation provided some funding for the study of race relations, particularly in the South (Odum 1951, 292). Many of the studies of inner-city poor and African American communities of the sixties were funded by various government agencies under the auspices of "Great Society" programs. The Department of Health and Human Services (then the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare), the National Institutes for Health, and other federally-funded agencies made research funds available in the sixties and seventies in an attempt to prevent racial conflict in urban neighborhoods (Moynihan 1969, Rainwater 1970).

Theoretical Maturity

Traditional community studies such as Warner's *Yankee City* series have been criticized for having a structural-functionalist bias, and thus a propensity for maintaining the status quo. Yet traditional community studies remain one of the best measures of social change and of comparability through time and space (Crow 2002). Stein (1960) ferreted out the threads of urbanization, industrialization, and bureaucratization in studies as diverse and chronologically separate as *Greenwich Village* (Ware 1935) and *Crestwood Heights* (Seeley *et al.* 1956). Revisits, beginning with *Middletown in Transition*, have similarly become a common part of the literature on community studies and have facilitated comparative analyses across time and space (Burawoy 2003). It is perhaps not an exaggeration to say that community studies have proven to be instructive as testing grounds for general theories of social change.

Several books on the community provide an overview of the literature and of the use of various theoretical perspectives (Stein 1960, Poplin 1972, Bell and Newby 1972, Bernard 1973, Stoneall 1983). Stoneall systematically examined the historical evolution of five theoretical perspectives: ecological, structural functionalism, conflict, social psychological, and network or exchange theory. Her analysis of each theory ties it to early European sociology or anthropology, and early American sociology. She also provided examples of community research representative of the five perspectives. She does not claim

that every community researcher has gone into the field with theoretical propositions that guide the work, nor does she claim that every theoretical perspective is overtly stated in the research design. In fact, such systematic and structured use of theory subverts the very openness that characterizes community research.

Most community research is along the lines of the “empirically open system” or unsystematic use of theory described by Vidich and Bensman (1968). The researchers attempt to analyze the problem in terms of existing theories in what they refer to as the “codification of theoretical perspectives” to result in heuristic theory.

Specific and discrete theories which have been used in the past . . . are examined, and the investigator attempts to discover the fundamental dimensions, implicit and explicit, of each. . . . In making comparisons, the codifier discovers overlapping areas, convergences, different levels of generality and generalizations, and different vectors of observation and perspective. . . . The net product is a heuristic model which serves as a basis for future research. (1968, 384–85)

This process is one of probes and checks of data against different theoretical perspectives resulting in the best theoretical possibilities in each. “Unsystematic theory, in this way, can lead to creative work” (Vidich and Bensman 1968, 385).

Reflexive Sociology

Gouldner first coined the term *reflexive sociology* (1970) as a rejection of value-neutral science where the scientist ostensibly studied others but never became involved or invested with the people or phenomena studied. He conceptualized reflexive sociology as a reciprocal process between sociologist and those studied: one is always influenced by the other because “the roots of sociology pass through the sociologist” (1970, 489).

The historical mission of a Reflexive Sociology as I conceive it . . . would be to *transform* the sociologist, to penetrate deeply into his daily life and work, enriching them with new sensitivities, and to raise the sociologist’s self-awareness to a new historical level. (1970, 489)

Reflexive sociology was a new term but not a new idea to those engaged in community research. It is sociological work that cannot be accomplished from a distance. The sociologist must gain entrance,

gain confidence, listen to learn, portray as honestly as possible, and at the same time do no harm. It is a life-changing experience for the sociologist and often for those studied. DuBois reflected upon his study of African Americans in Philadelphia, that in the end, he “had learned far more from Philadelphia Negroes than I had taught them . . .” (Katz and Sugrue 1998, 25). Reflecting on his work in Loma, New Mexico, Wolf characterized the need for reflexivity in community study as “surrender.”

If I surrender to a community or any other social phenomenon, . . . I must not reduce the community to a case in point, an item more or less . . . subsumable under a generalization, an element in a theory; if I do, it means that I have treated it exclusively as an object, have neglected the essentially human features at work in it and in myself. . . . I must not forget that I am a student who wants to find out and report as objectively as he can; if I do forget this it means either that I . . . have neglected features at work . . . including nature, other communities, society at large, the economy, the political situation, the historical moment. . . . (Wolff 1964, 247)

Burawoy acknowledged Gouldner's contribution to “power and reflexivity” while advocating further for a reflexive and extended case method consisting of: (1) extension of the observer into the world of the participant; (2) extension of observations over time and space; (3) extending out from micro to macro forces; and (4) extending existing theory to accommodate new observations and anomalies. Burawoy emphasizes that each dimension of the extended case method is imbued “with sensitivity to questions of power and reflexivity” (2000, 26–28).

Community studies have always included people as agents of social action, thus avoiding the overly deterministic view of humanity reflected in other forms of research. To some degree, community studies have always been reflexive as the researcher becomes a participant in the research enterprise. Some community studies also present evidence that external social processes are not always unstoppable—people do not always become victims of corporate giants, big government, or bureaucracy. Sometimes, the people win. There are examples where poor minorities won against government (Williams 1973); where inner cities did not become slums (Hudson 1987), and where a people prevailed in preserving community and environment (Foster 1988).

Recent Trends and Directions

Clearly the most notable trend in community studies is the impact of globalization and the acknowledgement, or assumption, in recent works that communities do not exist in a vacuum. This global perspective has led to the enlargement of the daily world of "community," but there is as yet no empirical evidence that community is disappearing either from the reality of everyday life or from the discipline of sociology. Community is, however, changing as the lived-in community and as the studied community.

Bell and Newby (1974) predicted that community studies would move in the direction of network analysis. A community might be one or several social fields in a social network. MacFarlane hailed the concept of network as "the first major advance in the language of sociology since the concept of role" (1977, 6). However, he described the methodological problems in network analysis as insurmountable. For example, one informant had 1,750 in his "personal network." In order to see to what extent they interacted with each other, a matrix of $1,750 \times 1,750$ was needed, exceeding the memory limits of most computers (1977, 7). Nevertheless, some social scientists have used network analysis, with varying degrees of sophistication, to study community or some segment of a community to capture both form (Macionis 1978, Burt 1977, Laumann and Pappi 1976) and content (Stack 1974).

Another topic that will no doubt become a part of community studies in the future is that of virtual communities—communities in cyberspace and on the World Wide Web. The viability of net communities is still an empirical question. No doubt, there are those individuals whose social worlds are constricted by disability or isolation who may form relationships through internet ties that function as communities. While there is currently an impressive array of books with titles suggesting they are about virtual communities, most are focused on the mechanics of establishing and maintaining such "communities" and provide little empirical data on the social organization of relations. Smith and Kollack's (1999) collection of essays and research include some that are sociological in perspective. A forthcoming volume promises to examine the social, political, and philosophical issues surrounding internet communities (Feenberg *et al.* 2004).

Traditional, in-depth community studies of the past are perhaps being replaced by less comprehensive, multiple or micro studies of today. Although multiple studies are useful for purposes of comparison or contrast, they typically lack the scope and depth of the more holistic community study. Also more prevalent today are narrowly defined studies of affinity communities focusing on one segment of a population, defined by its commonality or distinction: the working class, homeless men, retirees, or ethnic subcultures. This trend appears to support Keller's (2003) claim that affinity communities are becoming more common as people seek identity-enhancing relations in mass society.

Summary

Abrams once observed that the sociology of community has been characterized by a "body of theory which constantly predicts the collapse of community and . . . a body of empirical studies which finds community alive and well" (1984, 16). Despite the theoretical predictions and perhaps because of the empirical findings, there is nothing in this review of literature to suggest that interest in community studies is waning. Rather, community studies provide a powerful legacy and remain a viable and dynamic part of the sociological enterprise. Keller captures the enduring importance of the study of community by sociologists:

[W]e always come back to the local community as the foundation of more distant, complex, and abstract forms of collective association: attachment, a sense of belonging, and a deep, personalized, holistic focus. In a world that increasingly focuses on the global context, the local continues to be vital. (2003, 48)

Interest in the community as a phenomenon for sociological study shows the ebb and flow of time and competing interests. In some cases, the phenomenon studied has been a physical place or places and in others a symbolic expression of shared life space. There are, however, common and divergent threads in these endeavors. Collectively, community studies have captured much of the sociological phenomenon that we know and experience as community. These studies have functioned as a trajectory for the discipline as a whole in defining the enduring features of community and in describing

communities ordered or conflicted by stratification. Community studies pioneered the descriptive work of cultural diversity and ethnic conflicts and pioneered advances in methodology and professional ethics. Community sociologists refused to be bound by theoretical paradigms, while yielding to an observer-observed reciprocity that has contributed to a reflexive sociology. The body of work reviewed here represents much of the life's work of sociology. It is a body of work not without flaws or controversy, but an enduring legacy in a timeless effort to describe and explain the sociology of the everyday.

APPENDIX

Community Studies in Sociology

| Before 1900 | | | |
|-------------|---|----------------------------|---|
| Date | Name | Author | Theme |
| 1895 | Hull-House Maps and Papers | Residents of Hull-House | Survey data of Chicago's Hull House district with emphasis on wages and living conditions for European immigrants |
| 1967[1899] | The Philadelphia Negro | DuBois, W.E.B. | Conditions of life for Philadelphia's Black community using multiple sources of data |
| 1900–1909 | | | |
| 1968[1904] | Sociology of a NY City Block | Jones, Thomas J. | Social-psychological analysis of conditions in one heavily congested tenement area in New York |
| 1906 | An American Town | Williams, James M. | Community from social-psychological perspective with emphasis on growth and distribution of population |
| 1907 | Quaker Hill | Wilson, Warren H. | Community held together by religious and social bonds with emphasis on transition from primary to secondary contacts. |
| 1909 | The Study of the Population of Manhattanville | Woolston, Howard B. | Population change and competition in an area of New York City with an emphasis on biological determinism |

Appendix (cont.)

| Date | Name | Author | Theme |
|------------|---|------------------------|--|
| 1910–1919 | | | |
| 1910 | Our Slavic Fellow Citizens | Balch, Emily G. | Comparative study of immigrant life in the “old” and “new” worlds. |
| 1968[1912] | A Hoosier Village | Sims, Newell L. | Descriptive and historical study of a community in Indiana |
| 1923[1912] | Evolution of the Country Community | Wilson, Warren H. | Community study of organizations and institutions with emphasis on religious life |
| 1915 | The Social Anatomy of an Agricultural Community | Galpin, Charles J. | Delineation of rural communities in WI: village-farms services and communication |
| 1920–1929 | | | |
| 1961[1923] | The Hobo: The Sociology of Homeless Men | Anderson, Nels | Chicago’s Hobohemia in the 1920s |
| 1926 | The Expansion of Rural Life | Williams, James M. | The social psychology of rural development |
| 1928 | The Ghetto | Wirth, Louis | Jewish community in Chicago |
| 1929 | Middletown | Lynd, Robert and Helen | Holistic community study depicting life in middle America |
| 1930–1939 | | | |
| 1930 | Folk Culture on St Helena Island | Johnson, Guy B. | Isolated island off the coast of the Carolinas populated largely by Blacks since Civil War |

Appendix (cont.)

| Date | Name | Author | Theme |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| 1930–1939 (<i>cont.</i>) | | | |
| 1930 | A Social History of the Sea Islands | Johnson, Guion G. | History of above and other islands |
| 1930 | Black Yeomanry | Woofter, Thomas J. | History of entire Sea Island Research project |
| 1968[1932] | Sea Island to City | Keiser, Clyde V. | SC Sea Islanders migrated to NY City |
| 1932 | The Negro Family in Chicago | Frazier, E. Franklin | Problem-focused study of black families in Chicago in the late 20s |
| 1966[1934] | Shadow of the Plantation | Johnson, Charles S. | Negro life in Macon County, AL in the 30s |
| 1935 | Greenwich Village, 1920–1930 | Ware, Caroline F. | Field research in Greenwich Village 1920–30 |
| 1937 | Middletown in Transition | Lynd, Robert and Helen | Follow-up of earlier study |
| 1937 | Caste and Class in a Southern Town | Dollard, John | Race relations in a southern town with use of psychoanalytic concepts |
| 1940–1949 | | | |
| 1941 | Deep South | Davis, Allison; Burleigh B. and Mary R. Gardner | Race relations in Natchez, MS |
| 1941 | The Social Life of a Modern Community | Warner, W. Lloyd and Paul S. Lunt | Beginning of the Yankee City series in Newburyport MA |
| 1943 | Street Corner Society | Whyte, William F. | Study of the social organization of a slum in the 1930s |
| 1945 | Black Metropolis | Drake, St Clair and Horace R. Cayton | Study of Black life in segregated Chicago in the 1930s |

Appendix (cont.)

| Date | Name | Author | Theme |
|----------------------------|--|---|---|
| 1940–1949 (<i>cont.</i>) | | | |
| 1945 | Plainville USA | West, James | Midwest rural village of 65 households, poor, white and protestant |
| 1949 | Democracy in Jonesville | Warner, W. Lloyd et al. | Quality of life and inequality in a “typical” community in IL |
| 1949 | Elmtown’s Youth | Hollingshead, August B. | Impact of social class on adolescents in small town in Illinois using multiple methods of study |
| 1950–1959 | | | |
| 1951 | The Social History of a War-Boom Community | Havighurst, Robert and H. Gerthorn Morgan | War-time industry and its impact on new-comers and old-timers in churches, schools, businesses and social relations in Seneca, IL |
| 1953 | Community Power Structure | Hunter, Floyd | Power and decision-making in Atlanta, GA |
| 1955 | Black Ways of Kent | Lewis, Hylan | Ethnography of the Black subculture of a small mill town in the South |
| 1956 NY: Basic | Crestwood Heights | Seeley, John R., Alexander R. Sim, Elizabeth W. Loosley | Life in upper middleclass Canadian suburb with emphasis on family, child rearing, and mental health |
| 1956 | When Prophecy Fails | Festinger, Leon, H.W. Riecken, and S. Schachter | Participant observations inside a small group who believe they have an end-of-world prophesy and wait for it to happen |
| 1956 | The Organization Man | Whyte, William H. Jr. | A suburb, Park Forest, IL designed for upwardly mobile corporation men and their families |

Appendix (cont.)

| Date | Name | Author | Theme |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| 1950–1959 (<i>cont.</i>) | | | |
| 1958 | The Exurbanites | Spectorsky, A.C. | Three settlements of NY communications workers who moved beyond the suburbs to “rustic comfort” |
| 1958 | Small Town in Mass Society | Vidich, Arthur J. and Joseph Bensman | Penetration of external forces on a small community |
| 1960–1969 | | | |
| 1960 | Negro Leadership in a Southern City | Burgess, Elaine | Black leadership and power in Durham, NC |
| 1961 | Negro and White in Connecticut Town | Lee, Frank F. | Race relations in a small industrial town in CT |
| 1961 | Plainville Fifteen Years Later | Gallaher, Art, Jr. | Revisit of earlier study with emphasis on change in farm technology and social structure |
| 1962 | The Urban Villagers | Gans, Herbert J. | Ethnography of an inner city Italian neighborhood in Boston’s West End |
| 1966 | Doomsday Cult | Lofland, John | Practitioners of the Divine Precepts: conversion, proselytization and maintenance of faith |
| 1967 | The Levitowners | Gans, Herbert J. | Participant observation study of a new middle and working-class suburb, Levittown, NJ |
| 1967 | Tally’s Corner | Liebow, Elliot | Black inner-city neighborhood in Washington D.C. |
| 1969 | Soulside | Hannerz, Ulf | Ethnography of Washington D.C. ghetto |

Appendix (cont.)

| Date | Name | Author | Theme |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|---|
| 1960–1969 <i>(cont.)</i> | | | |
| 1969 | Coming Up Black | Schulz, David A. | Family life in St Louis housing project |
| 1970–1979 | | | |
| 1970 | Behind Ghetto Walls | Rainwater, Lee | Social world of a St Louis housing project |
| 1970 | You Owe Yourself a Drunk | Spradley, James P. | Alcoholics on Skid Row in Seattle, WA |
| 1971 | Idle Haven: Community | Johnson, Sheila K. | Patterns of neighboring in Idle Haven |
| Building | Among the Working-class Retired | | mobile home park, Oakland CA |
| 1972 | Hippies of the Haight | Cavan, Sherri | Drug culture and categories of residents of the Haight community in San Francisco |
| 1972 | Crisis in Watertown | Eden, Lynn | Polarization of community over firing of young minister |
| 1972 | A Community in Search of Itself | Lantz, Herman R. | Case study approach applied to Cairo, IL, a community of failed industry and conflicting race relations |
| 1973 | The Unexpected Community | Hochschild, Russell | Group of senior citizens who form community in a San Francisco housing project |
| 1973 | Black Community Control | Williams, Joyce E. | Issues and leadership in Black Texas community |
| 1973 | Hard Living on Clay Street | Howell, Joseph T. | Portraits of blue-collar families in a working class neighborhood of Washington D.C. |

Appendix (cont.)

| Date | Name | Author | Theme |
|----------------------------|---|---|---|
| 1970–1979 (<i>cont.</i>) | | | |
| 1974 | Across the City Line: A White Community in Transition | Zehner, Robert B. and F. Stuart Chapin, Jr. | Racial Transition in a white, working-class suburban community in Washington, D.C. |
| 1974 | Symbolic Communities | Hunter, Albert | Revisit to Chicago's local communities |
| 1974 | All Our Kin: Strategies for Survival in a Black Community | Stack, Carol | Networking and strategies for surviving poverty and other problems in a neighborhood comprised largely of single, black mothers |
| 1974 | Blue Collar Community | Kornblum, William | Relations between work and community on Chicago's South Side |
| 1975 | Elmtown's Youth and Elmtown Revisted | Hollingshead, August B. | Revisit and follow up on young people studied in the 40s |
| 1976 | Everything in its Path: Descruction of Community in the Buffalo Creek Flood | Erikson, Kai T. | Loss of community by the people of Buffalo Creek following a devastating flood |
| 1978 | Mexican Americans in a Dallas Barrio | Achor, Shirley | Participant observer study of a barrio in the midst of affluent Dallas, Texas |
| 1978 | A Place on the Corner | Anderson, Elijah | Participant observation of a group of people congregating around Jelly's bar on Chicago's South Side |

Appendix (cont.)

| Date | Name | Author | Theme |
|-----------|--|--|--|
| 1980–1989 | | | |
| 1982 | Middletown Families: Fifty Years of Change and Continuity | Caplow, T., H.M. Bahr, B.A. Chadwick, R. Hill, M.H. Williamson | Follow-up on original Middletown study with focus on families over time |
| 1982 | Norman Street: Poverty and Politics in an Urban Neighborhood | Susser, Ida | Working-class area of Brooklyn, NY, daily lives and collective actions of political experience |
| 1986 | Praying for Justice: Order and Community in an American Town | Greenhouse, Carol J. | Baptists in an Atlanta suburb and their structural means of conflict resolution |
| 1986 | Fisher Folk: Two Communities on Chesapeake Bay | Ellis, Carolyn | Comparative, historical analysis of two fishing communities |
| 1986 | Sugar Creek: Life on the Illinois Prairie | Faragher, John Mark | Analysis of archival materials of rural community in IL, 1817-post civil war |
| 1987 | Puerto Rican Chicago | Padilla, Felix M. | Two generations in a Chicago Puerto Rican neighborhood |
| 1987 | Buxton: Work and Racial Equality in a Coal Mining Community | Schwieder, Dorothy, Joseph Hraba, Elmer Schwieder | Documents and personal interviews used to reconstruct an Iowa community of the past, unique for racial integration and harmony |
| 1987 | Assimilation Blues: Black Families in a White Community | Tatum, Beverly D. | The experiences of middle class Black families in a predominantly white community |

Appendix (cont.)

| Date | Name | Author | Theme |
|----------------------------|---|---|--|
| 1980–1989 (<i>cont.</i>) | | | |
| 1987 | Black American Street Life: South Philadelphia 1969–1971 | Rose, Dan | Ethnography of black neighborhood focused on activities of an auto mechanic, his family, and associates |
| 1987 | The Unanticipated City: Loft Conversions in Lower Manhattan | Hudson, James R. | Loft conversion in three areas of lower Manhattan, 1950s–80s |
| 1988 | The Moral Order of a Suburb | Baumgartner, M.P. | Upper middle-class suburb near NY with focus on conflict suppression |
| 1988 | The Past is Another Country | Foster, Stephen W. | Ashe County NC in the 70s and the aftermath of a successful fight to halt the establishing of a hydroelectric system |
| 1988 | Upscaling Downtown Stalled Gentrification in Washington, D.C. | Williams, Brett | Multidirectional changes in a Black and working class neighborhood in Washington D.C. |
| 1988 | Beech Creek: A Study of a Kentucky Mountain Neighborhood | Brown, James S. | Small settlement of farm families in Eastern KY and a way of life that is disappearing |
| 1989 | The Village: An Oral Historical and Ethnographic Study of a Black Community | Watson, Wilbur H. | Holistic study of a small village near Cleveland settled by Blacks, Italians, and Germans |
| 1989 | Houston: Growth and Decline in a Sunbelt Boomtown | Shelton, Beth Anne, Nestor P. Rodriguez, Joe R. Feagin, Robert D. Bullard, Robert D. Thomas | Historical study of economic growth and decline of Houston, TX and its divergent populations |

Appendix (cont.)

| Date | Name | Author | Theme |
|-----------|--|------------------------------------|--|
| 1990–1999 | | | |
| 1990 | Street Wise | Anderson, Elijah | Life Styles in the Village-Northton: two communities, one poor and Black, one increasingly middle-class |
| 1990 | Protecting One's Turf: Social Strategies for Maintaining Urban Neighborhoods | DeSena, Judith N. | Ethnography focusing on methods residents use to protect their community against ethnic transition and crime |
| 1990 | City of Quartz: Excavating the Future in Los Angeles | Davis, Mike | Descriptive tour of LA as a market-driven, over-developed, underinvested infrastructure, and socially polarized |
| 1990 | Race, Redevelopment, and the New Company Town | Monti, Daniel J. | Five case studies of corporate redeveloped communities in St Louis |
| 1990 | Christiantown, USA | Stellway, Richard | Survey and interview data to produce an "insider" view of the family in Wheaton, IL |
| 1990 | Commonplaces: Community Ideology and Identity in American Culture | Hummon, David M. | Ideological components of communal beliefs in four diverse San Francisco communities |
| 1992 | The Death of an American Jewish Community | Levine, Hillel and Lawrence Harmon | The decline of Roxbury (Boston) as a prominent Jewish neighborhood after Jews moved to the suburbs and Blacks moved in |
| 1993 | Black Baltimore: A New Theory of Community | McDougall, Harold | Case study of the political process that created an impoverished community |

Appendix (cont.)

| Date | Name | Author | Theme |
|---------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|---|
| 1990–1999 (<i>cont.</i>) | | | |
| 1994 | Blockbusting in Baltimore: The Edmondson Village Story | Orser, W. Edward | Deliberately instigated White-Black transition of a west Baltimore neighborhood, 1955–65 |
| 1994 | Defending Community: The Struggle for Alternative Development in Cedar-Riverside | Stoecker, Randy | Case study of successful community organizing to save community from demolition and HUD renewal |
| 1994 | The First Suburban Chinatown: The Remaking of Monterey Park, CA | Fong, Timothy P. | Social and political conflicts over 30 years of community history |
| 1994 | From Urban Village to East Village: The Battle for New York's Lower East Side | Abu-Lughod, Janet | Three stages in the development, decline, and activism of a community |
| 1994 Boston: South End | Streets of Hope: The Fall and Rise of an Urban Neighborhood | Medoff, Peter and Holly Sklar | Role of a neighborhood group in the fight to save a Boston community |
| 1995 | The Heartland Chronicles | Foley, Douglas E. | Relations between whites and Mesquaki Indians in small Iowa community |
| 1995 | The Lost City: Discovering the Forgotten Virtues of Community in the Chicago of the 1950s | Ehrenhalt, Alan | Community and authority in three diverse Chicago communities of the 50s and today |
| 1995 | Urban Enclaves: Identity and Place in America | Abrahamson, Mark | Micro studies of 7 ethnically and culturally distinct neighborhoods in different cities |
| 1997 | Fortress America: Gated Communities in the United States | Blakely, Edward J. and Mary G. Snyder | Community exclusivity for purposes of lifestyle, prestige, or security |

Appendix (cont.)

| Date | Name | Author | Theme |
|----------------------------|--|---|---|
| 1990–1999 (<i>cont.</i>) | | | |
| 1997 | Virtual Politics: Identity and Community in Cyberspace | Holmes, David | Development of the Internet, WWW and implications for virtual communities |
| 1997 | Imagining Miami: Ethnic Politics in a Postmodern World | Croucher, Sheila | Historical and political analysis of Miami's power struggles, especially racial alliances |
| 1998 | Building Little Italy: Philadelphia's Italians Before Mass Immigration | Juliani, Richard N. | Historical, archival research about an Italian community prior to mass migration in early 1900s |
| 1998 | The Future of Us All: Race and Neighborhood Politics in NY City | Sanjek, Roger | Changes in Elmhurst's (Queens) ethnically diverse neighborhood |
| 1998 New | The Enduring Community: The Jews of Newark and Metro West | Helmreich, William B. | History of Jewish community now dispersed and its new center of business and Jewish institutions |
| 1998 | Reconstructing Chinatown: Ethnic Enclave, Global Change | Lin, Jan | NY's Chinatown in global context |
| 1998 | The Winu and Their Neighbors | Chase-Dunn, Christopher and Kelly M. Mann | Application of world-systems theory to a study of the Wintu, a sedentary hunting-gathering group in Northern California |
| 1998 | Between Two Nations: The Political Predicament of Latinos in New York City | Jones-Correa, Michael | Experiences in the lives of first-generation Latin American immigrants who are not bound by a territorial community |

Appendix (cont.)

| Date | Name | Author | Theme |
|----------------------------|--|--|---|
| 1990–1999 (<i>cont.</i>) | | | |
| 1998 | Left Behind in Rosedale: Race Relations and the Collapse of Community Institutions | Cummings, Scott | Racial transition and disintegration of TX community from 1970s to 1990s |
| 1999 | Communities in Cyberspace | Smith, Marc A. and Peter Kollock | Patterns of social interaction and organization in cyberspace |
| 1999 | Black Picket Fences | Pattillo-McCoy, Mary | Black middle-class community in Chicago |
| 1999 | Los Vegas: The Social Production of an All-American City | Gottdiener, Mark, Claudia C. Collins, and David R. Dickens | Historical, economic, political, and cultural analysis of Las Vegas |
| 1999 | Nuer Journeys, Nuer Lives: Sudanese Refugees in Minnesota | Holtzman, Jon D. | Community of Sudanese refugees resettled in MN |
| 1999 | Steelworker Alley | Bruno, Robert | Steelworkers in Youngstown, OH |
| 1999 | Worlds Apart: Why Poverty Persists in Rural America | Duncan, Cynthia M. | Study of class differences in three communities in Appalachia and New England |
| 1999 | Working Hard and Making Do: Surviving in Small Town America | Nelson, Margaret K. and Joan Smith | Working class families in a rural county in Vermont: sex roles, bartering, resources, and jobs |
| 1999 | The Global Ethnopolis: Chinatown, Japantown, and Manilatown in American Society | Lanuerre, Michael S. | San Francisco's Chinatown, Japantown, and defunct Manilatown, posited on a continuum of globalization, deglobalization, and reglobalization |

Appendix (cont.)

| Date | Name | Author | Theme |
|-----------------|--|--------------------|--|
| 2000 and beyond | | | |
| 2001 | Suburban Alchemy: 1960s New Towns and the Transformation of the American Dream | Bloom, Nicholas D. | History of three planned communities in Virginia, Maryland, and California |
| 2001 | Red Lines, Black Spaces: The Politics of Race and Space in a Black Middle-Class Suburb | Haynes, Bruce D. | Racial subordination in a black, middle-class section of Yonkers, NY |
| 2003 | Community | Keller, Suzanne | Theory, concepts and study of a designer community in NJ |
| 2003 | Newcomers to Old Towns | Salamon, Sonya | Micro studies of change in 6 very different mid-western communities |

REFERENCES

- Abbott, Andrew. 1999. *Department and Discipline: Chicago Sociology at One Hundred*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Abrams, Paul. 1984. "Introduction to the 1978 edition." Pp. 5–19 in Philip Abrams and Richard Brown (eds.). *UK Society: Work, Urbanism and Inequality*. London: Wiedenfeld & Nicolson.
- Abrahamson, Mark. 1995. *Urban Enclaves: Identity and Place in America*. New York: St. Martins Press.
- Abu-Lughod, Janet. 1994. *From Urban Village to East Village*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Achor, Shirley. 1978. *Mexican Americans in a Dallas Barrio*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Adams, Romanzo. 1928. *The Education of the Boys of Honolulu and Their Economic Outlook*. University of Hawaii Research Publication 4.
- . 1933. *The Peoples of Hawaii*. Honolulu: Institute of Pacific Relations.
- . 1934. "The Unorthodox Race Doctrine of Hawaii." In Edward Byron Reuter (ed.) *Race and Culture Contacts*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- . 1937. *Interracial Marriage in Hawaii: A Study of the Mutually Conditioned Processes of Acculturation and Amalgamation*. New York: Macmillan.
- Addams, Jane. 1907. *Newer Ideals of Peace*. New York: Macmillan.
- . 1910. *Twenty Years at Hull-House*. New York: Macmillan.
- . 1912. *A New Conscience and an Ancient Evil*. New York: Macmillan.
- . 1930. *The Second Twenty Years at Hull-House*. New York: Macmillan.
- Allen, Polly Wynn. 1988. *Building Domestic Liberty: Charlotte Perkins Gilman's Architectural Feminism*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Alexander, Elizabeth. 1995. "We Must Be About Our Father's Business. Anna Julia Cooper and the In-Corporation of the Nineteenth-Century African-American Woman Intellectual." *Signs* Vol. 20(2): 336–356.
- Alinsky, Saul. 1934. "A Sociological Technique in Clinical Criminology." Pp. 167–78 in *Proceedings of the Sixty-Fourth Annual Congress of the American Prison Association* (September 17–21).
- Allport, Gordon. 1958. *The Nature of Prejudice*, Abridged Edition. New York: Doubleday/Anchor.
- Alonso, Harriett Hyman. 1995. "Nobel Peace Laureates, Jane Addams and Emily Greene Balch," *The Journal of Women's History* 7 (Summer), 6–26.
- American Journal of Sociology. 1907. "Members." *American Journal of Sociology* 12(5): 736–38.
- American Sociological Association. 1968a. "Minutes of the First 1968 ASA Business Meeting." *The American Sociologist*, November.
- . 1968b. "Minutes of the First 1969 Council Meeting." *American Sociologist*, November.
- . 1970a. "Minutes of the Second Business Meeting." *American Sociologist*, February.
- . 1970b. "Minutes of the 1970 Council Meeting." *American Sociologist*, February.
- . 1972. "Report of the Committee on the Status of Racial and Ethnic Minorities In the Profession." *The American Sociologist*, August.
- American Sociological Society. 1906a. "Organization of the American Sociological Society. Official Report." *American Journal of Sociology* 11(4): 555–69.

- . 1906b. "The American Sociological Society." *American Journal of Sociology* 11(5): 681–82.
- Ames, Edward S. 1944. "Eulogy." Pp. 3–6 in *Robert Ezra Park (1864–1944)*. Privately published memorial pamphlet.
- Anderson, Elijah. 1978. *A Place on the Corner*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . 1996. "Introduction to the 1996 edition of *The Philadelphia Negro*." Pp. ix–xxxvi in W.E.B. DuBois, *The Philadelphia Negro*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Anderson, Nels. 1961[1923]. *The Hobo*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- [Anon.] 1899. Review of *West African Studies* by Mary H. Kingsley. *L'Année Sociologique* 3 (1898–99): 224–26.
- Aptheker, Bettina. 1982. *Woman's Legacy: Essays on Race, Sex and Class in American History*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- (ed.) 1977. *Lynching and Rape: An Exchange of Views by Jane Addams and Ida B. Wells*. New York: The Institute for Marxist Studies.
- Arizpe, Lourdes. 1981. "The Rural Exodus in Mexico and Mexican Migration to the United States." *International Migration Review* 15: 626–49.
- Arroyo-Alejandro, Jesus. 1979. "Synthesis of Some Relevant Ideas on Mexican Migration to the United States: A Research Proposal." Pp. 201–13 in Barry W. Poulson and T. Noel Osburn (eds.), *U.S.-Mexico Economic Relations*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.
- Ashley, David and David M. Orenstein. 1998. *Sociological Theory: Classical Statements, Fourth Ed.* Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Association of Black Sociologists. 1997. "The Membership Responds." *The Association of Black Sociologists* (July).
- Association of Black Sociologists. 2000. *Constitution and Bylaws*.
- Association of Black Sociologists. 2002. *Race & Society* 5.
- Avante Systems, Inc. and Cultural Research Associates. 1978. *A Survey of the Undocumented Population in Two Texas Border Areas. Study Done for the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Texas State Advisory Committee*.
- Bach, Robert L. 1978. "Mexican Immigration and the American State." *International Migration Review* 12: 536–58.
- , and Lisa A. Schraml. 1982. "Migration, Crisis and Theoretical Conflict." *International Migration Review* 16: 320–41.
- Bain, Read. 1927. "Trends in American Sociology." *Social Forces* 5(3): 413–422.
- Baker, Ray Stannard. 1913. "Mrs. Clara Cahill Park." *American Magazine* 75 (March): 33–35.
- Bakker, J.I. Hans. 1987. "Canadian Political Economy and Rural Sociology: Early History of Rural Studies in Canada." *The Rural Sociologist* 7(5): 470–84.
- Balch, Emily G. 1910. *Our Slavic Fellow Citizens*. New York: Charities Publications Committee.
- Ballard, Allen B. 1973. *The Education of Black Folk: The Afro-American Struggle for Knowledge in White America*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Bannister, Robert C. 1987. *Sociology and Scientism. The American Quest for Objectivity, 1880–1940*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- . 1991. *Jessie Bernard: The Making of a Feminist*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Baragar, Fletcher. 1996. "The Influence of Thorstein Veblen on the Economics of Harold Innis." *Journal of Economic Issues* 30(3): 667–83.
- Baran, Paul A. and Paul M. Sweezy. 1966. *Monopoly Capital: An Essay on the American Economic and Social Order*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Barnes, Harry Elmer. 1925. *The New History and the Social Studies*. New York: Century.
- . 1937. *A History of Historical Writing*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

- . 1948. *Historical Sociology: Its Origins and Development, Theories of Social Evolution from Cave Life to Atomic Bombing*. New York: Philosophical Library.
- , and Howard Becker. 1938. *Social Thought from Lore to Science*. Boston: D.C. Heath & Company.
- Bauman, Zygmunt. 1993. "Walter Benjamin, The Intellectual," *New Formations* 20: 47–58.
- Baumgartner, M.P. 1988. *The Moral Order of a Suburb*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Becker, Carl. 1960[1910]. "Kansas." Pp. 340–59 in Everett Rich (ed.) *The Heritage of Kansas: Selected Commentaries on Past Times*. Lawrence: University of Kansas Press. Originally published in *Essays in American History Dedicated to Frederick Jackson Turner*. New York: Henry Holt & Company.
- Becker, Ernest. 1971. *The Lost Science of Man*. New York: Brazillier.
- Becker, Howard P. 1941. "Review of *Theory and Processes of History*, by Frederick Teggart." *American Sociological Review* 6 (October): 731–738.
- Bell, Colin and Howard Newby. 1972. *Community Studies: An Introduction to the Sociology of the Local Community*. New York: Praeger Publishers.
- Bellah, Robert N. et al. 1985. *Habits of the Heart*. New York: Harper & Row.
- et al. 1991. *The Good Society*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Bernard, Jessie. 1929. "The History and Prospects of Sociology in the United States." Pp. 1–71 in George A. Lundberg, Read Bain, and Nels Anderson (eds.) *Trends in American Sociology*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- . 1973. *The Sociology of Community*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.
- Bernard, Luther L. 1909. "The Teaching of Sociology in the United States." *American Journal of Sociology* 15(2): 164–213.
- . 1948. "Sociological Trends in the South." *Social Forces* 27(1): 12–19.
- (ed.) 1934. *The Fields and Methods of Sociology*. New York: Ray Long & Richard R. Smith.
- . 1936. "Henry Hughes, First American Sociologist." *Social Forces* 15: 154–74.
- . 1937. "The Historic Pattern of Sociology in the South." *Social Forces* 16: 1–12.
- . 1945. "The Teaching of Sociology in the United States in the Last Fifty Years." *American Journal of Sociology* 50(6): 534–48.
- . 1948. "The Teaching of Sociology at Southern Colleges and Universities." *American Journal of Sociology*. 23: 491–515.
- , and Jessie Bernard. 1943. *The Origins of American Sociology: The Social Science Movement in the United States*. New York: Crowell.
- Besnard, Philippe. ed. 1983. *The Sociological Domain. The Durkheimians and the Founding of French Sociology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bethune, Mary McLeod. 1992. "A Century of Progress of Negro Women" (1933); "Breaking the Bars to Brotherhood" (1935); "My Last Will and Testament" (1953) in Walker (ed.). 1992.
- Blackmar, Frank. 1914. "Reasonable Department of Sociology for Colleges and Universities." *American Journal of Sociology* 20(2): 261–63.
- , and John Lewis Gillin. 1924. *Outlines of Sociology*. Revised Ed. New York: Macmillan.
- Blackwell, Gordon W. 1955. "In Memoriam: Howard Washington Odum, 1884–1954." *American Journal of Sociology* 60(5): 504–05.
- Blackwell, James E. 1974. "Role Behavior in a Corporate Structure: Black Sociologists in the ASA." Pp. 341–67 in Blackwell and Janowitz (eds.). 1974.
- , and Morris Janowitz (eds.). 1974. *Black Sociologists: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . 1975. *The Black Community: Diversity and Unity*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Blasi, Anthony J. 1988. *Moral Conflict and Christian Religion*. New York: Peter Lang.

- . 2000. "Praxis and Pragmatism: The Sociological Career of Charles H. Parrish, Jr." *Sociological Origins* 2(1): 15–28.
- . 2002. *A History of Sociological Research and Teaching at Catholic Notre Dame University, Indiana*. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press.
- Blumer, Herbert. 1939. "The Nature of Racial Prejudice." *Social Process in Hawaii* 5: 11–20.
- . 1979 [1939]. *Critiques of Research in the Social Sciences: An Appraisal of Thomas and Żnaniński's The Polish Peasant in Europe and America*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.
- Bolles, A. Lynn. 1988. "Ellen Irene Diggs." Pp. 59–64 in *Women Anthropologists: A Biographical Dictionary*. Ed. Ute Gacs et al. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Bonnell, Victoria E., and Lynn Hunt. 1999. *Beyond the Cultural Turn: New Directions in the Study of Society and Culture*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Bontemps, Arna, ed. 1972. *The Harlem Renaissance Remembered*. New York: Dodd, Mead.
- Boulding, Kenneth. 1965. "The Medium and the Message." *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science* 31(2): 268–73.
- Bouquillon, Thomas. 1899. "Moral Theology at the End of the Nineteenth Century." *Catholic University Bulletin* 5(4): 244–68.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1991. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bowser, Benjamin P. 2002. "Studies of the African Diaspora: The Work and Reflections of St. Clair Drake." Pp. 128–57 in Robert E. Washington and Donald Cunliffe (eds.) *Confronting the American Dilemma of Race*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Boyd-Melba, Joyce. 1994. "Canon Configuration for Ida B. Wells-Barrett." *The Black Scholar* 24 (Winter): 8–13.
- Bowen, Louise deKoven. 1913. "The Colored People of Chicago." *Survey* 31 (1 November): 117–20.
- . 1913. *The Colored People of Chicago*. Chicago: Juvenile Protective Association. Pamphlet.
- . 1926. *Growing Up With a City*. New York: Macmillan.
- Brazil, Wayne D. *Howard W. Odum: The Building Years, 1884–1930*. New York: Garland Press.
- Broderick, Francis L. 1959. *W.E.B. DuBois: Negro Leader in a Time of Crisis*. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.
- . 1974. "W.E.B. DuBois: History of an Intellectual" Pp. 3–24 in Blackwell and Janowitz (eds.). 1974.
- Brooks, Lee, and Alvin Bertrand. 1962. *History of the Southern Sociological Society*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.
- Broschart, Kay Richards. 1991. "Ida Wells-Barnett (1862–1931)." Pp. 432–39 in Deegan (ed.). 1991.
- . 1997. "The Impact of Region, Race and Gender on the Construction of History: The Case of Early Black Women Sociologists." Paper presented at the Ninety-Second Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association.
- . 2002. "Research in the Service of Society: Women at the Institute for Research in Social Science." *American Sociologist* 33(3): 100–15.
- Brown, James S. 1988. *Beech Creek: A Study of a Kentucky Mountain Neighborhood*. Berea, KY: Berea College Press.
- Brown, Victoria. 1999. "Advocate for Democracy: Jane Addams and the Pullman Strike." Pp. 130–58 in Richard Schneirov, Shelton Stromquist, and Nick Salvatore (eds.) *The Pullman Strike and the Crisis of the 1890s: Essays on Labor and Politics*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Bruhn, John G., and Howard M. Rebach. 1996. *Clinical Sociology: An Agenda for Action*. New York: Plenum.

- Bruno, Robert. 1999. *Steelworker Alley*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Buck, Paul. 1962. "Harvard Attitudes toward Radcliffe in the Early Years." *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society* 33–50.
- . (ed.). 1965. *The Social Sciences at Harvard 1860–1920*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bukharin, Nikolai. 1929. *Imperialism and World Economy*. New York: International Publishers.
- Bullock, Edna D., ed. 1915. *Selected Articles on Mothers' Pensions*. White Plains, NY: Wilson Co.
- Bullock, Henry A. 1970. *A History of Negro Education in the South From 1619 to the Present*. New York: Praeger.
- Bulmer, Martin. 1984. *The Chicago School of Sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Burawoy, Michael, et al. 2000. *Global Ethnography*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . 2003. "Revisits: An Outline of a Theory of Reflexive Ethnography." *American Sociological Review* 68: 645–79.
- . 2004. "Public Sociologies: Contradictions, Dilemmas, and Possibilities." *Social Forces* 82: 1603–18.
- Burgess, Elaine. 1960. *Negro Leadership in a Southern City*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Burgess, Ernest W. 1956. "Charles Spurgeon Johnson: Social Scientist, Editor and Educational Statesman." *Phylon* 17(4): 317–21.
- Burke, William J., and Will David Howe (eds.). 1972. *American Authors and Books: 1640 to the Present Day*. New York: Crown Publishers.
- Burnet, Jean. 1952. *Next-Year Country: A Study of Rural Social Organization in Alberta*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Burns, Tony. 1996. "The Theoretical Underpinnings of Chicago Sociology in the 1920s and 30s." *The Sociological Review* 44(3): 474–94.
- Burt, Ronald. 1977. "Positions in Multiple Networks." *Social Forces* 56: 551–75.
- Bustamante, Jorge A. 1972. "The 'Wetback' as Deviant: An Application of Labeling Theory." *American Journal of Sociology* 77: 706–18.
- . 1975. *Mexican Immigration and the Social Relations of Capitalism*. Ph.D. dissertation. University of Notre Dame.
- . 1985. *Mexican Transboundary Migrants: A Bilateral Approach to an International Labor Market Phenomenon*. Tijuana, Baja California: Centro de Estudios Fronterizos del Norte de Mexico.
- , and Geronimo C. Martinez. 1979. "Undocumented Immigration from Mexico: Beyond Borders but within Systems." *Journal of International Affairs* 33: 265–84.
- "Cahill, Edward." P. 132 in *Who Was Who in America, Vol. 1, 1897–1942*. Chicago: Marquis Co., 1943.
- Calhoun, Craig. 1996. "The Rise and Domestication of Historical Sociology." Pp. 305–37 in Terrence J. McDonald (ed.) *The Historic Turn in the Human Sciences*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Camic, Charles. 1987. "The Making of a Method: A Historical Reinterpretation of the Early Parsons." *American Sociological Review* 52(4): 421–39.
- . 1989. "Structure after 50: The Anatomy of a Charter." *American Journal of Sociology* 95 (July), 38–107.
- . 1991. "Introduction" to Charles Camic (ed.), *Talcott Parsons: The Early Essays*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Campbell, James. 1992. *The Community Reconstructs*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Caplow, Theodore, et al. 1982. *Middletown Families: Fifty Years of Change and Continuity*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Cardenas, Gilbert. 1977. *A Theoretical Approach to the Sociology of Mexican Labor Migration*. Ph.D. dissertation. University of Notre Dame.

- . 1980. "Social, Economic and Demographic Characteristics of Undocumented Mexicans in the Houston Labor Market: A Preliminary Report." Houston: Gulf Coast Legal Foundation.
- , and Estevan Flores. 1978. "Political Economy of International Labor Migration." In Antonio Rios-Bustamante, ed., *Immigration and Public Policy: Human Rights for Undocumented Workers and Their Families*. University of California at Los Angeles: Chicano Studies Research Center.
- Carey, James T. 1975. *Sociology and Public Affairs. The Chicago School*. Beverley Hills: Sage Library of Social Research.
- Carey, James W. 1993. Book Review of *History and Communications: Harold Innis, Marshall McLuhan, the Interpretation of History and The Bias of Communication: The Classic Work on Communication by the Man who Inspired Marshall McLuhan*. *Canadian Historical Review* 74(3): 437–42.
- . 1999. "Innis 'in' Chicago: Hope as the Sire of Discovery." Pp. 81–104 in Charles R. Aclana and William J. Buxton (eds.), *Harold Innis in the New Century: Reflections and Refractions*. Montreal and Kingston, ON: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Carnes, Tony. 1994. "Frederick J. Teggart on 'Entering California': Self-reflections on Migrations, Race, Gender and the Humanistic Sciences." Unpublished American Sociological Association paper.
- Carroll, Jackson W., Carl S. Dudley and William McKinney. 1986. *Handbook for Congregational Studies*. Nashville: Abingdon Press.
- Carter, Linda M. 1999. "E. Franklin Frazier." Pp. 428–31 in Jessie Carney Smith (ed.). 1999.
- Cavan, Sherri. 1972. *Hippies of the Haight*. New York: E.P. Dutton.
- Cayton, Horace. 1970. *Long Old Road*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Chapin, F. Stuart. 1911. "Report on Questionnaire of Committee on Teaching." *American Journal of Sociology* 16(6): 774–93.
- Chapoulie, Jean-Michel. 1996. "Everett Hughes and the Chicago Tradition." *Sociological Theory*. 14(1): 3–29.
- . 2000. "L'étrange carrière de la notion de classe sociale dans la tradition de Chicago en sociologie." *Archives européennes de sociologie* 41(1): 53–70.
- Chase-Dunn, Christopher and Kelly N. Mann. 1998. *The Winu and Their Neighbors*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Chateauvert, Melinda. 1988. "The Third Step: Anna Julia Cooper and Black Education in the District of Columbia, 1910–1960." Pp. 261–76 in Darlene Clark Hine (ed.), *Black Women in United States History*, vol. I. Brooklyn, NY: Carlson Publishing.
- Chaves, Mark. 2004. *Congregations in America*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Chicago Broadaxe. 1903. "Oratorical Failure: Booker T. Washington's Feeble Efforts at Raleigh, N.C." *Broadaxe* (November 14): 1.
- Chicago Commission on Race Relations. 1922. *The Negro in Chicago*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Church, Robert L. 1965. "The Economists Study Society: Sociology at Harvard, 1891–1902." Pp. 18–91 in *Social Sciences at Harvard 1860–1920*, ed. Paul Buck. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Clark, Carroll D. 1965. "History of the Sociology Department: The University of Kansas, 1889–1965." *Kansas Journal of Sociology*. 1(3): 90–101. [University of Kansas Archives. Carroll DeWitt Clark Papers. Box 5, Folder 26.]
- Clark, Elizabeth J., Jan Marie Fritz, and P.P. Rieker (eds.). 1990. *Clinical Sociological Perspectives on Illness & Loss: The Linkage of Theory and Practice*. Philadelphia: Charles Press.

- Clark, Terry Nichols. 1973. *Prophets and Patrons. The French University and the Emergence of the Social Sciences*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Cleveland *Journal*. 1906. "Future of the Negro—Prof. Jesse Lawson, of Washington, Advocates Religious Alliance with Catholic Church." *Cleveland Journal* (March 10): 1.
- Clinton, Catherine. 1984. *The Other Civil War: American Women in the Nineteenth Century*. New York: Hill & Wang.
- Cohen, Robin. 1980. "Migration, Late Capitalism, and Development." Address to the Plenary Session of the Annual Conference of the Development Studies Association (September).
- Coleman, James. 1996. "A Vision for Sociology." Pp. 343–49 in Jon Clark (ed.) *James S. Coleman*. Washington, D.C.: Falmer Press.
- Coleman, Paulette. 1999. "Kelly Miller." Pp. 815–19 in Jessie Carney Smith (ed.). 1999.
- Collins, Patricia Hill. 1998. *Fighting Words: Black Women and the Search for Justice*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Collins, Randall. 1994. *Four Sociological Traditions*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- . 1998. "Introduction" to John Bendix, "Comparison in the Work of Reinhard Bendix." *Sociological Theory* 16(3): 298–301.
- Colored American. 1903a. "Colored Sociologists to Meet." *Colored American* (Oct. 10, 1903): 10.
- . 1903b. "A Big Conference." *Colored American* (Nov. 7): 7.
- . 1903c. "The Sociological Conference." *Colored American* (Nov. 21): 8.
- . 1903d. "The Southern Problem: Historian Johnson Takes a Hopeful View of the South and Advocates the Gospel of Peace—Excerpts from His Address Before the Sociological Society." *Colored American* (Nov. 21): 14–15.
- . 1904. "Mrs. Lawson's Itinerary." *Colored American* (May 7): 5.
- Conant, Melvin. 1955. *Race Issues on the World Scene*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Conny, Peter Thomas. 1977. "Frederick John Teggart, Librarian, Historian and Prophet of Social Institutions, Third President of California Library Association." *California Librarian* (January).
- "Constitution of the American Sociological Society." 1907. *American Journal of Sociology* 12 (March): 735–36.
- Converse, Jean M. 1987. *Survey Research in the United States: Roots and Emergence 1890–1960*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Conyers, James E. 1992. "The Association of Black Sociologists: A Descriptive Account from an Insider." *American Sociologist* (Spring): 49–55.
- and Joseph W. Scott, with Sandra V. Walker. 1997a. "Excerpts from 'A Brief History of the ABS'." *The Association of Black Sociologists Spring Newsletter* (April): 1–2.
- and Joseph W. Scott, with Sandra V. Walker. 2001. "A Brief History of the Association of Black Sociologists, 1970–2001." Pp. 3–10 in Association of Black Sociologists, *African Americans in 2001: Issues and Social Policy*.
- Cookingham, Mary E. 1987. "Social Economists and Reform: Berkeley, 1906–1961," *History of Political Economy* 19 (1987), 47–65.
- Cooper, Anna Julia. 1988 [1892]. *A Voice From the South*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- . 1992 (1892). "The Ethics of the Negro Question" Pp. 59–80 in Walker. ed. 1992.
- Cooper, George and Gavan Daws. 1985. *Land and Power in Hawaii: The Democratic Years*. Honolulu: Benchmark Press.
- Cornelius, Janet Duitsman. 2004. Review of *Race, Hull-House, and the University of Chicago*. *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society* 96 (Winter): 402–03.

- Cornelius, Wayne A. 1977. "Memorandum To Administration Officials Concerned With Policy On Illegal Aliens." Addendum to Briefing Paper Prepared for National Security Council.
- . 1978. *Mexican Migration to the United States: Causes, Consequences, and U.S. Responses*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Migration and Development Study Group, Center for International Studies, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- . 1979a. "La Migración Ilegal Mexicana a Los Estados Unidos: Conclusiones de Investigaciones Recientes, Implicaciones Políticas y Prioridades de Investigación." Pp. 69–109 in Centro de Estudios Internacionales de El Colegio de México, *Indocumentados: Mitos y Realidades*. México, D.F.: El Colegio de México.
- . 1979b. "La Nueva Mitología de la Emigración Indocumentada Mexicana a Los Estados Unidos." Pp. 111–131 in Centro de Estudios Internacionales de El Colegio de México, *Indocumentados: Mitos y Realidades*. México, D.F.: El Colegio de México.
- . 1979c. *Mexican and Caribbean Migration to the United States: A Report to the Ford Foundation*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- . 1980a. *Immigration, Mexican Development Policy, and the Future of U.S.-Mexican Relations*. La Jolla, California: University of California, San Diego.
- . 1980b. "Mexican Immigration: Causes and Consequences for Mexico," Pp. 69–84 in Roy Simon Bryce-Laporte, ed., *Sourcebook on The New Immigration: Implications for the United States and the International Community*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Books.
- . 1981. *Mexican Migration to the United States: The Limits of Government Intervention*. La Jolla, California: University of California, San Diego.
- . 1983. "Competing Paradigms for the Study of Mexican Immigration." Pp. 187–200 in Armando Valdez, Albert Camarillo, and Tomas Almaguer, eds., *The State of Chicano Research on Family, Labor and Migration*. Stanford, California: Stanford Center for Chicano Research.
- . 1987. *The United States Demand for Mexican Labor. Prepared for the Workshop on Migration Issues, Bilateral Commission on the Future of U.S.-Mexican Relations*. La Jolla, California: University of California, San Diego.
- , and Juan Diez-Canedo. 1976. *Mexican Migration to the United States: The View from Rural Sending Communities*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Center for International Studies, Migration and Development Study Group.
- , Carmen Ines Cruz, Juanita Castano, and Elsa M. Chaney. 1976. *The Dynamics of Migration: International Migration*. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution, Interdisciplinary Communications Program, Occasional Monograph Series, No. 5, Vol. 2.
- Craig, John E. 1983. "Sociology and Related Disciplines between the Wars: Maurice Halbwachs and the Imperialism of the Durkheimians." In *The Sociological Domain*, ed. Philippe Besnard. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crane, Jeffrey L. 1992. "Sociology in Hawai'i: Beginnings." Pp. 1–10 in Jeffrey L. Crane, Alton M. Okinaka, Jan H. Mejer, and Anthony J. Blasi, *Sociology of Hawaii. Facts and Commentary*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Crow, Graham. 2002. "Community Studies: Fifty Years of Theorization." *Sociological Research on Line* 7(3) (<http://www.socresonline.org.uk/7/3/crow.html>).
- Crummett, Maria de los Angeles. 1984. *Agrarian Class Structure and Migration: A Comparative Regional Analysis From Aguascalientes, Mexico*. Ph.D. dissertation. New School for Social Research.
- Cue, Reynaldo Antonio. 1977. *Men from an Underdeveloped Society: The Socioeconomic and Spatial Origins and Initial Destination of Undocumented Mexican Immigrants*. M.A. Thesis, University of Texas, Austin.
- Cuff, Robert D. 1979. "Veblen and Toronto." *Canadian Review of American Studies* 10(3): 347–53.

- Cummings, Scott. 1998. *Left Behind in Rosedale*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Cunnigen, Donald. 2003. "The Legacy of Ernst Borinski: The Production of an African American Tradition." *Teaching Sociology* 31: 397–411.
- Dangberg, Grace. 1983. *A Guide to the Life and Works of Frederick J. Teggart*. Reno, Nevada: Grace Dangberg Foundation.
- Daniel, Walter G. and Robert P. Daniel. 1946. "The Curriculum of the Negro College." *Journal of Educational Sociology* 19(8): 496–502.
- Daniels, Sadie Iola. 1931. *Women Builders*. Washington, D.C.: Associated Publishers.
- Dannett, Sylvia. 1964, 1966. *Profiles of Negro Womanhood. Volume 1, 1619–1900. Volume 2, 20th Century*. Yonkers, NY: Educational Heritage.
- Davis, Ada J. 1930. "The Evolution of the Institution of Mothers' Pensions in the United States." *American Journal of Sociology* 35 (January): 573–87.
- Davis, Allen 1973. *American Heroine: The Life and Legend of Jane Addams*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Davis, Allison, Burleigh B. Gardner, and Mary R. Gardner. 1941. *Deep South* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Davis, Arthur K. 1971. "Canadian Society and History as Hinterland versus Metropolis." Pp. 6–32 in Richard J. Ossenberrg (ed.), *Canadian Society: Pluralism, Change and Conflict*. Scarborough, ON: Prentice-Hall.
- Davis, Elizabeth Lindsay. 1933. "Mrs. Rosetta E. Lawson." Pp. 215–18 in *Lifting as They Climb*, by Elizabeth Lindsay Davis, with an introduction by Sieglinde Lemke. New York: G.K. Hall, 1996.
- Daws, Gavan. 1969. *Shoals of Time: A History of the Hawaiian Islands*. New York: Macmillan.
- de Beauvoir, Simone. 1952 [1949]. *The Second Sex*, tr., ed. H.M. Parsheley. New York: Modern Library.
- de Montlibert, Christian (ed.). 1997. *Maurice Halbwachs 1877–1945. Colloque de la Faculté des Sciences Sociales de Strasbourg (Mars 1995)*. Strasbourg: Presses Universitaires de Strasbourg.
- Deegan, Mary Jo. 1978. "Women in Sociology, 1890–1930." *Journal of the History of Sociology* 1 (Fall): 11–34.
- . 1981. "Early Women Sociologists and the American Sociological Society." *American Sociologist* 16 (February): 14–24.
- . 1983. "Sociology at Wellesley College, 1900–1919." *Journal of the History of Sociology* 6 (Spring): 91–115.
- . 1985. Review of *The Chicago School of Sociology* by Martin Bulmer. *Contemporary Sociology* 14 (May): 365–66.
- . 1987a. "An American Dream." *Humanity and Society* 11 (August): 353–65.
- . 1987b. "Not a Sociologist: The Historical Redefinition of Early Women, Activists, and Humanist Sociologists." Keynote address, James B. McKee Symposium, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan.
- . 1988a. *Jane Addams and the Men of the Chicago School, 1892–1920*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.
- . 1988b. "W.E.B. Du Bois and the Women of Hull-House, 1896–1899." *American Sociologist* 19 (Winter): 301–11.
- . 1991. "(Ellen) Irene Diggs (1906–???)". Pp. 124–30 in Deegan (ed.). 1991.
- (ed.). 1991. *Women in Sociology*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- . 1994. "The Marginal Man as a Gendered Concept." Pp. 15–34 in Gubert and Tomasi (eds.). 1994.
- . 1995. "The Second Sex and the Chicago School: Women's Accounts, Knowledge, and Work, 1945–1960." Pp. 322–64 in Fine (ed.). 1995.
- . 1996a. "Dear Love, Dear Love: Feminist Pragmatism and the Chicago Female World of Love and Ritual." *Gender & Society* 10 (Oct.): 590–607.
- . 1996b. "A Very Different Vision of Jane Addams and Emily Greene Balch." *Journal of Women's History* 8 (Summer): 121–25.

- . 1997. "Gilman's Sociological Journey from *Herland* to *Ourland*." Pp. 1–57 in *With Her in Ourland: Sequel to Herland* by Charlotte Perkins Gilman, ed. Mary Jo Deegan and Michael R. Hill. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- . 1998 "Mary E.B.R.S. Coolidge's *Why Women Are So*." *Sociological Origins* 1(1): 4–8.
- . 1999. "Play from the Perspective of George Herbert Mead." Pp. xix–cxii in *Play, School, and Society*, ed. and introduced by Mary Jo Deegan. New York: Peter Lang Press.
- . 2000a. "Oliver C. Cox and the Chicago School of Race Relations, 1892–1960." Pp. 271–88 in Herbert M. Hunter (ed.) 2000.
- . 2000b. "Transcending a Patriarchal and Racist Past: African American Women in Sociology, 1890–1920." *Sociological Origins* 2 (Summer): 37–54.
- . 2001. "The Chicago School of Ethnography." Pp. 11–25 in *The Handbook of Ethnography*, ed. Paul Atkinson, Amanda Coffey, Sara Delamont, John Lofland, and Lyn Lofland. London, U.K.: Sage.
- . 2002a. *Race, Hull-House, and the University of Chicago: A New Conscience Against Ancient Evils*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- . 2002b. "Fannie Barrier Williams: A Chicagoan's View of the African American Experience, 1893–1926." Pp. xiii–lx in Mary Jo Deegan (ed.) *A New Woman of Color*. DeKalb, IL: Northeastern Illinois University.
- . 2003a. "The Human Drama Behind the Study of Humans as Potato Bugs: The Curious Marriage of Robert E. Park and Clara Cahill Park. Unpublished paper. [Revised version in this volume]
- . 2003b. "Textbooks, the History of Sociology, and the Sociological Stock of Knowledge." *Sociological Theory* 21 (Sept.): 298–305.
- , and Michael R. Hill. 1991a. "Doctoral Dissertations as Liminal Journeys of the Self." *Teaching Sociology* 19 (July): 322–32.
- , and Michael R. Hill. 1991b. "Lucile Eaves 1969–1953." Pp. 140–47 in Deegan (ed.). 1991.
- , and Linda J. Rynbrandt. 2000. "For God and Community." Pp. 1–25 in Vasilikie Demos and Marcia Texler Segal (eds.) *Social Change for Women and Children*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- , and Ana-Maria Wahl. 2003. "Arts and Crafts in Chicago and Britain: The Sociology of Ellen Gates Starr at Hull-House." Pp. 1–35 in Ellen Gates Starr, *On Art, Labor and Religion*, ed. and introduced by Mary Jo Deegan and Ana-Maria Wahl. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Degler, Carl. 1980. *At Odds: Women and the American Family From the Revolution to the Present*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- de Janvry, Alain and Carlos Garramon. 1977. "Laws of Motion of Capital in the Center-Periphery Structure." *Review of Radical Political Economics* 9: 29–38.
- . 1982. *Migrants and Stay-at-Homes: A Comparative Study of Rural Migration From Michoacan, Mexico*. La Jolla, California: University of California, San Diego, Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies, Monograph Series, 5.
- Dennis, Rutledge. 2004. "ABS Transfers Archival Documents and Photos to Howard's Moorland-Spingarn Research Center." *The Griot: Association of Black Sociologists* (June): 6.
- Deutrich, Mabel, and Virginia Purdy. 1980. *Clio Was a Woman: Studies in the History of American Women*. Washington, DC: Howard University Press.
- Devine, Edward T. 1913a. "Pensions for Mothers." *Survey* 30 (5 July): 57–60.
- . 1913b. "State Funds to Mothers." *Survey* 31 (1 March): 747–48.
- Dickerson, Bette Jeanne. 1986. *The Demographic Characteristics Affecting the Voluntary Organization Memberships of Black Americans*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Washington State University.
- . 1994. "Ethnic Identity and Feminism: Views from Leaders of African American Women's Association." Pp. 84–96 in Gay Young and Bette J. Dickerson (eds.), *Color, Class & Country: Experiences of Gender*. London: Zed Books.

- Diggins, John P. 1978. *The Bard of Savagery: Thorstein Veblen and Modern Social Theory*. New York: Seabury Press.
- Diner, Stephen. *A City and Its Universities*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1980.
- . [1921] 2003. *Darkwater Voices from within the Veil*, intro. Joe R. Feagin. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books.
- Dolan, Timothy M. 1981. *Prophet of a Better Hope: The Life of William J. Kerby*. Unpublished M.A. thesis, Catholic University of America.
- Dollard, John. 1937. *Caste and Class in a Southern Town*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Doyle, Bertram W. 1933. "The Introductory Course in Sociology in Negro Colleges and Universities." *Journal of Educational Sociology* 7(1): 30–36.
- Drake, St. Clair. 1983. "The Tuskegee Connection." *Society* 20 (May/June): 82–92.
- and Horace R. Cayton. 1945. *Black Metropolis*. New York: Harcourt Brace.
- DuBois, William Edward Burghardt. 1899, 1967, 1996. *The Philadelphia Negro*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press; New York: Benjamin Blom; Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- . [1903a] 1995. "The Laboratory in Sociology at Atlanta University." Pp. 165–68 in Lewis (ed.). 1995.
- . [1903b] 2003. *The Negro Church*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
- . 1903. *Souls of Black Folk*. Chicago: A.C. McClurg.
- . 1904a. *Some Notes on Negro Crime in Georgia: The Atlanta University Publications*, No. 9. Atlanta: Atlanta University Press.
- . 1904b. "The Parting of the Ways." *World Today* (April): 521–23.
- . 1905a. *A Select Bibliography of the American Negro: The Atlanta University Publications*, No. 10. Atlanta: Atlanta University Press.
- . 1995 [1905b]. "Atlanta University." Pp. 237–52 in Lewis (ed.). 1995.
- . 1906. *The Health and Physique of the Negro American: The Atlanta University Publications*, No. 11. Atlanta: Atlanta University Press.
- . 1907. *Economic Co-operation among Negro Americans: The Atlanta University Publications*, No. 12. Atlanta: Atlanta University Press.
- . 1940. *Dusk of Dawn: An Essay Toward an Autobiography of a Race Concept*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Company.
- . 1968. *The Autobiography of W.E.B. DuBois*. New York: International.
- . 1978. *On Sociology and the Black Community*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Dunster, Alfreda A. (ed.). 1970. *The Autobiography of Ida B. Wells*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Durkheim, Emile. [1897] 1997. *Suicide*. New York: Free Press.
- . [1915] 1965. *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*, tr. Joseph Ward Swain. New York: Free Press.
- Eaves, Lucile. 2000. "My Sociological Life History—1928." *Sociological Origins* 2(2): 65–70.
- Edwards, G. Franklin. 1974. "E. Franklin Frazier." Pp. 85–117 in Blackwell and Janowitz (eds.). 1974.
- Ehrenhalt, Alan. 1995. *The Lost City*. New York: Basic Books.
- Eisenstadt, S.N. 1961. *Essays on Sociological Aspects of Political and Economic Development*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Ellis, Carolyn. 1986. *Fisher Folk: Two Communities on Chesapeake Bay*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Ellwood, Charles A. 1907. "How Should Sociology be Taught as a College or University Subject?" *American Journal of Sociology* 12: 588–606.
- Enriquez, Eugene, Gilles Houle, Jacques Rheume, and Robert Sevigny (eds.). 1993. *L'analyse clinique dans les sciences humaines*. Montreal: Editions Saint-Martin.
- Epstein, Cynthia F. 1973. "Successful Black Professional Women." *American Journal of Sociology*. 78: 912–934.

- Estrada, Leobardo F., Gilbert Cardenas, and L. Manuel Garcia y Griego. 1978. "Measuring the Volume and Social Impact of Undocumented Immigration: Confusions Leading to Unfounded Exaggerations." Unpublished Manuscript.
- Faragher, John Mark. 1986. *Sugar Creek: Life on the Illinois Prairie*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky.
- Faris, Ellsworth. 1938. "Assimilation." *Social Process in Hawaii* 4: 6–11.
- Faris, Robert E.L. 1967. *Chicago Sociology: 1920–1932*. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press.
- Farrell, John C. 1967. *Beloved Lady*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Feagin, Joe R. 2001. "Social Justice and Sociology: Agendas for the Twenty-First Century." *American Sociological Review* 66 (February): 1–20.
- , and Hernan Vera. 2001. *Liberation Sociology*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- , Hernan Vera, and Pinar Batur. 2001. *White Racism*, 2nd ed. New York: Routledge.
- Feenberg, Andrew et al. 2004. *Community in the Digital Age*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Fenton, Steve. 1983. "The Sociology of Hawaii: Some Reflections." *Social Process in Hawaii* 30: 86–100.
- Festinger, Leon, Henry W. Riecken, Stanley Schachter. 1956. *When Prophecy Fails*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Fine, Gary A. 1994. "The Social Construction of Style: Thorstein Veblen's The Theory of the Leisure Class as Contested Text." *Sociological Quarterly* 35(3): 457–72.
- (ed.). 1995. *A Second Chicago School? The Development of a Postwar American Sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Fish, Virginia. 1991. "Frances R. Donovan 1880–1965)." Pp. 131–47 in Deegan (ed.). 1991.
- Fitzpatrick, Ellen. 1990. *Endless Crusade*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Fleming, Robert. 1996. *The Wisdom of the Elders: Inspiring Reflections from the Heart of African American Culture*. New York: One World.
- Flores, Estevan. 1978. "The Limitations of the Push/Pull Demographic Approach, Mexican Immigration and the Circulation of Class Struggle." Paper Presented at the I Simposio Internacional Sobre Las Problemas de los Trabajadores Migratorios de Mexico y Los Estados Unidos de Norte America. Universidad de Guadalajara, Guadalajara, Jalisco, Mexico. July 11–14, 1978.
- . 1982. *Post-Bracero Undocumented Mexican Immigration to the United States and Political Recomposition*. Ph.D. dissertation. University of Texas, Austin.
- . 1983. "The Impact of Undocumented Migration on the U.S. Labor Market." *Houston Journal of International Law* 5(2).
- . 1984. "Research on Undocumented Immigrants and Public Policy: A Study of the Texas School Case." *International Migration Review* 18: 505–23.
- Foster, John B. and Henryk Szlajfer (eds.). 1984. *The Faltering Economy: The Problem of Accumulation Under Monopoly Capitalism*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Foster, Stephen W. 1988. *The Past is Another Country*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Frank, Andre Gunder. 1967. *Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America* New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Frazier, E. Franklin. 1939. *The Negro Family in the United States*. Preface by Ernest W. Burgess. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- . 1945. "My Most Humiliating Jim Crow Experience." *Negro Digest* 4 (Nov.): 81–82.
- . 1957. *Black Bourgeoisie*. New York: Free Press.
- . 1963. *The Negro Church in America*. New York: Schocken.
- Frey, Connie D. 2001. "The Birth of Southern Sociology: The Southern Sociological Congress, A Professional Society." Paper presented to the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association. Anaheim, California.

- Friedan, Betty. 1963. *The Feminine Mystique*. New York: Norton.
- Fritz, Jan Marie. 1985. *The Clinical Sociology Handbook*. New York: Garland.
- . 1988. "Charles Gomillion, Educator-Community Activist." *Clinical Sociology Review* 13–21.
- . 1989. "Dean Winternitz, Clinical Sociology and the Julius Rosenwald Fund." *Clinical Sociology Review* 7: 17–27.
- . 1990a. "In Pursuit of Justice: W.E.B. Du Bois." *Clinical Sociology Review* 8: 15–26.
- . 1990b. "Notes from the History of American Sociology: Frank Blackmar's Last Years at the University of Kansas." *Mid-American Review of Sociology* 14(1–2): 13–26.
- . 1991a. "The History of American Clinical Sociology: The First Courses." *Clinical Sociology Review* 9: 5–26.
- . 1991b. "The Emergence of American Clinical Sociology." Pp. 17–32 in Rebach and Bruhn (eds.). 1991.
- . 1991c. "Elizabeth Briant Lee." Pp. 249–255 in Deegan (ed.). 1991.
- . 2002. "Community Matters." Pp. 235–64 in Straus (ed.) *Using Sociology: An Introduction from the Applied and Clinical Perspectives*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- . 2004. "Jane Addams." In Roger Caves (ed.) *Encyclopedia of the City*. London: Routledge.
- (ed.). 2001. *The Clinical Sociology Resource Book*, 5th ed. Washington, D.C.: American Sociological Association Teaching Resources Center and the Sociological Practice Association.
- Fuchs, Lawrence H. 1961. *Hawaii Pono: A Society History*. New York: Harcourt, Brace Jovanovich.
- Fulcomer [Folkmar], Daniel. 1894. "Instruction in Sociology in Institutions of Learning." *Proceedings of the National Conference of Charities and Correction*. Boston: George Ellis.
- Fullinwider, S.P. 1969. *The Mind and Mood of Black America*. Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press.
- Furfey, Paul Hanly. 1953. *The Scope and Method of Sociology: A Metasociological Treatise*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- . 1967. "Kerby, William Joseph." *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. 8. New York: McGraw-Hill, pp. 164–65.
- Furner, Mary O. 1975. *Advocacy and Objectivity: A Crisis in the Professionalization of American Social Science, 1865–1905*. Lexington, KY: University of Kentucky Press.
- Gabel, Leona. 1980. "Cooper, Anna Julia Haywood." Pp. 163–65 Sicherman and Green (eds.). 1980.
- Gallaher, Art, Jr. 1964. "Plainville: The Twice-Studied Town." Pp. 285–305 in Arthur J. Vidich, Joseph Bensman, and Maurice R. Stein (eds.) *Reflections on Community Studies*. New York: Wiley.
- Galpin, Charles. 1915. "The Social Anatomy of an Agricultural Community." *Research Bulletin* 34 Madison: University of Wisconsin Agricultural Experiment Station.
- Gamio, Manuel. 1930. *Mexican Immigration to the United States*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gans, Herbert J. 1962. *The Urban Villagers*. New York: Free Press.
- . 1967. *The Levittowners*. New York: Pantheon.
- Garraty, John, and Mark Carnes (eds.). 1999. *American National Biography*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gaulejac, Vincent de, and Shirley Roy (eds.). 1993. *Sociologies cliniques*. Paris: Hommes et perspectives.
- Gearty, Patrick W. 1953. *The Economic Thought of Monsignor John A. Ryan*. Washington: Catholic University of America Press.
- Gee, Wilson. 1932. *Research Barriers in the South*. New York: Century Co.
- . 1934. *Social Science Research Organizations in American Universities and Colleges*. New York: Appleton-Century.

- Gemorah, Solomon. 1969. "Frederick J. Teggart: Scientific Historian of the 'New History.'" *South Atlantic Quarterly* 68: 478–90.
- Gerschenkron, Alexander. 1962. *Economic Backwardness in Historical Perspective: A Book of Essays*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press.
- Gettys, Warner E. 1934. "Community Study." Pp. 67–82 in L.L. Bernard (ed.) *The Fields and Methods of Sociology*. New York: Ray Long & Richard R. Smith.
- Giddens, Anthony. 1971. *Capitalism and Modern Social Theory: An Analysis of the Writings of Marx, Durkheim and Max Weber*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1987. *Sociology: A Brief but Critical Introduction*, 2nd ed. San Diego, CA: Harcourt Brace Javanovich.
- Giddings, Paula. 1984. *When and Where I Enter: The Impact of Black Women on Race and Sex in America*. New York: Morrow.
- Gilkeson, John S. 1995. "American Social Scientists and the Domestication of 'Class' 1929–1955." *Journal of The History of The Behavioral Sciences* 31: 331–46.
- Gilman, Charlotte Perkins. 1966/c. 1898. *Women and Economics*. New York: Harper Torchbooks.
- . 1935. *The Living of Charlotte Perkins Gilman: An Autobiography*. With a foreword by Zona Gale. New York: D. Appleton-Century.
- . 2004. *Social Ethics: Sociology and the Future of Society*. Ed. and intro. Michael R. Hill and Mary Jo Deegan. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Glassner, Barry and Jonathan A. Freedman 1979. *Clinical Sociology*. New York: Longman.
- Gluckman, Max. 1958 [1940 and 1942]. *Analysis of a Social Situation in Modern Zululand*. The Rhodes-Livingstone Papers 28. Manchester, England: Manchester University Press for The Rhodes-Livingstone Institute.
- Goffman, Erving. 1959. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- . 1977. "The Arrangement Between the Sexes." *Theory and Society* 4 (Fall): 301–31.
- Gomillion, Charles Goode. 1942. The Influence of the Negro on the Culture of the South. *Social Forces* 20(3): 386–90.
- . 1947. "The Negro and Civil Rights." Pp. 292–301 in Jessie P. Guzman (ed.) *Negro Year Book*. Tuskegee, Alabama: Tuskegee Institute.
- . 1957. The Negro Voter in Alabama." *Journal of Negro Education* 26(3): 281–86.
- . 1962. "The Tuskegee Voting Story." *Freedomways* 2(3): 231–36.
- . 1965. "Civic Democracy in Tuskegee." *Freedomways* 2(3): 412–16.
- Goodwin, Joanne L. 1997. *Gender and the Politics of Welfare Reform*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Gordon, David L.A. 2002. "William Lyon Mackenzie King, Planning Advocate." *Planning Perspectives* 17(2): 97–122.
- Gould, Meredith. 1980. "Review Essay: The New Sociology." *SIGNS: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 5: 459–67.
- Gouldner, Alvin 1965. "Explorations in Applied Social Science." *Social Problems* 3(3): 169–81. [Reprinted pp. 5–22 in Alvin Gouldner and S.M. Miller (eds.) *Applied Sociology*. New York: Free Press, 1965.]
- . 1970. *The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gove, Walter R. 1985. "The Effect of Age and Gender on Deviant Behavior: A Biopsychosocial Perspective." In *Gender and the Life Course*, ed. Alice S. Rossi. New York: Aldine.
- Grafmeyer, Yves, and Isaac Joseph. eds. 1990. *L'école de Chicago*. Paris: Editions Aubier.
- Graham, Otis L., Jr. 1977. "Illegal Immigration." *Center Magazine* (July/August): 56–66.

- Grebler, Leo. 1966. *Mexican Immigration to the United States: The Record and Its Implications*. (University of California at Los Angeles: Mexican American Study Project, Advanced Report No. 2).
- Greek, Cecil E. 1992. *The Religious Roots of American Sociology*. New York: Garland.
- Green, Elizabeth Alden. 1979. *Mary Lyon and Mount Holyoke: Opening the Gates*. Hanover, NH: University Press of New England.
- Green, Loraine Richardson. 1919. *The Rise of Race Consciousness in the American Negro*. M.A. Thesis, Department of Sociology, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.
- Greenhouse, Carol J. 1986. *Praying for Justice: Order and Community in an American Town*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Gregory, Steven. 1996. Book Review of *From Urban Village to East Village: The Battle for New York's Lower East Side*. *Contemporary Sociology* 25(3): 372–74.
- Grimes, Charlotte. 1993. "James Laue: Leader in Conflict Resolution." *St. Louis Post Dispatch* (Sept. 29): 11a.
- Gubert, Renzo, and Luigi Tomasi (eds.). 1994. *Robert E. Park e la teoria del "melting pot"/Robert E. Park and the "Melting Pot" Theory*. Sociologia 9. Trento, Italy: Reverdito Edizioni.
- Guy-Sheffall, Beverly. 1982. "Black Women and Higher Education: Spelman and Bennett Colleges Revisited." *Journal of Negro Education* 51 (Summer): 278–87.
- Guzman, Jessie Parkhurst. 1984. *Crusade for Civic Democracy: The Story of the Tuskegee Civic Association, 1941–1970*. New York: Vantage.
- Hallwachs, Maurice. 1932a. "Chicago, expérience ethnique." *Annales d'histoire économique et sociale* 4: 11–49.
- . 1932b. "La sociologie en Allemagne et aux Etats-Unis." *Annales d'histoire économique et sociale* 4: 81–82.
- . 1970 [1938]. *Morphologie sociale*. Paris: Librairie Armand Colin.
- . 1971 [1942]. *La topographie légendaire des Evangiles en Terre Sainte*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Haney, David Paul. 1998. *Democratic Ideals, Scientific Identities, and the Struggle for a Public Sociology in the United States, 1945–1962*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Texas.
- Hankins, Frank H. 1925. "Sociology." In Harry Elmer Barnes (ed.), *The History and Prospects of the Social Sciences*. New York: Knopf.
- Hard, William. 1913. "Motherless Children of Living Mothers." *Delineator* (January): 19.
- . "Financing Motherhood." 1913. *Delineator* (April): 263, 314.
- Harlan, Louis R., Stuart B. Kaufman, and Raymond W. Smock (eds.). 1972–1989. *The Booker T. Washington Papers*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Harris, Trudier (ed.). 1991. *Selected Works of Ida B. Wells*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Harvey, Lee. 1987. *Myths of the Chicago School of Sociology*. Aldershot, U.K.: Gower.
- Harwarth, Irene, Mindi Maline, and Elizabeth DeBra. 1997. *Women's Colleges in the United States: History, Issues, and Challenges*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.
- Hatfield, Henry Rand. 1935. "Jessica Blanche Peixotto" in E.T. Grether *et al.* (eds.) *Essays in Social Economics: In Honor of Jessica Blanche Peixotto*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Havighurst, Robert J. and Anton J. Jansen. 1967. "Community Research: A Trend Report and Bibliography." *Current Sociology* 15(2): 1–126.
- Hawkins, B. Denise. 1995. "Black Sociologists Ponder: Scholarly Path to Change." *Black Issues in Higher Education* (September 7): 24–27.
- Haynes, Elizabeth Ross. 1997. *Unsung Heroes, The Black Boy of Atlanta, "Negroes in Domestic Service in the United States"*. New York: G.K. Hall & Company.

- . 1923. "Negroes in Domestic Service in the United States." *Journal of Negro History*. 8 (October): 384–442.
- Haynes, George E. 1946. "Clinical Methods in Interracial and Intercultural Relations." *Journal of Educational Sociology* 19(5).
- Hayter, Roger and Trevor J. Barnes. 1997. "Introduction." Pp. 1–10 in Roger Hayter and Trevor J. Barnes (eds.) *Troubles in the Rainforest: British Columbia's Forest Economy in Transition*. Victoria, BC: Western Geographical Press.
- Healey, J.A. 2002. *Race, Ethnicity, Gender, and Class*, 3rd Ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Heilbron, Johan. 1985. "Les métamorphoses du durkheimisme, 1920–1940." *Revue française de sociologie* 26: 203–37.
- Helmreich, William B. 1998. *The Enduring Community: The Jews of Newark and Metro West*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Henslin, James M. 2005. *Sociology*, 7th Ed. Boston: Pearson Allyn & Bacon.
- Herring, Cedric. 2000. "Doing the Possible: The Presidential Legacy of the Association of Black Sociologists." Presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Black Sociologists.
- Hesslink, George K. 1968. *Black Neighbors*. New York: Bobbs-Merrill.
- Heyer, Paul. 1993. "Empire, History, and Communications Viewed from the Margins: The Legacies of Gordon Childe and Harold Innis." Retrieved August 23, 2003 (<http://www.mcc.murdoch.edu.au/ReadingRoom/7.1/Heyer.html>).
- Hildebrand, Dietrich von. 1969. *Die Idee der sittlichen Handlung. Sittlichkeit und ethische Werkerkenntnis*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Hill, Michael R. 1989. *Roscoe Pound and American Sociology: A Study in Archival Frame Analysis, Sociobiography, and Sociological Jurisprudence*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Nebraska-Lincoln.
- . 1993. *Archival Strategies and Techniques*. Intro. John Van Maanen, Peter K. Manning, and Marc L. Miller. (Qualitative Research Methods Series, Vol. 31). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- . 1996. "The Autobiography of W.E.B. DuBois." Pp. 438–41 in *Masterplots*. Rev. 2nd ed., ed. Frank N. Magill. Pasadena, CA: Salem Press.
- . 1999. "Bio-Bibliography: Eva J. Ross—Catholic Sociologist." *Sociological Origins* 1(2): 106–10.
- . 2000a. "Lucile Eaves and Nebraska Sociology." *Sociological Origins* 2(2): 61–64.
- . 2000b. "The Intellectual Context of Émile Durkheim's Review of George Elliott Howard's *American Institutional Perspective on Marriage and Divorce*." *Sociological Origins* 2(2) 75–80.
- . 2001a. "Martineauian Sociology and Our Disciplinary Future." Pp. 191–93 in Michael R. Hill and Susan Hoecker-Drysdale (eds.), *Harriet Martineau: Theoretical & Methodological Perspectives*. New York: Routledge.
- . 2001b. "Of Time, Space, and the History of Sociology: Methodological Rules in Archives and Archival Research." Pp. 326–36 in Janusz Mucha, Dirk Käsler, and Włodzimierz Winclawski (eds.), *Mirrors and Windows: Essays in the History of Sociology*. Torun, Poland: Nicholas Copernicus University Press.
- . 2003. "Lists: Starting Points for Researching and Writing the Histories of Academic Departments." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, Atlanta, GA, August, 2003.
- Hiller, Harry H. 1982. *Society and Change: S.D. Clark and the Development of Canadian Sociology*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Himes, Joseph S. 1949. "Development and Status of Sociology in Negro Colleges." *Journal of Educational Sociology* 23(1): 17–32.
- Hine, Darlene Clark (ed.). 1993. *Black Women in America: An Historical Encyclopedia*. Brooklyn: Carlson Publishing.
- (ed.). 1990–1995. *Black Women in United States History*. Volumes 1–16. Brooklyn, NY: Carlson Publishing.

- , and Kathleen Thompson. 1998. *A Shining Thread of Hope: The History of Black Women in America*. New York: Broadway Books.
- Hinkle, Roscoe C. 1980. *Founding Theory of American Sociology, 1881–1915*. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- . 1994. *Developments in American Sociological Theory, 1915–1950*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Hobson, Fred. 1979. "Howard Washington Odum (1884–1954)," pp. 331–33 in *Southern Writers: A Biographical Dictionary*. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press.
- Hobson, J.A. 1971. *Imperialism*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Hochschild, Russell. 1973. *The Unexpected Community*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Hodgen, Margaret T. 1968. "Frederick J. Teggart." *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences* 15: 598–99.
- Hollingshead, August B. 1948. "Community Research: Development and Present Condition." *American Sociological Review* 13(2): 136–56.
- . 1949. *Elmtown's Youth*. New York: Wiley.
- Holt, Thomas C. 1999. "DuBois, W.E.B." Pp. 944–49 in *American National Biography*, Vol. 6. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hormann, Bernhard. 1968. *Community Forces in Hawaii*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- . 1979a. "Retrospect and Prospect." *Social Process in Hawaii* 27: 24–27.
- . 1979b. "Selections from 'The Caucasian Minority.'" *Social Process in Hawaii* 27: 28–37.
- Horowitz, Helen Lefkowitz. 1984. *Alma Mater: Design and Experience in the Women's Colleges from their Nineteenth-Century Beginnings to the 1930s*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Horowitz, Irving Louis (ed.) 1969. *Sociological Self-Images. A Collective Portrait*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hougen, Harvey R. 1977. "The Impact of Politics and Prison Industry on the General Management of the Kansas State Penitentiary, 1883–1909." *Kansas Historical Quarterly* 43(3): 297–318. http://www.kancoll.org/khq/1977/77_3_hougen.htm
- House, Floyd N. 1926. "Review of *Theory of History* by Frederick Teggart." *American Journal of Sociology* 32 (July): 131–32.
- Howard, George Elliott. 1999. "Amos G. Warner: A Biographical Sketch." *Sociological Origins* 1(2): 77–84.
- Howell, Joseph T. 1973. *Hard Living on Clay Street*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press.
- Howerth, I.W. 1894. "Present Condition of Sociology in the United States." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 5: 112–121.
- Huber, Joan. 1976. "Review Essay: Sociology." *SIGNS: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*. 3: 685–697.
- Hudgins, John L. 1994. "The Segmentation of Southern Sociology? Social Research at Historically Black Colleges and Universities." *Social Forces* 72 (March): 885–93.
- Hudson, James R. 1987. *The Unanticipated City: Loft Conversions in Lower Manhattan*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Hughes, Everett C. 1944. "Eulogy" Pp. 7–10 in *Robert Ezra Park (1864–1944)*. Privately published memorial pamphlet.
- . 1950. "Preface." Pp. xi–xiv in *Race and Culture*, ed. Everett C. Hughes, Charles S. Johnson, Jitsuiichi Masuoka, Robert Redfield, and Louis Wirth. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- . 1961. "The Nature of Racial Frontiers." Pp. 51–57 in Jitsuiichi Masuoka and Preston Valien (eds.) *Race Relations: Problems and Theory. Essays in Honor of Robert E. Park*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- . 1964. "Robert E. Park." *New Society* (31 December): 543–49.
- Hughes, Helen MacGill. 1940. *News and the Human Interest Story*, introduced by Robert E. Park. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- . 1973a. "Maid of All Work or Departmental Sister-in-Law?" *American Journal of Sociology* 78 (Jan.): 5–10.
- . 1975. "Caroline Baer Rose, 1913–1975." *Social Problems* 22 (Apr.): 469–70.
- Hull, Gloria, et al. 1982. *All the Women Are White, All the Blacks Are Men, But Some of Us Are Brave: Black Women's Studies*. Old Westbury, NY: Feminist Press.
- Hummon, David M. 1990. *Commonplaces: Community Ideology and Identity in American Culture*. New York: Free Press.
- Hunter, Albert J. 1974. *Symbolic Communities*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- , and Gerald D. Suttles. 1972. "The Expanding Community of Limited Liability" Pp. 44–81 in *The Social Construction of Communities* by Gerald Suttles. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hunter, Floyd. 1953. *Community Power Structure: A Study of Decision Makers*, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Hunter, Herbert M. (ed.). 2000. *The Sociology of Oliver C. Cox: New Perspectives*. Stamford, CT: JAI Press.
- Hutchinson, Louise Daniel. 1981. *Anna J. Cooper: A Voice from the South*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Indianapolis *Freeman*. 1903a. "Both Races Unite in the National Sociological Society at Washington." *Indianapolis Freeman* (Nov. 5): 1.
- . 1903b. "The Washington Conference of the National Sociological Society. . . ." *Indianapolis Freeman* (Nov. 21): 1.
- Innis, Harold A. 1928. "Industrialism and Settlement in Western Canada." *Report of the International Geographical Congress*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1929. "A Bibliography of Thorstein Veblen." *Southwestern Political and Social Science Quarterly* 10(1): 56–68.
- . 1938. "The Penetrative Powers of the Price System." *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science* 4(3): 299–319.
- . 1940. *The Cod Fisheries. The History of an International Economy*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- . 1950. *Empire and Communications*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- . 1951. *The Bias of Communication*. Introduction by Marshall McLuhan. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- . 1956 [1930]. *The Fur Trade in Canada: An Introduction to Canadian Economic History*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- . 1979. "The Wheat Economy." Pp. 273–79 in M.Q. Innis (ed.), *Essays in Canadian Economic History*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Jackson, Eric R. 1999. "Frazier, E. Franklin." Pp. 420–21 in *American National Biography*. Vol. 8. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Jackson, Jacqueline J. 1974. "Black Female Sociologists." Pp. 267–95 in Blackwell and Janowitz (ed.). 1972.
- Jaisson, Marie. 1999. "Temps et espace chez Maurice Halbwachs (1925–1945)." *Revue d'histoire des sciences humaines* 1: 163–78.
- James, Edward, et al. 1971. *Notable American Women, 1607–1950*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press.
- Janowitz, Morris. 1967. *The Community Press in an Urban Setting. The Social Elements of Urbanism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Jarmon, Charles. 2003. "Sociology at Howard University: From E. Franklin Frazier and Beyond." *Teaching Sociology* 31: 366–74.
- Jefferson, Paul. n.d. (a). "Sociology, Race, and the New Liberalism: 'Doing Good After A Plan' at Hampton Institute, 1893–1917." Unpublished manuscript.
- . n.d. (b). *The Janus-Face of a Counter-Discourse: African-American Sociology, 1895–1945*. Table of Contents and Introduction. Unpublished work in progress.
- . 1986. Working Notes on the Prehistory of Black Sociology: The Tuskegee Negro Conference. *Knowledge and Society: Studies in the Sociology of Culture Past and Present* 6: 19–151.

- . 1996. "Present at the Creation: Rethinking DuBois's 'Practice Theory.'" *Research in Race and Ethnic Relations* 9: 127–69.
- Jewell, Terri L. 1993. *The Black Woman's Gumbo Ya-Ya: Quotations by Black Women*. Freedom, CA: The Crossing Press.
- Johnson, Charles S. 1944. "Eulogy." Pp. 26–31 in *Robert Ezra Park (1864–1944)*. Privately published memorial pamphlet.
- . 1946. "The Faculty." *Journal of Educational Sociology* 47: 471–83.
- Johnson, Guy B. 1930. *Folk Culture on St. Helena Island*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Johnson, Sheila K. 1971. *Idle Haven: Community Building Among the Working-Class Retired*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Johnson, Yolanda Yvette. 2003. *Oliver Cromwell Cox on Marriageable Males in the African American Community: A Chicago Tradition*. Unpublished M.A. thesis. University of Nebraska-Lincoln.
- Johnston, Barry V. 1995. *Pitirim A. Sorokin. An Intellectual Biography*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.
- , and Guion G. Johnson. 1980. *Research in Service to Society*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Jones, Butler A. 1974. "The Tradition of Sociology Teaching in Black Colleges: The Unheralded Professionals." Pp. 121–64 in Blackwell and Janowitz (eds.). 1974.
- Jones, Jacqueline. 1985. *Labor of Love, Labor of Sorrow: Black Women, Work and the Family From Slavery to the Present*. New York: Basic Books.
- Jones, Robert A. 1983. "The New History of Sociology." *Annual Review of Sociology* 9: 447–69.
- Jones, Thomas Jesse. 1905. "Social Studies in the Hampton Curriculum, I: Why They Are Needed." *Southern Workman* 34: 686–90.
- . 1906. "Social Studies in the Hampton Curriculum, II: Civics and Social Welfare." *Southern Workman* 35: 49–55.
- . 1968 [1904]. *The Sociology of a New York City Block*. New York: AMS Press.
- Jordan, John M. 1999. "Odum, Howard Washington." Pp. 626–27 in *American National Biography*. Vol. 16. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Juliani, Richard N. 1998. *Building Little Italy: Philadelphia's Italians Before Mass Immigration*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Käsler, Dirk. 1981. "Methodological Problems of a Sociological History of Early German Sociology." Paper presented at the Department of Education, University of Chicago, Nov. 5.
- Katz, Michael B. and Thomas J. Sugrue. 1998. *W.E.B. DuBois, Race, and the City*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Keil, Thomas J. 1988. *On Strike! Capital Cities and the Wilkes-Barre Newspaper Unions*.
- Keith, Bruce 1991. "Susan Kingsbury 1870–1949." Pp. 217–24 in Deegan (ed.). 1991.
- Keller, Frances Richardson. 1973. *Toward Human Understanding: The Life and Times of Charles Waddell Chesnut*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. University of Chicago.
- . 1988. "The Perspective of A Black American on Slavery and the French Revolution: Anna Julia Cooper." Introduction to *Slavery and the French Revolutionists* by Anna Julia Cooper. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press.
- Keller, Suzanne. 2003. *Community*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Kendall, Diana 2004. *Sociology in Our Times: The Essentials*, 4th Ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
- Kennedy, Raymond and Ruby Jo Reeves Kennedy. 1942. "Sociology in American Colleges." *American Sociological Review* 7(5): 661–75.
- Kent, Noel J. 1983. *Hawaii: Islands under the Influence*. New York: Monthly Review.
- Kerby, William J. 1897. *Le socialisme aux Etats-Unis*. Dissertation, Université Catholique de Louvain, Ecole des Sciences Politiques et Sociales). Bruxelles: Goemaere.

- . 1908–09. “Sociological Aspects of Lying.” *Catholic University Bulletin* 14(4): 351–60; 14(6): 540–51; 15(6): 537–50.
- . 1921. “Processes in Radicalism.” *Publications of the American Sociological Society* 12: 163–73.
- . 1948. *Introduction to Social Living*. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press.
- Killian, Lewis M. 1994. *Black and White: Reflections of a White Southern Sociologist*. Dix Hills, NY: General Hall.
- Kilson, Marion. 1977. “Black Women in the Professions, 1890–1970.” *Monthly Labor Review* (May): 38–41.
- King, Martin Luther, Jr. 1969. “The Role of the Behavioral Scientist in the Civil Rights Movement.” *American Psychologist* 23 (March): 180–86.
- Kingsley, Mary H. 1897. *Travels in West Africa, Congo Français, Corisco and Camerons*. London: Macmillan.
- . *West African Studies*. London: Macmillan, 1899. Reviewed by H. Hubert and/or M. Mauss in *L'Année sociologique* 3:(1898–99): 224–26. [ed. Émile Durkheim]
- Kinloch, Graham C. 1985. “White Perspectives on Black Americans: A Study of Journal Articles in Professional Sociology.” *Phylon* 46: 319–332.
- Kladky, William. 1999. “Vance Rupert B.” Pp. 166–67 in *American National Biography*. Vol. 22. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Klein, Kerwin Lee. 1997. *Frontiers of Historical Imagination: Narrating the European Conquest of Native America, 1890–1990*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Kornblum, William. 1974. *Blue Collar Community*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- , Joseph Julian and Carolyn D. Smith. 2004. *Social Problems*, 11th Ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice-Hall.
- Kraybill, Ron. 2002. “Reflections on Twenty Years in Peacebuilding.” Pp. 30–44 in Cynthia Sampson and John Paul Lederach (eds.) *From the Ground Up: Mennonite Contributions to International Peacebuilding*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kuklick, Henrika. 1973. “A ‘Scientific Revolution’: Sociological Theory in the United States, 1930–1945.” *Sociological Inquiry* 43: 3–22.
- Kunde, James E. 1997. *Metropolitan Investment Strategies for Sustainable Communities*. Joint Center for Sustainable Communities press release. October.
- Kurtz, Lester R. 1984. *Evaluating Chicago Sociology*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Kuznets, S. (ed.). 1955. *Economic Growth: Brazil, India, Japan*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Ladner, Joyce A. 1973. *The Death of White Sociology*. New York: Vintage Books, Random House.
- Lal, Barbara Ballis. *The Romance of Culture in an Urban Civilization*. London, U.K.: Routledge, 1990.
- Lambeth, Helena Carney. 1996. “Rosetta E. Coakley Lawson.” Pp. 398–400 in Jessie Carney Smith (ed.) 1996.
- Lasker, Gabriel. 1952. “Environmental Growth Factors and Selective Migration.” *Human Biology* (24): 262–89.
- . 1954. “The Question of Physical Selection of Mexican Migrants to the United States.” *Human Biology* (26): 52–58.
- Laue, James and Gerald Cormick. 1978. “The Ethics of Intervention in Community Disputes.” Pp. 205–32 in Gordon Bermant, Herbert C. Kelman, and Donald P. Warwick (eds.) *The Ethics of Social Intervention*. Washington, DC: Halsted Press.
- Laumann, Edward and Franz Pappi. 1976. *Networks of Collective Action: A Perspective on Community Influence Systems*. New York: Academic Press.
- Lavey, Patrick Bernard. 1988. *William J. Kerby, John A. Ryan, and the Awakening of the Twentieth-Century American Catholic Social Conscience, 1899–1919*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.

- Lawson, Jesse. 1887. *The Ethics of the Labor Problem. An Address before the Bethel Literary and Historical Association*. Washington, DC: George H. Stoddart.
- . 1904a. "A Commission on the Race Problem." *Colored American Magazine* 7 (Sept.): 577–79.
- . 1904b. "A Plea for Fair Play." *World Today* (April): 516–18.
- (ed.). 1904c. *How to Solve the Race Problem: The Proceedings of the Washington Conference on the Race Problem in the United States under the Auspices of the National Sociological Society*. Washington, DC: Beresford.
- Lawson, Rosetta E. 1903a. Remarks on a Trip through North Carolina, excerpted in "A Baptist Jubilee: The Progress of Twenty Years." *Colored American* (May 2): 1–2.
- . 1903b. Letter on Temperance Work, reprinted as "Mrs. Lawson's Tour: The Work of the W.C.T.U. in the Southland." *Colored American* (May 16): 7.
- . 1905. "The W.C.T.U." *Cleveland Journal* 2 (Feb. 25): 2.
- Laxer, Gordon (ed.). 1991. *Perspectives on Canadian Economic Development: Class, Staples, Gender, and Elites*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Lee, Alfred McClung. 1944. "Sociology, Clinical." P. 303 in H.P. Fairchild (ed.), *Dictionary of Sociology*. New York: Philosophical Library.
- Lee, Frank F. 1961. *Negro and White in Connecticut Town*. New Haven: College and University Press.
- Leffall, Dolores C., and Janet L. Sims. 1976. "Mary McLeod Bethune—The Educator; Also Including a Selected Annotated Bibliography." *Journal of Negro Education*. 45 (Summer): 342–58.
- Leggon, Cheryl B. 1980. "Black Female Professionals" Pp. 189–202 in LaFrances Rogers-Rose (ed.), *The Black Woman*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Lemert, Charles, and Esme Bahn (eds.). 1997. *The Voice of Anna Julia Cooper*. Lanham, MD: Rowan & Littlefield.
- Lengermann, Patricia Madoo. 1979. "The Founding of the *American Sociological Review*: The Anatomy of a Rebellion." *American Sociological Review* 44: 185–98.
- , and Jill Niebrugge-Brantley. 1998. *The Women Founders: Sociology and Social Theory, 1830–1930: A Text/Reader*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- , and Jill Niebrugge-Brantley. 2002. "The Caribbean Connection: Oliver Cox, C.L.R. James, and Eric Williams." Paper presented in the History of Sociology Section Mini-Conference, Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association in Chicago.
- Lenin, V.I. 1939. *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*. New York: International Publishers.
- Leo, John. 1968a. "Sociology Scored by Negro Leader." *New York Times* (28 Aug.): 21.
- . 1968b. "Sociologists Get Negro Complaint." *New York Times* (29 Aug.): 30.
- . 1968c. "Sociologist Urges 'a Second Israel' in Andes for Negroes." *New York Times* (31 Aug.): 18.
- Lerner, Gerda (ed.). 1972. *Black Women in White America: A Documentary History*. New York: Pantheon.
- . 1979. *The Majority Finds Its Past: Placing Women in History*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lescher, Bruce H. 1990. *The Spiritual Life and Social Action in American Catholic Spirituality: William J. Kerby and Paul Hanly Furfey*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Graduate Theological Union, Berkeley, California.
- Levine, Donald N. (ed.). 1971. *Georg Simmel On Individuality and Social Forms*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . 1995. *Visions of the Sociological Tradition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- , Ellwood B. Carter, and Eleanor Mills Gorman. 1976. "Simmel's Influence on American Sociology." *American Journal of Sociology* 81: 1112–32.

- Levine, Rhonda F., and James A. Geschwender. 1981. "Class Struggle, State Policy, and the Rationalization of Agriculture: The Organization of Agriculture in Hawaii." *Research in Social Movements, Conflict and Change* 4: 123–50.
- Levy, Marion J., Jr. 1998. "Thorstein Veblen's Absentee Ownership." *Society* 35(3): 64–68.
- Lewis, David L. 1995. *W.E.B. DuBois: A Reader*. New York: Henry Holt & Company.
- . 2000. *W.E.B. DuBois*. New York: Henry Holt & Company.
- Lewis, Hylan. 1955. *Black Ways of Kent*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina.
- Liebow, Elliot. 1967. *Tally's Corner*. Boston: Little Brown.
- Lin, Jan. 1998. *Reconstructing Chinatown: Ethnic Enclave, Global Change*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Lincoln, C. Eric and Lawrence H. Mamiya. 1990. *The Black Church in the African-American Experience*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Lind, Andrew W. 1935. "Sociological Research at the University of Hawaii." *Social Process in Hawaii* 1: 47–49.
- . 1938. *An Island Community: Ecological Succession in Hawaii*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . 1955. *Hawaii's People*. Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii.
- . 1979. "Social Process in Hawaii: The Early Years." *Social Process in Hawaii* 27: 7–9.
- . 1982. "Race and Ethnic Relations: An Overview." *Social Process in Hawaii* 29: 130–50.
- Lindner, Rolf. 1996. *The Reportage of Urban Culture*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Linnekin, Jocelyn. 1985. *Children of the Land: Exchange and Status in a Hawaiian Community*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Lipset, Seymour M. 1959 [1950]. *Agrarian Socialism: The Cooperative Commonwealth Federation in Saskatchewan*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- . 1963. *The First New Nation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Lofland, John. 1966. *Doomsday Cult*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Lowenberg, Bert James, and Ruth Bogin. 1976. *Black Women in Nineteenth-Century American Life*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Luison, Lucio (ed.). 1998. *Introduzione alla Sociologia clinica: Teorie, metodi e tecniche di intervento*. Milano, Italy: FrancoAngeli.
- Luker, Ralph E. 1991. *The Social Gospel in Black & White: American Racial Reform, 1885–1912*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Lumpkin, Katharine D. 1947. *The Making of A Southerner*. New York: Alfred Knopf.
- Luxemburg, Rosa. 1951. *The Accumulation of Capital*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Lybarger, Michael. 1983. "Origins of the Modern Social Studies: 1900–1916." *History of Education Quarterly* 23(4): 455–68.
- Lyman, Stanford M. 1988. "Le Conte, Royce, Teggart, Blumer: A Berkeley Dialogue on Sociology, Social Change, and Symbolic Interaction." *Symbolic Interaction* 11.
- . 1992. *Militarism, Imperialism, and Racial Accommodation*. Fayetteville, AR: University of Arkansas Press.
- Lynd, Robert, and Helen Lynd. 1956 [1929]. *Middletown*. New York: Harcourt Brace.
- . 1937. *Middletown in Transition*. New York: Harcourt-Brace.
- Lyon, David. 1984. "Community as Ideology and Utopia." *Universities Quarterly: Culture, Education and Society* 38(3): 253–69.
- MacFarlane, Alan. 1977. "History and the Study of Communities." *Social History* 5. <<http://www.alanmacfarlane.com/TEXTS/DISCUSSI.pdf>>.
- Macionis, John. 1978. "The Search for Community in Modern Society." *Qualitative Sociology* 1:130–43.
- MacIver, Robert M. 1970 [1917]. *Community: A Sociological Study*. London: Frank Cass.

- , and Charles H. Page. 1949. *Society: An Introductory Analysis*. New York: Rinehart.
- Macpherson, C.B. 1953. *Democracy in Alberta: The Theory and Practice of a Quasi-Party System*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- Madge, John. 1962. *The Origins of Scientific Sociology*. New York: Free Press.
- Mahoney, Kathleen A. 2003. *Catholic Higher Education in Protestant America. The Jesuits and Harvard in the Age of the University*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Mainiero, Lina (ed.). 1979. *American Women Writers*. New York: Frederick Ungar.
- Manicas, Peter T. 1987. *A History and Philosophy of the Social Sciences*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Manis, Jerome and Bernard Meltzer, eds. *Symbolic Interactionism*. 3rd Edition. Boston: Beacon Press, 1980.
- Marcel, Jean-Christophe. 1999. "Maurice Halbwachs à Chicago ou les ambiguïtés d'un rationalisme durkheimien." *Revue d'histoire des sciences humaines* 1: 47–67.
- Marley, Rita, with Hettie Jones. 2004. *No Woman No Cry: My Life With Bob Marley*. New York: Hyperion.
- Martin, Katherine. 1979. "Herring, Harriet Laura." Pp. 119–20 in *Dictionary of North Carolina Biography*. Vol. 3. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Martindale, Don. 1960. *The Nature and Types of Sociological Theory*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Mather, Frank L. (ed.). 1915. *Who's Who of the Colored Race: A General Biographical Dictionary of Men and Women of African Descent*. Chicago: [publisher not stated].
- Matthews, Fred H. 1977. *Quest for an American Sociology. Robert E. Park and the Chicago School*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Mattson, Vernon and Rick Tilman. 1986. "Thorstein Veblen, Frederick Jackson Turner, and the American Experience." *Journal of Economic Issues* 20(4): 219–35.
- Mauss, Marcel. 1896–97. Review of 1897. *Travels in West Africa, Congo Français, Corisco and Camerons* by Mary H. Kingsley. *L'Année Sociologique* 1: 179–83.
- May, Henry F. 1993. *Three Faces of Berkeley: Competing Ideologies in the Wheeler Era, 1899–1919*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Mays, Benjamin E. and Joseph W. Nicholson. 1933. *The Negro's Church*. New York: Institute of Social and Religious Research.
- McClusky, Audrey Thomas. 1999. "George Edmund Haynes." Pp. 528–32 in Jessie Carney Smith (ed.). 1999.
- McCullough, James E. (ed.). 1912. *The Call of the New South*. Nashville: Southern Sociological Congress.
- McDonald, Terrence J. 1998. "What We Talk about When We Talk about History: The Conversations of History and Sociology." In Terrence J. McDonald (ed.) *The Historic Turn in the Human Sciences*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- McDonagh, Edward C. 1944. "An Approach to Clinical Sociology." *Sociology and Social Research* 27(5): 376–83.
- McDougall, Harold. 1993. *Black Baltimore: A New Theory of Community*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- McRoberts, Omar M. 2003. *Streets of Glory: Church and Community in a Black Urban Neighborhood*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Mead, George Herbert. 1899. "The Working Hypothesis in Social Reform." *American Journal of Sociology* 5 (March): 369–71.
- . 1934. *Mind, Self and Society*, ed. and intro. Charles Morris. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . 1999. *Play, School, and Society*, ed. and intro. Mary Jo Deegan. New York: Peter Lang.
- Medoff, Peter and Holly Sklar. 1994. *Streets of Hope: The Rise and Fall of an Urban Neighborhood*. Boston: South End Press.
- Merton, Robert K. 1949, 1968. *Social Theory and Social Structure*, Enlarged Ed. New York: Free Press.

- . 1972. "Insiders and Outsiders: A Chapter in the Sociology of Knowledge." *American Journal of Sociology* 78: 9–47.
- Metzger, Linda, et al. 1989. *Black Writers*. Detroit: Gale Research Inc.
- Meyerowitz, Lisa. 1997. "The Negro in Art Week: Defining the 'New Negro' Through Art Exhibition." *African American Review* 31 (Spring): 75–89.
- Mill, John Stuart. 1909. *Principles of Political Economy*. London: Longmans.
- Miller, Kelly. 1897. *A Review of Hoffman's Race Traits and Tendencies of the American Negro*. (Occasional Papers, No. 1.) Washington, DC: The American Negro Academy.
- . 1904. "Problems of the City Negro." *World Today* (April): 514–16.
- Mills, C. Wright. 1959. *The Sociological Imagination*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- . 1960. *Images of Man: The Classical Tradition in Sociological Thinking*. New York: George Braziller.
- Mines, Richard. 1984. "Network Migration and Mexican Rural Development: A Case Study." Pp. 136–55 in Richard C. Jones (ed.), *Patterns of Undocumented Migration. Mexico and the United States*. Totowa, New Jersey: Rowman & Allenheld.
- Mitchell, Ross E. 2001. "Thorstein Veblen: Pioneer in Environmental Sociology." *Organization & Environment* 14(4): 389–408.
- Molyneaux, Lambert. 1961. "In Memoriam Wilson Gee 1888–1961." *American Sociological Review* 26(3): 457–58.
- Monti, Daniel J. 1990. *Race, Redevelopment, and the New Company Town*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Moore, Jacqueline. 1999. *Leading the Race: The Transformation of the Black Elite in the Nation's Capital, 1880–1920*. Richmond, VA: University of Virginia Press.
- Morgan, Gordon D. 1997. *Toward an American Sociology*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Moss, Alfred A. 1981. *The American Negro Academy*. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press.
- Moynihan, Daniel Patrick 1969. *Maximum Feasible Misunderstanding*. New York: Free Press.
- Mullins, Nicholas C. 1973. *Theories and Theory Groups in Contemporary American Sociology*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Murray, C.S.C., Raymond W. 1935. *Introductory Sociology*. New York: F.S. Crofts & Co.
- Murray, Stephen. 1980. "Resistance to Sociology at Berkeley." *Journal of the History of Sociology* 2 (Spring).
- Neill, Robin. 1972. *A New Theory of Value: The Canadian Economic of H.A. Innis*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- . 1991. *A History of Canadian Economic Thought*. London: Routledge.
- . 1998. "Europe in America: Veblen and his Canadian Connections." Pp. 167–89 in M. Rutherford (ed.) *The Economic Mind in America: Essays in the History of American Economics*. London: Routledge.
- Nerad, Maresi. 1999. *The Academic Kitchen: A Social History of Gender Stratification at the University of California, Berkeley*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Neverdon-Morton, Cynthia. 1989. *Afro-American Women of the South and the Advancement of the Race, 1895–1925*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press.
- New York Times. 1903a. "Booker T. Washington Pleads for Negroes; Suggests a Conference to Discuss the Whole Race Problem." *New York Times* (Feb. 23): 7.
- . 1903b. "To Consider Race Problem: Sociologists Will Discuss the American Negro at the Washington Convention." *New York Times* (Nov. 1): 20.
- . 1903c. "To Act in Alabama Cases: Sociologists Will Ask Attorney General Knox to Defend Constitution." *New York Times* (Nov. 12): 8.
- . 1903d. "Race Problem Inquiry: National Sociological Society's Appeal to Congress." *New York Times* (Nov. 13): 3.
- Nichols, Charles W. 1923. "Justice Edward Cahill Memorial." *M.R.* 222. www.micourt-history.org/new/sessions/PDFS/Cahille222.pdf

- Nichols, Lawrence T. 1997. "Sociology in the Women's Annex: Inequality and Integration at Harvard and Radcliffe, 1879–1947." *American Sociologist* 28(3): 5–28.
- Nisbet, Robert A. 1978. "Review of *Theory and Processes of History*, by Frederick Teggart." *The American Spectator* (January).
- . 1978–79. "Teggart of Berkeley," *American Scholar* 48.
- . 1992 *Teachers and Scholars: A Memoir of Berkeley in Depression and War*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Noble, Jeanne. 1978. *Beautiful, Also, Are the Souls of My Black Sisters: A History of the Black Woman in America*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Nordyke, Eleanor C. 1977. *The Peopling of Hawaii*. Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii.
- Novick, Peter. 1988. *That Noble Dream: The "Objectivity Question" and the American Historical Profession*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nuesse, C. Joseph. 2000. "William Joseph Kerby (1870–1936): The Approach to His Field of the First American Catholic Sociologist." *American Catholic Studies* 111 (Spring-Winter): 77–96.
- OAH Magazine of History*. 1997. "Pullman's Testimony before the Strike Commission, 1894." *OAH* (Organization of American Historians) *Magazine of History* 11(2): 36.
- Odum, Howard W. 1927. *American Masters of Social Science*. New York: Holt.
- . 1951. *American Sociology. The Story of Sociology in the United States through 1950*. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.
- Ogburn, William F. 1955. "Howard W. Odum." *American Sociological Review* 23(2): 237.
- Orange County Task Force on Medical Care for Illegal Aliens. 1976. *The Economic Impact of Undocumented Immigrants on Public Health Services in Orange County, California: A Study of Medical Costs, Tax Contributions, and Health Needs of Undocumented Immigrants. Final Report Presented to the Orange County Board of Supervisors*.
- Oxford Universal Dictionary*. 1933.
- Page, Charles H. 1982. *Fifty Years in the Sociological Enterprise*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Palmieri, Patricia Ann. 1995. *In Adamless Eden: The Community of Women Faculty at Wellesley*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Park, Clara Cahill. [1894]. "Coming to New York to Study Art." *Harper's Young People*. Advertisement in Scrapbook, Robert E. Park Papers, box 10, folder 1.
- . [1894]. "From New York Studios." Unidentified newspaper clipping, Scrapbook, Robert E. Park Papers, box 10, folder 1.
- . 1895. "The Manners Tart." *Philistine* 1(4) (September): 116–17.
- . 1896. "A Protestant Service." *Philistine* 2(2) (January): 59–61.
- . 1904. "Native Women in Africa: Their Hard Lot in the March of Progress." Boston: Reprinted by the Congo Committee of the Massachusetts Commission for International Justice. (Orig. *Boston Transcript* 4 November 1904). Microfiche in *The Gerritsen Collection of Women's History*, No. 2144.
- . 1912a. "Widows' Pension in Massachusetts." *Child Welfare Magazine* 6(10) (June): 343–46.
- . 1912b. "Union for Mother Protection in Germany." *Child Welfare Magazine* 6(10) (June): 364–65.
- . 1912c. "Mary Garrett." *American Magazine* 74 (September): 553.
- . 1913a. "Helping the Widowed Mother Keep a Home." *Home Progress* 2 (April): 43–48.
- . 1913b. "Motherhood and Pensions." *Survey* 30 (12 April): 74.
- . 1913c. "Pensions for Mothers." *Survey* 30 (30 August): 669.
- . 1914. "Widows' Pension." *Survey* 32 (20 June): 331.
- . 1926. "Review of *Growing Up With a City*." *American Journal of Sociology* 32(1): 151.

- . 1927. "Review of *The New Japanese Womanhood*." *American Journal of Sociology* 32(6): 1022–23.
- . 1928. "Types of Lovely Color." *Opportunity* 6 (October): 300.
- . 1929. Cover Portraits. *Opportunity* 7 (January & March).
- . 1936. "Review of *The Living of Charlotte Perkins Gilman*." *American Journal of Sociology* 41 (May): 701–02.
- . 1979. Reproduction of a drawing of Robert E. Park, Berlin, 1900. Frontispiece to *Robert E. Park* by Winifred Rauschenbush. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- "Park, Clara Cahill." 1914. Pp. 619–20 in John William Leonard (ed.), *Woman's Who's Who of America*. New York: American Commonwealth Co.
- Park, Robert E. 1918. "Methods of Forming Public Opinion Applicable to Social Welfare Publicity." Pp. 615–22 in *Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work*, 45.
- . 1918. Discussion of "Methods of Forming Public Opinion Applicable to Social Welfare Publicity." Pp. 625–26 in *Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work*, 45.
- . 1920. "Foreign Language Press and Social Progress." Pp. 493–500 in *Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work*, 47.
- . 1921. "Immigrant Heritages." Pp. 492–97 in *Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work*, 48.
- . 1921. "The City as a Social Laboratory." Pp. 1–19 in T.V. Smith and Leslie White (ed.), *An Experiment on Social Science Research*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . 1922. "Letters Collected by R.E. Park and Booker T. Washington." *Journal of Negro History* 7 (April): 206–22.
- . 1923. "The Mind of the Rover." *World Tomorrow* 6 (September): 269–70.
- . 1924a. "Play and Juvenile Delinquency." *Playground* 18 (May): 95–6.
- . 1924b. "A Race Relations Survey." *Journal of Applied Sociology* 8 (March): 195–205.
- . 1924c. "The Significance of Social Research in Social Service." *Journal of Applied Sociology* 8 (May–June): 263–67.
- . 1924d. "The Concept of Social Distance." *Journal of Applied Sociology* 8 (July): 256–60.
- . 1924e. "Experience and Race Relations." *Applied Sociology* 9 (Sept.): 18–24.
- . 1926a. "Behind Our Masks." *Survey Graphic* 56 (1 May): 135–39.
- . 1926b. "Methods of a Race Survey." *Journal of Applied Sociology* 10 (May–June): 410–15.
- . 1926c. "Our Racial Frontier on the Pacific." *Survey* 56 (1 May): 192–6.
- . 1928. "Human Migration and the Marginal Man." *American Journal of Sociology* 33 (May): 881–93.
- . 1932. "The University and the Community of Races." *Pacific Affairs* 5 (August): 695–703.
- . 1934. "Race Relations and Certain Frontiers." Pp. 57–85 in Edward Byron Reuter (ed.), *Race and Culture Contacts*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- . 1936. "Succession, an Ecological Concept." *American Sociological Review* 1 (April): 174–75.
- . 1941. "The Social Function of War: Observations and Notes." *American Journal of Sociology* 46 (January): 551–70.
- . 1944a. "Missions and the Modern World." *American Journal of Sociology* 50 (November): 177–83.
- . 1944b. "An Autobiographical Note." Pp. 10–14 in *Robert Ezra Park (1864–1944)*. Privately published memorial pamphlet.
- . 1950. "The Race Relations Cycle in Hawaii." Pp. 189–95 in Robert E. Park

- (Everett C. Hughes *et al.*, eds.) *Race and Culture*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press. [Reprint of "Introduction" to Adams 1937]
- , and Ernest W. Burgess. 1921. *Introduction to the Science of Sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- , Ernest W. Burgess, and Roderick D. McKenzie. 1967 [1925]. *The City*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Parsons, Talcott. 1937. *The Structure of Social Action* (two vols.). New York: McGraw Hill.
- Patterson, David L. 1931. "Blackmar Passes from K.U. Scene." March 30. Lawrence Kansas, University of Kansas Archives, F.W. Blackmar file.
- Peebles-Wilkins, Wilma. 1995. "Janie Porter Barrett and the Virginia Industrial School for Colored Girls: Community Response to the Needs of African-American Children." *Child Welfare*. 74: 143–62.
- Platt, Anthony M. 1991. *E. Franklin Frazier Reconsidered*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- "Plea for Widowed Mothers." 1912. *New York Times* (8 January): 1.
- Poplin, Dennis E. 1972. *Communities: A Survey of Theories and Methods of Research*. New York: MacMillan.
- Population Reference Bureau. 1998. "Population: A Lively Introduction." *Population Bulletin* 53(3).
- Portes, Alejandro. 1974. "Return of the Wetback." *Society* 11(3): 40–46.
- . 1977. "Labor Functions of Illegal Aliens." *Society* 14(6): 31.
- . 1978. "Migration and Underdevelopment." *Politics and Society* 8: 1–48.
- , and Jozsef Borocz. 1989. "Contemporary Immigration: Theoretical Perspectives on its Determinants and Modes of Incorporation." *International Migration Review* 23: 606–30.
- , and John Walton. 1981. *Labor, Class and the International System*. New York: Academic Press.
- Portes, Stanley D. 1962. *A Century of Social Thinking in Hawaii*. Palo Alto, CA: Pacific Books.
- Potts, David B. 1965. "Social Ethics at Harvard, 1881–1931: A Study in Academic Activism." Pp. 91–129 in Paul Buck (ed.) *Social Sciences at Harvard 1860–1920*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Powell, William S. 1988. "Jocher, Katharine." Pp. 281–82 in *Dictionary of North Carolina Biography*. Vol. 3. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Prebisch, Raul. 1950. *The Economic Development of Latin America and Its Principal Problems*. New York: United Nations.
- . 1964. *The Economic Development Of Latin America In The Post-War Period*. New York: United Nations.
- Pridmore, Jay. 1991. "Enduring Spirit." *University of Chicago Magazine* 83 (Oct.): 66.
- Putnam, Robert D. 2000. *Bowling Alone*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Rainwater, Lee. 1970. *Behind Ghetto Walls*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Rauschenbush, Winifred. 1979. *Robert E Park*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- Rebach, Howard M. and John G. Bruhn (eds.). 1991. *Handbook of Clinical Sociology*. New York: Plenum
- Reed, John Shelton. 1993. *Surveying the South: Studies in Regional Sociology*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press.
- Reidman, Agnes. 1991. "Margaret Jarman Hagood (1907–1963)." Pp. 155–63 in Deegan (ed.). 1991.
- Residents of Hull-House. 1970 [1895]. *Hull-House Maps and Papers*. New York: Arno.
- Rheume, Jacques. 1997. "The Project of Clinical Sociology in Quebec." *International Sociology* 12(2): 165–74.
- Rhoades, Lawrence J. 1981. *A History of the American Sociological Association, 1905–1980*. Washington, DC: American Sociological Association.

- Richmond, Mary. 1913. "Motherhood and Pensions." *Survey* 30 (1 March): 774–80.
- Rios, Victor, Jr. 1982. *International Capitalism and Mexican Migration to the United States*. Ph.D. dissertation. University of Notre Dame.
- Robbins, Richard. 1974. "Charles S. Johnson." Pp. 56–84 in Blackwell and Janowitz (eds.). 1974.
- . 1999a. "Johnson, Charles S. (1893–1956)." Pp. 616–19 in Jessie Carney Smith (ed.). 1999.
- . 1999b. "Johnson, Charles Spurgeon." Pp. 55–57 in *American National Biography*. Vol. 12. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Roberts, Kenneth David. 1980. *Agarian Structure and Labor Migration in Rural Mexico: The Case of Circular Migration of Undocumented Workers to the U.S.* Ph.D. dissertation. The University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- Robinson, James Harvey. 1912 [1965]. *The New History*. New York: Macmillan.
- Rogers-Rose, LaFrancis. 1980. "The Black Woman: A Historical Overview" Pp. 15–25 in LaFrances Rogers-Rose (ed.) *The Black Woman*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Roller, David C., and Robert W. Twyman (eds.). 1979. *Encyclopedia of Southern History*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.
- "Roosevelt for Widows' Aid" 1912. *New York Times* (9 January): 4.
- Roscoe, Janice. 1991. "Dorothy Swaine Thomas." In Deegan (ed.). 1991.
- Rose, Dan. 1987. *Black American Street Life: South Philadelphia 1969–71*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Rosenberg, Rosalind. 1982. *Beyond Separate Spheres: The Intellectual Roots of Modern Feminism*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Ross, Dorothy. 1991. *The Origin of American Social Sciences*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Rouse, Jacqueline Anne. 1989. *Lugenia Burns Hope*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.
- Ruch, Libby O. 1980. "Sex Roles in Hawaii: Structure and Dimensions." *Social Process in Hawaii* 28: 88–99.
- Rudwick, Elliott. 1969. "Note on a Forgotten Black Sociologist: W.E.B. DuBois and the Sociological Profession." *American Sociologist* 4: 303–06.
- . 1974. "W.E.B. DuBois as Sociologist." Pp. 25–55 in Blackwell and Janowitz (eds.). 1974.
- Rynbrandt, Linda J. 1999. *Caroline Bartlett Crane and Progressive Era Reform*, with a series editor's Foreword by Mary Jo Deegan (p. ix). New York: Garland.
- Salem, Dorothy C. 1990. *To Better Our World: Black Women in Organized Reform*. Brooklyn, NY: Carlson Publishing Co.
- (ed.). 1993. *African American Women: A Biographical Dictionary* New York: Garland Publishing.
- Samora, Julian. 1971. *Los Mojados: The Wetback Story*. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Sanjek, Roger. 1998. *The Future of Us All: Race and Neighborhood Politics in New York City*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Sassen-Koob, Saskia. 1979. "The International Circulation of Resources and Development: The Case of Migrant Labor." *Development and Change* 9: 509–45.
- Schachter, Joseph P. 2004. "Geographic Mobility: 2002 to 2003." *Population Characteristics: Current Population Reports*. Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of the Census.
- Scharnhorst, Gary. 1985. *Charlotte Perkins Gilman*. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow.
- Scheler, Max. 1973. *Formalism in Ethics and Non Formal Ethics of Values. A New Attempt toward the Foundations of an Ethical Personalism*, translated by M.S. Frings and R.L. Funk. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Scherer, Jacqueline. 1972. *Contemporary Community: Sociological Illusion or Reality*. London: Tavistock.

- Schiele, Jerome. 1999. "E Franklin Frazier and the Interfacing of Black Sociology and Black Social Work." *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare* 26(2): 105–25.
- Schmitt, Robert C. 1982. "Hawaii's Social Rating." *Social Process in Hawaii* 29: 151–57.
- Schutz, Alfred. 1967 [1932]. *The Phenomenology of the Social World*. Tr. by George Walsh and Frederick Lehnert, intro. by George Walsh. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Schwager, Sally. 1982. *"Harvard Women": A History of the Founding of Radcliffe College*. Unpublished dissertation, Harvard University.
- Schwendinger, Herman, and Julia Schwendinger. 1974. *The Sociologists of the Chair: A Radical Analysis of the Formative Years of North American Sociology, 1883–1922*. New York: Basic Books.
- Schwieder, Dorothy, Joseph Hraba, and Elmer Schwieder. 1987. *Buxton: Work and Racial Equality in a Coal Mining Community*. Ames, IA: Iowa State University Press.
- Scott, Anne Firor. 1970. *The Southern Lady From Pedestal to Politics, 1830–1930*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . 1984. *Making the Invisible Woman Visible*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Scott, Joseph W. n.d. "A Brief History of the Association of Black Sociologists." Association of Black Sociologists Reference Files, Box 1. Moorland-Spingarn Research Center, Howard University.
- . 1996. "President's Corner—Facing the Future: Challenges for the Upcoming Year." *Association of Black Sociologists* (October): 1–3.
- Seeley, John R.; R. Alexander Sim; and Elizabeth W. Loosley. 1963 [1956]. *Crestwood Heights*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Shelton, Beth Anne et al. 1989. *Houston: Growth and Decline in a Sunbelt Boomtown*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Shils, Edward. 1991. "Robert E. Park, 1864–1944." *American Scholar* 60 (Winter): 120–27.
- . 1994. "The Sociology of Robert E. Park. Pp. 15–34 in Gubert and Tomasi (eds.), 1994.
- Short, James F. ed. 1971. *The Social Fabric of the Metropolis. Contributions of the Chicago School of Urban Sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Sicherman, Barbara, and Carol H. Green (eds.). 1980. *Notable American Women: The Modern Period*. Cambridge: Belknap Press.
- Siegfried, Charlene Haddock. 1998. *Pragmatism and Feminism*. Chicago, Ill: University of Chicago Press.
- Simmel, Georg. 1908. *Soziologie. Untersuchungen über die Formen der Vergesellschaftung*. Leipzig: Verlag von Duncker & Humblot.
- . 1971a. "The Problem of Sociology." Pp. 23–35 in Levine (ed.). 1971. [Originally from Simmel 1908.]
- . 1971b. "The Stranger." Pp. 143–49 in Levine (ed.). 1971. [Originally from Simmel 1908.]
- . 1971c. "Group Expansion and the development of Individuality." Pp. 251–93 in Levine (ed.). 1971. [Originally from Simmel 1908.]
- Simpson, Ida Harper. 1988. *Fifty Years of the Southern Sociological Society: Change and Continuity in a Professional Society*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.
- Sims, Newall L. 1968 [1912]. *A Hoosier Village: A Sociological Study with Special Reference to Social Causation*. New York: AMS Press.
- Skocpol, Theda. 1992. *Protecting Soldiers and Mothers*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Small, Albion W. 1896. "Scholarship and Social Agitation." *American Journal of Sociology*. 1(5): 564–82.
- . 1905. *General Sociology: An Exposition of the Main Development in Sociological Theory from Spencer to Ratzenhofer*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Smith, Charles U. and Lewis Killian. 1974. "Black Sociologists and Social Protest." Pp. 191–228 in Blackwell and Janowitz (eds.). 1974.

- Smith, Dennis. 1988. *The Chicago School: A Liberal Critique of Capitalism*. New York: Macmillan.
- Smith, Dorothy. 1974. "Women's Perspective as a Radical Critique of Sociology." *Social Inquiry*. 4: 7–13.
- Smith, Jessie Carney (ed.). 1992. *Notable Black American Women*. Detroit: Gale Research.
- . 1996. *Notable Black American Women II*. New York: Gale Research.
- (ed.). 1999. *Notable Black American Men*. Detroit: Gale Research.
- Smith, Marc A. and Peter Kollock. 1999. *Communities in Cyberspace*. New York: Routledge.
- Smith, Mark C. 1994. *Social Science in the Crucible: The American Debate over Objectivity and Purpose, 1918–1941*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Smith, Stanley H. 1974. "Sociological Research and Fisk University: A Case Study." Pp. 164–90 in Blackwell and Janowitz (eds.). 1974.
- Solomon, Barbara Miller. 1985. *In the Company of Educated Women*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Sorokin, Pitirim A. 1928. *Contemporary Sociological Theories*. New York: Harper & Row.
- . 1940. "Review of *Rome and China: A Study of Correlations in Historical Events*, by Frederick Teggart" *American Journal of Sociology* 46 (Nov.): 387–90.
- Southern Sociological Congress Proceedings*. 1912. *The Call of the New South*, ed. James E. McCulloch.
- . 1915. *New Chivalry-Health*, ed. James E. McCulloch.
- . 1916–1918. *Democracy in Earnest*, ed. James E. McCulloch.
- Spradley, James P. 1970. *You Owe Yourself a Drunk*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Stacey, Judith, and Barrie Thorne. 1985. "The Missing Feminist Revolution in Sociology." *Social Problems*. 32: 301–16.
- Stacey, Margaret. 1969. "The Myth of Community Studies." *British Journal of Sociology* 20(2): 134–47.
- Stack, Carol. 1974. *All Our Kin: Strategies for Survival in a Black Community*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Stanfield, John H. 1985. *Philanthropy and Jim Crow in American Social Science*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- (ed.). 1993. *A History of Race Relations Research: First-Generation Recollections*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Stark, Rodney. 2004. *Sociology*, 9th Ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
- Stein, Maurice R. 1960. *The Eclipse of Community*. New York: Harper Torchbooks.
- Sterling, Dorothy (ed.). 1984. *We Are Your Sisters: Black Women in the Nineteenth Century*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Stoecker, Randy. 1994. *Defending Community*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Stoneall, Linda. 1983. *Country Life, City Life: Five Theories of Community*. New York: Praeger.
- Stonequist, Everett V. 1935. "The Marginal Man in Hawaii." *Social Process in Hawaii* 1: 18–20.
- Straus, Roger A. (ed.). 1979. Special issue on clinical sociology. *American Behavioral Scientist*. March/April.
- (ed.). 2001. *Using Sociology: An Introduction from the Applied and Clinical Perspectives*. 3rd ed. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Stringer, Patricia A., and Irene Thompson (eds.). 1982. *Stepping Off the Pedestal: Academic Women in the South*. New York: The Modern Language Association of America.
- Suttles, Gerald D. 1968. *The Social Order of the Slum*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Swezy, Paul M. 1958. "Veblen on American Capitalism." Pp. 177–97 in Douglas F. Dowd (ed.) *Thorstein Veblen: A Critical Reappraisal*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

- Taber, H.P. 1896. "Editor." *Philistine* 2(2) (January): 61.
- Takaki, Rinald. 1983. *Pau Hana: Plantation Life and Labor in Hawaii*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Tatum, Beverly D. 1987. *Assimilation Blues: Black Families in a White Community*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Teggart, Frederick J. 1910. "The Circumstance or the Substance of History." *American Historical Review* 15 (July): 709–19.
- . 1916. *Prolegomena to History: The Relation of History of Literature, Philosophy, and Science*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- . 1918. *The Processes of History*. New Haven: Yale University Press; reprinted in Teggart 1941.
- . 1919. "Anthropology and History," *Journal of Philosophy, Psychology and Scientific Methods* 16 (December): 691–696.
- . 1923. "Review of *History: Its Theory and Practice*," *American Historical Review* 28 (January).
- . 1925. *Theory of History*. New Haven: Yale University Press; reprinted in Teggart 1941.
- . "Review of *The New History and the Social Studies*," *American Historical Review* 31 (January 1926).
- . "Notes on 'Timeless' Sociology." *Social Forces* 7 (March 1929): 362–65.
- . 1939. *Rome and China. A Study of Correlations in Historical Events*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- . 1941 *Theory and Processes of History*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- . 1942. "Causation in Historical Events." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 3 (January): 3–11.
- . 1949. *The Idea of Progress. A Collection of Readings*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Terborg-Penn, Rosalyn. 1998. *African American Women in the Struggle for the Vote*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Thomas, William I. 1909. *Source Book for Social Origins*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- [Thomas, W.I.], Robert E. Park (listed erroneously as first author) and Herbert A. Miller. 1921. *Old World Traits Transplanted*. New York: Harper & Brothers. (Reprint, with the authorship of "W.I. Thomas Together with Robert E. Park and Herbert A. Miller," a new introduction by Donald R. Young. Montclair, NJ: Patterson Smith, 1971).
- , and Florian Znaniecki. 1996 [1918–1920]. *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Thompson, Edgar T. 1975. *Plantation Societies, Race Relations and the South: The Regimentation of Populations*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- . 1979. "Vance, Rupert Bayless." P. 1269 in *Encyclopedia of Southern History*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.
- Thompson, Mildred I. 1990. *Ida B. Wells-Barrett: An Exploratory Study of an American Black Woman*. Brooklyn: Carlson Publishing Co.
- Timasheff, Nicholas S., and George A. Thøedorsen. 1976. *Sociological Theory, Its Nature and Growth*. New York: Random House.
- Tolman, Frank L. 1902a. "The Study of Sociology in Institutions of Learning in the United States, I." *American Journal of Sociology* 7(4): 797–838.
- . 1902b. "The Study of Sociology in Institutions of Learning in the United States, II." *American Journal of Sociology* 8(1): 85–121.
- . 1902c. "The Study of Sociology in Institutions of Learning in the United States, III." *American Journal of Sociology* 8(2): 251–72.
- . 1903. "The Study of Sociology in Institutions of Learning in the United States, IV." *American Journal of Sociology* 8(4): 531–58.

- Toppin, Edgar Allan. 1999. "Haynes, George Edmund." Pp. 414–15 in *American National Biography*. Vol. 10. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Tosi, Michelina and Francesco Battisti (eds.). 1995. *Sociologia clinica e sistemi socio-sanitari: Dalle premesse epistemologiche allo studio di casi e interventi*. Milano, Italy: FrancoAngeli.
- Trask, Haunani-Kay. 1983. "The Office of Hawaiian Affairs: Self-Determination or State Dependency." *Social Process in Hawaii* 30: 104–12.
- Tulane University. 1929. *Bulletin of the Tulane University of Louisiana* 30(6). June 1.
- Tulanian. 1928. "Child Guidance Clinic Planned by Sociologists." *Tulanian*. 1(7): 8.
- Turner, Ralph H. 1967. "Introduction." *Robert E. Park*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Turner, Stephen Park, and Jonathan H. Turner. 1990. *The Impossible Science: An Institutional Analysis of American Sociology*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Valien, Preston. 1958. "Sociology of Charles S. Johnson." *Sociology and Social Research* 42(4): 243–48.
- van Bockstaele, Jacques, Maria van Bockstaele, Colette Barrot, and Cl. Magny. 1963. "Travaux de sociologie clinique: Quelques conditions d'une intervention de type analytique en sociologie." *L'Annee Sociologique*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- van Bockstaele, Jacques, Maria van Bockstaele, Colette Barrot, Jacques Malbos, and Pierrette Schein. 1968. "Problemes de la sociologie clinique: Nouvelles observations sur la definition de la socioanalyse." *L'Annee Sociologique*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Vaughn, Gerald F. 1999. "Veblen's Possible Influence on the New Deal Land-Utilization Program as Evidenced by his Student Claud Franklin Clayton." *Journal of Economic Issues* 33(3): 713–27.
- Veblen, Thorstein B. 1892. "The Price of Wheat Since 1867." *Journal of Political Economy* 1(1): 68–103.
- . 1919. "On the Nature and Uses of Sabotage." *The Dial Magazine*. 341–46 (April 5).
- . 1939 [1915]. *Imperial Germany and the Industrial Revolution*. New York: The Viking Press.
- . 1954. *Essays in Our Changing Order*. Translated by Leon Ardzrooni. New York: Viking Press.
- . 1964 [1923]. *Absentee Ownership and Business Enterprise in Recent Times: The Case of America*. New York: Sentry Press.
- . 1967 [1899]. *The Theory of the Leisure Class: An Economic Study of Institutions*. New York: Funk & Wagnalls.
- Verret, Michel. 1972. "Halbwachs ou le deuxième age du Durkheimisme." *Cahiers internationaux de sociologie* 53: 311–336.
- Vidich, Arthur J. 1974. Review of *Contemporary Community: Sociological Illusion or Reality?* *Contemporary Sociology* 3(4): 333–334.
- , and Joseph Bensman 1958 and revised ed. 1968. *Small Town in Mass Society*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- , Joseph Bensman, and Maurice R. Stein. 1964. *Reflections on Community Studies*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- , and Stanford M. Lyman. 1985. *American Sociology: Worldly Rejections of Religion and Their Directions*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Vorse, Mary Heaton. 1969/c. 1914. *Labor's New Millions*. New York: Arno.
- . 1942. *Time and the Town*. New York: Dial Press.
- . 1985. *Rebel Pen*, ed. Dee Garrison. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Vromen, Suzanne. 1975. *The Sociology of Maurice Halbwachs*. Ph.D. dissertation. New York: New York University.
- Walker, Robbie Jean. 1992. *The Rhetoric of Struggle*. Ed. Robbie Jean Walker. New York: Garland Publishing.

- Wallerstein, Immanuel. 1974. *The Modern World-System, Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy in the Sixteenth Century*. New York: Academic Press.
- Ware, Caroline F. 1935. *Greenwich Village*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.
- Warner, W. Lloyd. 1966. *Yankee City* (one vol., abridged ed.) New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- , and Paul S. Lunt. 1941. *The Social Life of a Modern Community*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Washington Bee. 1903a. "Commissioner McFarland's Address—Good and Sensible Advice." *Washington Bee* (Nov. 14): 1.
- . 1903b. "A Cool Reception." *Washington Bee* (November 14): 1.
- . 1903c. "Like Sheep." *Washington Bee* (Nov. 14): 4.
- Washington Post. 1993. "James Laue, GMU Specialist in Conflict Resolution, Dies." *Washington Post*. Sept. 30.
- Washington, Booker T. 1904a. "The Tuskegee Idea." *World Today* (April): 511–14.
- . 1904b. "Remarks to the National Sociological Society." Pp. 141–44 in Jesse Lawson (ed.). 1904.
- Washington, Helen Mary. 1988. "Introduction." In *A Voice From the South* by Anna Julia Cooper. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Watkins, William H. 1995–96. "Thomas Jesse Jones, Social Studies, and Race." *International Journal of Social Education* 10: 124–34.
- Watson, Alexander John. 1977. "Harold Innis and Classical Scholarship." *Journal of Canadian Studies* 12(5): 45–61.
- Watson, Wilbur H. 1989. *The Village: An Oral Historical and Ethnographic Study of a Black Community*. Atlanta: Village Vanguard.
- Weber, Max. 1971. *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*, two volumes. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Weiner, Myron (ed.). 1966. *Modernization: The Dynamics of Growth*. New York: Basic Books.
- Weiss, Nancy J. 1974. *The National Urban League 1910–1940*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wells-Barnett, Ida B. 1904. "Booker T. Washington and His Critics." *World Today* (April): 518–21.
- . 1991. *The Selected Works*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wernick, Iddo K. 1996. "Consuming Materials: The American Way." *Forecasting and Social Change* 53(1): 111–22.
- West, Cornel. 1989. *The American Evasion of Philosophy*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- West, James. 1945. *Plainville, USA*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Westkoff, Marcia. 1979. "Feminist Criticism of the Social Sciences." *Harvard Educational Review* 49: 422–30.
- Wexler, Sanford. 1993. *The Civil Rights Movement: An Eyewitness History*. New York: Facts On File, Inc.
- White, Deborah Gray. 1999. *Too Heavy a Load: Black Women in Defense of Themselves*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Whittaker, Elvi. 1986. *The Mainland Haole: The White Experience in Hawaii*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Whyte, William Foote. 1943 (Revised and Expanded 3rd Ed. 1981). *Street Corner Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wiest, Raymond E. 1979. "Implications of International Labor Migration for Mexican Rural Development." Pp. 85–97 in Fernando Camara and Robert Van Kemper (eds.). *Migration Across Frontiers: Mexico and The United States*. Albany, NY: State University of New York at Albany, Institute for Mesoamerican Studies.
- Willems-Braun, Bruce. 1997. "Colonial Vestiges: Representing Forest Landscapes on Canada's West Coast." Pp. 99–127 in Trevor J. Barnes and Roger Hayter

- (eds.) *Troubles in the Rainforest: British Columbia's Forest Economy in Transition*. Victoria, BC: Western Geographical Press.
- Williams, Brett. 1988. *Upscaling Downtown: Stalled Gentrification in Washington, D.C.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Willams, James M. 1906. *An American Town*. New York: James Kempster.
- Williams, Joyce E. 1973. *Black Community Control*. New York: Praeger.
- Wilson, Frances Rusan. 1997. "Introduction." Pp. xv–xxxvii in *Unsung Heroes, The Black Boy of Atlanta, "Negroes in Domestic Service in the United States,"* by Elizabeth Ross Haynes. New York: G.K. Hall & Company.
- Wilson, Warren H. 1907. *Quaker Hill*. Quaker Hill, New York: Quaker Hill Conference Association.
- . 1923. *The Evolution of the Country Community*. Boston: Pilgrim Press.
- Winbush, Raymond, and David Leon Reed. 1999. "W.E.B. DuBois." Pp. 336–41 in Jessie Carney Smith (ed.). 1999.
- Winston, Michael R. 1999. "Miller, Kelly." Pp. 503–05 in *American National Biography*. Vol. 15. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wirth, Louis. 1928. *The Ghetto*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . 1931a. "Clinical Sociology." *American Journal of Sociology* 37: 49–66.
- . 1931b *Sociology: Vocations for those Interested in It*. Pamphlet. Vocational Guidance Series, No. 1. Chicago; University of Chicago, Department of Special Collections. Louis Wirth Collection. Box LVI, Folder 6.
- . 1938. "Urbanism as a Way of Life." *American Journal of Sociology* 44(1): 1–24.
- Wolff, Kurt H. 1964. "Surrender and Community Study: The Study of Loma." Pp. 233–63 in Vidich, Arthur J. *et al.* (eds.). 1964.
- Woman's Era*. 1896. "Temporary Rules Issued by the Executive Committee of the N.A. of C.W." *Woman's Era* 3 (October–November): 3–4.
- Wood, Charles H. 1982. "Equilibrium and Historical-Structural Perspectives on Migration." *International Migration Review* 16: 298–319.
- Woolever, Cynthia and Deborah Bruce. 2002. *A Field Guide to U.S. Congregations*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Work, Monroe N. (ed.). 1916. *The Negro Year Book: An Annual Encyclopedia for the Negro, 1916–1917*. Tuskegee, Alabama: Negro Year Book Publishing Company.
- Wright II, E. 2002a. "Using the Master's Tools: The Atlanta Sociological Laboratory and American Sociology, 1896–1924." *Sociological Spectrum* 22: 15–39.
- . 2002b. "Why Black People Tend to Shout! An Earnest Attempt to Explain the Sociological Negation of the Atlanta Sociological Laboratory Despite Its Possible Unpleasantness." *Sociological Spectrum* 22: 335–61.
- . 2002c. "The Atlanta Sociological Laboratory 1896–1924: A Historical Account of the First American School of Sociology." *Western Journal of Black Studies* 26: 165–74.
- Wylie, Mary Lou. 1984. "Women's Participation in SSS." *The Southern Sociologist* 15 (Winter): 25–28.
- Yamamura, Douglas. 1938. "The Social Process in Hawaii." *Social Process in Hawaii* 4: 1–5.
- Young, Alford A., Jr. 2002. "The 'Negro Problem' and the Character of the Black Community." Pp. 71–108 in *Confronting the American Dilemma of Race* ed. Robert E. Washington and Donald Cunnigen. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Young, Kimball. 1995. *Kimball Young on Sociology in Transition 1912–1968. An Oral Account by the 35th President of the ASA*. Ed. Fred B. Lindstrom, Ronald A. Hardert, and Laura L. Johnson. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Zehner, Robert B. and F. Stuart Chapin, Jr. 1974. *Across the City Line: A White Community in Transition*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Press.
- Zimmerman, Carle C. 1938. *The Changing Community*. New York: Harper & Brothers.

- Zolberg, Aristide R. 1989. "The Next Waves: Migration Theory for a Changing World." *International Migration Review* 23): 403–30.
- Zorbaugh, Harvey Warren. 1929. *The Gold Coast and the Slum: A Sociological Study of Chicago's Near North Side*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . 1939. "Sociology in the clinic." *Journal of Educational Sociology* 12(6): 344–51.
- Zuckerman, Phillip, Sandra L. Barnes and Daniel Cady. 2003. "The Negro Church: An Introduction." In *The Negro Church*, ed. W.E.B. DuBois, pp. vii–xxvi. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

Unpublished Resources

Archives

- Atlanta, Georgia. Robert W. Woodruff Library, Atlanta University Archives and Special Collections.
- Boston, Massachusetts. Simmons College Archives, Simmons College.
- Cambridge, Massachusetts. Schlesinger Library, Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study, Harvard University.
- Chicago, Illinois, Robert E. Park Papers, The Special Collections Research Center, Regenstein Library, University of Chicago.
- Chicago, Illinois, Louis Wirth Papers. The Special Collections Research Center, Regenstein Library, University of Chicago.
- Chicago, Illinois, Chicago Women's Club Papers, Chicago Historical Society.
- . Minutes of the Chicago Women's Club, 1926–1927, box 8.
- . National and International Committee (February, 1926).
- . The 1927 Negro Art Exhibit in Chicago scrapbook, box 52.
- Columbus, Ohio. Archives/Library, Ohio Historical Society, George A. Myers Papers.
- Hampton, Virginia. Hampton Museum and University Archives, Hampton University.
- Jacksonville, Florida. Special Collections, Thomas G. Carpenter Library, University of North Florida, Eartha Mary Magdalen White Collection.
- Lawrence, Kansas. University of Kansas Archives. F.W. Blackmar file. Carroll DeWitt Clark Papers.
- Nashville, Tennessee. Archives and Special Collections, Fisk University.
- Northampton, Massachusetts. Smith College Archives and Sophia Smith Collections, Smith College.
- South Hadley, Massachusetts. Mount Holyoke College Archives and Special Collections.
- Washington, D.C., Association of Black Sociologists Reference Files, Moorland-Spingarn Research Center, Howard University.
- Washington, D.C. Moorland-Spingarn Research Center, Howard University.
- Wellesley, Massachusetts. Wellesley University Archives and Special Collections, Wellesley College.

Interviews

- Gomillion, Charles Goode, and Jan Fritz, 16 June 1987.
- Green, Loraine Richardson and Mary Jo Deegan, 8 August 1990; 10 August 1992; 10 October 1992 (by telephone).

ABOUT THE CONTRIBUTORS

JANE ADDAMS (1860–1935) graduated from Rockford College in 1882. She co-founded the Hull-House social settlement in Chicago with Ellen Gates Starr in 1889, where she contributed to the development of sociology, especially as an applied field. Active in the women's suffrage, progressive, and peace movements, she received the Nobel Peace Prize in 1931. Many academic sociologists distanced themselves from her after 1919, when the U.S. Department of Justice labeled her the most dangerous woman in America.

ANTHONY J. BLASI is Professor of Sociology at Tennessee State University. He received the Ph.D. from the University of Notre Dame in 1974 and served as the president of the Association for the Sociology of Religion in 2001. His recent books include *A Sociology of Johannine Christianity* (1996), *A History of Sociological Research and Teaching at Catholic Notre Dame University* (with Bernard F. Donahoe, 2002), and *The Transition from Vowed to Lay Ministry in American Catholicism* (2004). He co-edited the *Handbook of Early Christianity. Social Science Perspectives* (with Paul-André Turcotte and Jean Duhaime, 2002).

KAY RICHARDS BROSCART is Emerita Professor of Sociology at Hollins University in Roanoke, Virginia. She received the Ph.D. from Yale University in 1968. She has previously published articles on the contributions of American and British women to the history and development of sociology. The major focus of her current research is the history of sociology in the American South.

The late JEFFREY L. CRANE, a native of Honolulu, taught for many years at the University of Hawaii, Hilo, before taking up university administrative work there and at Northern University, Aberdeen, South Dakota. He received the Ph.D. from the University of Notre Dame in 1979. He authored or co-authored some sixteen articles and, with Anthony J. Blasi, the late Jan Mejer, and Alton Okinaka, authored *Sociology of Hawai'i: Facts and Commentary* (1992).

MARY JO DEEGAN is Professor of Sociology at the University of Nebraska, Lincoln. She received the Ph.D. from the University of Chicago in 1975. In 2002 she was awarded the History of Sociology Section Distinguished Scholarly Career Award. In addition to her own many publications, which include *Race, Hull-House, and the University of Chicago: A New Conscience Against Ancient Evils* (2002), she has served the history of sociology by editing numerous collections, often of historical works, adding important introductions. Recent edited books include Charlotte Perkins Gilman, *With Her in Ourland: Sequel to Herland* (co-ed. with Michael R. Hill, 1997); *The American Ritual Tapestry. Social Rules and Cultural Meanings* (1998); George H. Mead, *Play, School, and Society* (1999); George H. Mead, *Essays in Social Psychology* (2001), Mead's long-lost book; Ellen Gates Starr, *On Art, Labor and Religion* (co-edited with Anna-Maria Wahl, 2003); Jane Addams *et al.*, *Women at the Hague: The International Congress of Women and Its Results* (2003). Her *Jane Addams and the Men of the Chicago School, 1892-1920* (1988) is widely cited in works on the history of American sociology.

BETTE J. DICKERSON is Associate Professor of Sociology at American University. She received the Ph.D. at Washington State University in 1986. She edited *African American Single Mothers: Understanding Their Lives and Families* (1995) and co-edited *Color, Class & Country: Experiences of Gender* (with Gay Young, 1994). She has been conducting research on the careers and organizational involvement of African American sociologists.

JAN MARIE FRITZ is Professor of Health Policy and Planning at the University of Cincinnati. She received the Ph.D. from American University in 1978. She is the author or editor of over 85 publications, including five editions of *The Clinical Sociology Resource Book* and *Mediation as a Tool for Social Intervention*. She is a past president of the Sociological Practice Association, the Section on Sociological Practice of the American Sociological Association, and the clinical sociology research division of the International Sociological Association. She was the I.S.A. representative to the United Nations for four years and is a member of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's National Environmental Justice Advisory Council.

MICHAEL R. HILL is the editor of *Sociological Origins*. He received doctorates in geography (1982) and sociology (1989) from the University

of Nebraska, Lincoln. He is the author of *Archival Strategies and Techniques* (1993) and has co-edited Charlotte Perkins Gilman, *With Her in Ourland: Sequel to Herland* (with Mary Jo Deegan, 1997) and *Harriet Martineau: Theoretical & Methodological Perspectives* (with Susan Hoecker-Drysdale, 2001).

VICKY M. MACLEAN is Associate Professor of Sociology at Middle Tennessee State University. She received the Ph.D. from Duke University in 1992. She has worked as an applied sociologist for the Federal Women's Program of the National Institutes of Environmental Health Sciences, the U.S. General Accounting Office, and the Texas Woman's University's Institute for Women's Health. She has written articles and reports on the sociology of work, health, and gender. Her current research includes women's contributions to sociology, and gender.

ROSS MITCHELL, Ph.D. University of Alberta, is an Environmental Sociologist with the Alberta Research Council. He has an extensive background in environmental sociology and resource management. His current research interests include social indicators, participatory governance, and social impacts in resource-dependent communities.

VICTOR RIOS, JR. is Associate Professor of Sociology at the College of the Desert in Palm Desert, California. He received the Ph.D. from the University of Notre Dame in 1982. His contribution in this volume was first presented at the joint meeting of the Western Social Science Association and the Association of Borderlands Scholars in Denver in 1992. His research interests include Chicano culture, political economy and undocumented immigration, class and inequality, and popular culture. He has authored *The Best Football in Texas*, a book on Texas high school football.

JONATHAN VANANTWERPEN is a Ph.D. candidate in the Department of Sociology at the University of California, Berkeley. He is co-editor (with Michael Burawoy) of an online volume entitled *Producing Public Sociology: Contributions from Berkeley Faculty* (2nd edition, 2005), and co-author (with Craig Calhoun) of a chapter on "mainstream sociology" in *Sociology in America: The American Sociological Association Centennial History* (2005). An earlier version of his contribution to this volume won the History of Sociology Section's Graduate Student Paper Award in 2002.

SUZANNE VROMEN is Professor Emerita of Sociology at Bard College. She earned the M.S. in urban planning at Columbia University and the Ph.D. in sociology at New York University. Her writings focus on social theorists, collective memory, and commemorations. She is at present completing a manuscript on children hidden during the Holocaust.

JOYCE E. WILLIAMS is Professor of Sociology Emerita, Texas Woman's University. She received the Ph.D. from Washington University in Saint Louis in 1971. She is the author of three books: *Black Community Control*, *The Second Assault*, and *Lest We Forget*, as well as numerous articles and essays on inequality, education, violence against women, and race and ethnic relations. She is currently working on a history of sociology in the United States.

ROBERT A. WORTHAM is Professor of Sociology at North Carolina Central University. He earned the Ph.D. at Emory University in 1986. He is the author of *Social-Scientific Approaches in Biblical Literature* (1999) as well as numerous articles. He is a past president of the North Carolina Sociological Association. He is currently co-editing and contributing to a forthcoming volume of *Sociation Today* devoted to the sociological legacy of W.E.B. Du Bois.

INDEX OF PERSONAL NAMES

- Abbott, Andrew 158n
 Abbott, Edith 19, 35, 284, 286, 312
 Abrahamson, Mark 381, 401
 Abrams, Paul 389
 Abu-Lughod, Janet 381, 401
 Achor, Shirley 383, 397
 Adams, George P. 156n, 165, 167
 Adams, Herbert B. 319, 321
 Adams, Romanzo 360–61, 363, 366–68
 Addams, Jane xviii, 1, 19–20, 27, 29–32, 35, 38, 46, 48ff., 55, 132, 136, 180, 182–85, 198, 204, 233, 285, 287, 329, 332, 372
 Alinsky, Saul 45
 Allen, Polly Wynn 184
 Allen, Walter 204
 Allprt, Floyd H. 311
 Allport, Gordon 78
 Alonso, Harriet 185
 Ames, Edward S. 20
 Anderson, Elijah 75–76, 380, 397, 400
 Anderson, Nels 332, 372, 376, 392
 Angell, J.W. 347
 Anthony, Susan B. 297
 Armstrong, Samuel Chapman 269
 Ashley, David 348n
 Ashley, William James 311
- Bach, Robert L. 101, 103
 Bacon, Alice 271
 Bahr, Howard M. 398
 Bain, Read 375
 Baker, Ray Stannard 25–26
 Bakker, J.I. Hans 344n
 Balch, Emily Greene 19, 136, 184–85, 262, 284–87, 305, 312, 371–72, 377, 392
 Baldwin, Ruth Standish 277
 Ballard, Allen B. 261
 Bannister, Robert C. 143n, 148n, 150n, 153, 260
 Baragar, Fletcher 349, 352
 Baran, Paul A. 342
 Barnes, Harry Elmer 148–49, 151–55, 159–61, 168, 170, 172, 290, 292–95, 313
 Barnes, Sandra L. 78, 81
 Barnes, Trevor J. 346
 Barrett, Janie Porter 61–64, 71, 73, 194–95
 Barrot, Collette 42
 Bates, Katherine 285
 Battisti, Francesco 42
 Batur, Pinar 190
 Bauman, Zygmunt 177
 Baumgartner, M.P. 380, 399
 Beard, Belle Boone 65ff., 72
 Beard, Charles A. 149
 Becker, Carl 46, 149
 Becker, Ernest 18
 Becker, Howard 372
 Becker, Howard P. 148–49, 152–55, 159, 162, 168, 170, 295, 314
 Bell, Colin 385, 387
 Bell, Derrick 209
 Bellah, Robert N. 153n, 377–78
 Bendix, Reinhard 144, 153, 176
 Bensman, Joseph 380, 384, 386, 395
 Bentham, Jeremy 348
 Bernard, Jessie 206, 260, 264, 318, 374, 378–79, 385
 Bernard, Luther Lee 159–60, 166–67, 170, 174, 206, 230, 260, 264–65, 280, 306n, 318
 Bethune, Mary McLeod 61–62, 64, 71, 73, 194, 197–99
 Bhan, Esme 232
 Bigham, J.A. 307
 Blackmar, Frank W. 46ff., 55, 319
 Blackwell, James E. 189, 191–92, 202, 207, 212n, 213–25, 237
 Blakely, Edward J. 401
 Blasi, Anthony J. 96n, 118n, 126, 129, 318
 Blauner, Robert 153n
 Bloch, Marc 323
 Bloom, Nicholas O. 404
 Blumer, Herbert 144, 153, 157n, 158, 186, 362, 372
 Boas, Franz 86
 Bock, Kenneth 144, 153n, 158–59
 Bockstaele, Jacques van 42
 Bockstaele, Maria van 42
 Bogardus, Emory 362

- Bolton, Herbert E. 146
 Bond, Horace Mann 279
 Bonnell, Victoria E. 177
 Bontemps, Arna 28
 Booth, Charles 375
 Borocz, Jozsef 104
 Bouglé, Celestin 329
 Boulding, Kenneth 346
 Bouquillon, Thomas 114–15, 116n
 Bourdieu, Pierre 141n, 156n
 Bowen, Louise de Koven 29–30
 Bowman, Isaiah 147
 Bowser, Benjamin P. 385
 Brackett, Jeffrey Richardson 301, 316
 Bradley, Walter K. 321
 Brandeis, Louis 25
 Brazil, Wayne D. 241
 Breckinridge, Sophonisba 35
 Broderick, Francis L. 235
 Brooks, John Graham 301
 Brooks, Walter H. 135
 Broschart, Kay Richards 57n, 126, 129, 229n, 233
 Brown, Elsa Barkley 224
 Brown, James S. 380, 383, 399
 Brown, Thomas I. 307
 Brown, Victoria 50
 Brown, William Oscar 275, 309
 Bruce, Deborah 93
 Bruno, Robert 381, 403
 Bryson, Gladys Eugenia 295, 314
 Buck, Paul 263, 304
 Bukharin, Nikolai 98
 Bullard, Robert D. 399
 Bullock, Henry A. 273
 Bulmer, Martin 33, 35, 90–91, 326, 328, 335
 Burawoy, Michael 56n, 92, 371–72, 385, 387
 Burgess, Elaine 380, 395
 Burgess, Ernest W. 18, 31–32, 43, 45, 55, 82, 170, 186, 190, 242, 325, 329–30, 332, 334, 384
 Burnet, Jean 357–58
 Burns, John 3
 Burt, Ronald 388
 Bustamante, Jorge 104ff.
 Byerly, William 282–83
 Cabot, Richard C. 311
 Cady, Daniel 78, 81
 Cahill, Edward 20–21
 Cahill, Lucy Crawford 20
 Calhoun, Craig 176
 Camic, Charles 143n, 148n, 173
 Campbell, James 19, 31
 Caplow, Theodore 380, 398
 Cardenas, Gilberto 104ff.
 Carey, James W. 346
 Carlyle, Thomas 12
 Carmichael, Stokely 210
 Carnes, Tony 146n
 Carroll, Jackson W. 82
 Carter, Ellwood B. 111n
 Carter, James Earl 53
 Carter, Linda M. 243
 Carter, Wilmoth A. 200
 Carver, Thomas 311
 Cavan, Ruth Shonle 326
 Cavan, Sherri 380, 396
 Cayton, Horace 279, 383, 393
 Chadwick, Bruce A. 398
 Chapin, F. Stuart 264, 290–92, 313
 Chapin, F. Stuart, Jr. 380, 397
 Chapoulie, Jean-Michel 335, 374
 Chase-Dunn, Christopher 381, 402
 Chaves, Mark 93
 Chesnutt, Charles Waddell 135
 Childs, Richard 298n
 Church, Robert L. 284–85
 Claghorn, Kate 136
 Clark, Carroll D. 47
 Clark, John Bates 319
 Clark, S.D. 357–58
 Clark, Terry Nichols 331
 Clausen, John 153n
 Cleveland, Grover 50
 Clew, Elsie 262
 Cohen, Robin 103
 Coleman, James 374, 379
 Coleman, Paulette 234
 Collins, Claudia C. 403
 Collins, Randall 153n, 176
 Coman, Katherine 284–87, 312
 Commons, John R. 183, 320–21
 Comstock, Alzada Peckham 298, 304, 315
 Comte, Auguste xviii, 115–16, 143, 145, 162, 169–70, 288, 293, 339
 Conant, Melvin 363
 Conklin, Agnes 44
 Conmy, Peter Thomas 146
 Converse, Jean M. 374–75, 385
 Conyers, James E. 222, 227
 Cookingham, Mary E. 156n
 Cooley, Charles Horton xviii, 27, 160n

- Cooley, Leroy C. 308
Coolidge, Mary E.B. Roberts 284, 286
Cooper, Anna Julia 60–63, 71, 73, 132, 194–95, 199, 230, 231ff., 251, 253
Cooper, George 368
Cooper, George C. 231
Copeland, Morris 347
Cormick, Gerald 53–54
Cornelius, Janet Duitsman 180
Cornelius, Wayne A. 104, 107–108
Coser, Lewis xvii, 185, 206
Coser, Rose Laub 206
Cothran, Tillman 201, 216
Cottrell, Leonard 43
Craig, Arthur Ylusses 135
Craig, John E. 324, 328
Crane, Jeffrey L. 318, 337, 368
Crane, Stephen 21
Croce, Benedetto 151
Cromwell, John W. 135
Croucher, Sheila 402
Crow, Graham 385
Crowell, John F. 321
Cuff, Robert D. 349
Cummings, Edward 311
Cummings, John 311
Cummings, Scott 381, 403
Cunnigen, Donald 227n, 266, 274
Curtis, Mattoon M. 321
Cussler, Margaret Thekla 284
- Dangberg, Grace 146, 162
Daniel, Robert P. 280–81
Daniel, Walter G. 280–81
Daniels, Sadie Iola 64
Darwin, Charles 288
Davidson, James A. 307
Davis, Ada J. 27
Davis, Allen 50
Davis, Allison 382, 393
Davis, Arthur K. 353
Davis, Elizabeth Lindsay 130
Davis, Fred 372
Davis, Horace Bancroft 316
Davis, Kingsley 153n
Davis, Mike 400
Daws, Gavan 368
DeBeauvoir, Simone 181
DeBra, Elizabeth 262
Deegan, Mary Jo 1–2, 18–21, 24, 29–33, 35, 125, 129, 131–32, 179–85, 188–97, 199–201, 204, 260, 264–65, 282, 285, 297, 302–304, 318, 372
DeGive, Mary Lewis 284
Degler, Carl 62
DeGreef, Guillaume 116
Delany, Matin R. 213
Dennis, Rutledge M. 227n
DeNood, Neal B. 295, 314
Deploige, Simon 115
DeSena, Judith N. 400
Deutsch, Monroe 166
Devine, Edward T. 26–27
Dewey, John 1, 319
Dickens, David R. 403
Dickerson, Bette J. 125–26, 211–13, 227n
Dietrich, Ethel Barbara 295–300, 315
Diggins, John P. 341
Diggs, Ellen Irene 65ff., 72–73, 192
Dike, Samuel W. 290
Dill, Augustus Grandville 80, 307
Dilthey, Wilhelm xviii, 142
Doggett, Allen B., Jr. 308
Dolan, Timothy M. 112n
Dollard, John 382, 393
Donnan, Elizabeth 287
Doyle, Bertram W. 278–80, 310
Drachslor, Julius 291
Drake, St. Clair 382–83, 393
DuBois, William E.B. xviii, 1, 57, 67–68, 74ff., 116, 129, 131, 133, 135, 188–90, 192–93, 198, 200, 204, 220–21, 230, 234ff., 247, 251, 253, 259, 266ff., 269, 272, 274, 276, 280, 297, 305, 307, 321, 371, 374–75, 377, 387, 391
Dudley, Carl S. 82
Duncan, Cynthia M. 403
Dusnter, Alfreda 63
Durkheim, Émile 92, 115, 126, 148n, 159, 160n, 174, 323, 330, 336, 339, 344n
Duster, Troy 153n, 206, 217
Dyke, Charles Bartlett 271
- Eaves, Lucille 182, 300, 302–303, 305, 316, 318
Eberhard, Wolfram 153n
Edelman, Marian Wright 212
Eden, Lynn 396
Edwards, G. Franklin 275
Edwards, Harry 153n
Ehrenhalt, Alan 381, 401
Eisenstadt, S.N. 97

- Eliot, Charles William 114, 272, 282, 283n
 Eliot, George 14
 Ellis, Carolyn 380, 398
 Ellwood, Charles 119, 148, 274, 318, 321
 Ely, Richard T. 319–20
 Emerick, Charles F. 290–91, 313
 Emerson, Samuel Franklin 319, 321
 Emerton, Ehraim 150
 England, Paula 204
 Enriquez, Eugene 42
 Erikson, Kai T. 397
 Estrada, Leobardo F. 104
 Ewell, John L. 309

 Fairchild, Henry Pratt 45
 Fairchild, M. 302
 Falkner, Roland 84
 Faragher, John Mark 380, 398
 Faris, Ellsworth 324, 362
 Faris, Robert E.L. 31, 318, 326, 334
 Farrell, John C. 180
 Feagin, Joe R. 18, 27n, 128–29, 184, 190, 201, 204, 399
 Febvre, Lucien 323
 Feenberg, Andrew 388
 Festinger, Leon 383, 394
 Fenton, Steve 363
 Fetter, Frank Albert 320
 Fine, Gary Alan 31, 341
 Fish, Virginia 181
 Fitzpatrick, Ellen 284n
 Fitzhugh, George 230, 250
 Fleming, Robert 209
 Flexner, Abraham 42
 Flores, Estevan 105–107
 Foerster, Robert F. 311
 Foley, Douglas E. 401
 Fong, Timothy P. 401
 Ford, James 311
 Form, William H. 206
 Foster, John B. 342
 Foster, Stephen W. 387, 399
 Fradenburgh, Jason N. 319
 Franklin, John Hope 277, 279
 Frazier, E. Franklin 81, 93, 189, 190–92, 200, 206, 215, 221, 234, 236, 242–44, 255, 257–59, 275, 279–80, 305, 309, 382–83, 393
 Freeman, Alice 286
 Frelinghuysen, John T. 131
 Frey, Connie D. 128n, 129
 Friedan, Betty 182, 187, 201
 Fritz, Jan 2, 42, 46–48, 50, 53, 54n, 74–75, 78
 Fry, C. Luther 278, 310
 Fuchs, Lawrence 368
 Fulcomer, Daniel 264, 318
 Fullinwider, S.P. 273–75, 278
 Furfey, Paul Hanly 112n, 114, 122
 Furner, Mary O. 127n

 Gabel, Leona 232
 Galbraith, John Kenneth 344n
 Gallaher, Art, Jr. 383, 395
 Galpin, Charles J. 375–77, 392
 Gamio, Manuel 105
 Gans, Herbert J. 380, 382, 395
 Gardner, Burleigh B. 382, 393
 Gardner, Mary R. 382, 393
 Garramon, Carlos 100
 Gaulejac, Vincent de 42
 Gearty, Patrick W. 122
 Gemorah, Solomon 146n
 Gerschenkron, Alexander 352n
 Geschwender, James A. 366
 Gettys, Warner E. 375
 Giddens, Anthony 142n, 264
 Giddings, Franklin H. 149, 262, 272, 274, 292, 296, 300, 302, 305, 319, 321, 376–77
 Gilkeson, John S. 335
 Gillin, John Lewis 47
 Gilman, Charlotte Perkins 30, 38, 128, 136, 180, 182–84, 204
 Glazer, Nathan 153n
 Glick, Clarence E. 43, 362
 Glock, Charles Y. 153n
 Gluckman, Max 372
 Glueck, Sheldon 284, 311
 Goffman, Erving 19, 144, 153n, 192, 372
 Goldberg, Arthur J. 299
 Gomillion, Charles 46, 50ff., 55
 Goodrich, Carter 347
 Goodwin, Frank A. 294
 Goodwin, Joanne L. 18, 20, 31
 Gordon, David L. A. 347
 Gorman, Eleanor Mills 111n
 Gottdiener, Mark 403
 Gouldner, Alvin W. 45, 153n, 386, 387
 Gove, Walter R. 84
 Graham, Otis L., Jr. 104
 Grebler, Leo 104

- Greek, Cecil E. 260
 Green, Loraine Richardson 27-29,
 194, 196-97, 200
 Green, Wendell E. 197
 Greene, John M. 289
 Greenhouse, Carol J. 380, 383, 398
 Gregory, Steven 373
 Griffin, Johnnie 227
 Grimes, Charlotte 53
 Gulliver, John Putnam 321
 Guzman, Jessie Parkhurst 52
- Hagood, Margaret Jarman 65ff.,
 72-73
 Halbwachs, Maruice 126, 323ff.
 Halbwachs, Yvonne 324, 327
 Hallinan, Maureen 187, 206
 Ham, William T. 311
 Hamilton, Alice 285
 Haney, David Paul 144n, 154n
 Hankins, Frank H. 159-60, 166, 290,
 292-95, 313-14
 Hannerz, Ulf 395
 Hard, William 25, 35
 Hardwick, Katherine Davis 316
 Hargens, Lowell 206
 Harlan, Louis R. 133
 Harmon, Lawrence 400
 Harvey, Lee 33
 Harwarth, Irene 262
 Hatfield, Henry Rand 156n
 Hauser, Philip 202
 Havighurst, Robert J. 378, 394
 Hawkins, B. Denise 219, 225
 Haynes, Birdye 189
 Haynes, Bruce D. 404
 Haynes, Elizabeth Ross 61-62,
 64-65, 71, 73, 189, 194, 196-97
 Haynes, George Edmund 45, 65,
 189, 197, 199, 236-37, 247, 254,
 256, 258-59, 277, 280, 305, 310
 Hayter, Roger 346
 Healey, J.A. 93
 Helmreich, William B. 381, 402
 Henderson, Charles R. 33
 Henslin, James M. 74
 Herring, Harriet Laura 65ff., 72-73,
 221-22, 225, 227, 236, 240-41,
 254, 256, 259
 Hesslink, George K. 380
 Hewes, Amy 297-99, 303-305, 315
 Heyer, Paul 340
 Hicks, John D. 153
- Hildebrand, Dietrich von 118
 Hill, Michael R. 125, 128-29, 132,
 188, 194, 264-65, 302-303, 318
 Hill, Reuben 398
 Hiller, Harry H. 345
 Himes, Joseph S. 265
 Hinkle, Roscoe C. 260
 Hobson, Fred 238
 Hobson, J.A. 97-98
 Hochschild, Arlie 153n
 Hochschild, Russell 380, 383, 396
 Hodgen, Margaret T. 146n, 153n,
 156-58, 158n
 Hollingshead, August B. 376-77, 380,
 394, 397
 Holmes, David 402
 Holtzman, Jon D. 403
 Homans, George C. 153n
 Hope, John 197-98
 Hope, Lugenia Burns 194, 197-99
 Hormann, Bernhard 362-63, 368
 Horowitz, Helen Lefkowitz 261-62,
 285, 289
 Hougen, Harvey 47-48
 Houle, Gilles 42
 House, Floyd N. 148-49, 159, 161,
 171-72
 Howard, George Elliott 301-302,
 318, 321
 Howard, Oliver O. 273
 Howell, Joseph T. 380, 382, 396
 Hraba, Joseph 398
 Huber, Joan 206
 Hudson, James R. 380, 387, 399
 Huff, Richard S. 308
 Hughes, Everett C. 33, 35-36, 158,
 186, 206, 365, 372
 Hughes, Helen McGill 19, 186-87,
 206, 326
 Hughes, Henry 230, 250
 Hummon, David M. 381, 400
 Humphrey, Sarah W. 290
 Hunt, Lynn 177
 Hunter, Albert J. 378, 380, 397
 Hunter, Floyd 382, 394
 Hunter, Herbert M. 129
 Husserl, Edmund 118
 Hutchinson, Edward 312
- Innis, Harold 337, 339ff.
- Jackson, Jacqueline Johnson 222-23
 Jackson, Maurice 223

- Jaisson, Marie 336
 James, Edward 62–64
 James, William 121, 190
 Janowitz, Morris 189, 207, 215–17,
 219–21, 223–24, 237, 378
 Jansen, Anton J. 378
 Janvry, Alain de 100
 Jarmon, Charles 276
 Jefferson, Paul 266–71, 280–81
 Jenkins, F. Raymond 308
 Jenks, Jeremiah Whipple 320
 Jenks, Leland 288, 313
 Jocher, Katharine 65ff., 72–73, 236,
 239–40, 254, 256, 258–59
 Johnson, Charles S. 28, 190, 211,
 220–21, 236, 241–42, 247, 255–59,
 261, 275, 278–79, 305, 310, 393
 Johnson, Guion G. 393
 Johnson, Guy B. 236, 245–46, 255,
 257, 259, 382, 392
 Johnson, James Weldon 29
 Johnson, Sheila K. 380, 396
 Johnson, Yolanda Yvette 129
 Johnston, Barry V. 318
 Jones, Butler 192, 265, 270n, 271,
 273–74, 277–78
 Jones, Thomas Jesse 271–72, 280,
 305, 308–309, 371, 377, 391
 Jones, William Henry 309
 Jones-Correa, Michael 402
 Joslyn, Carl S. 312
 Julian, Joseph 75, 77
 Juliani, Richard N. 381, 402

 Kaahumanu 369
 Kant, Immanuel 348n
 Käsler, Dirk 61n, 132–33, 194
 Katz, Michael B. 387
 Kaufman, Stuart B. 133
 Keane, John J. 114–15
 Keil, Thomas J. 384
 Keiser, Clyde V. 393
 Keith, Bruce 302
 Keller, Frances Richardson 135
 Keller, Suzanne 371, 373, 378, 389,
 404
 Kelley, Florence 19, 35
 Kendall, Diana 92
 Kennedy, Raymond 264
 Kennedy, Ruby Jo Reeves 264
 Kent, Noel J. 366
 Kerby, Edward 113n
 Kerby, Ora 113n, 115n
 Kerby, William J. 58, 111ff., 320

 Khaldun, Abd-al-Rahman ibn 41
 Killian, Lewis 211, 218, 260
 King, Martin Luther, Jr. 52, 202–203
 Kingsbury, Susan Myra 300ff., 305,
 316
 Kingsley, Mary H. 28
 Kinloch, Graham C. 210
 Kladky, William 244
 Kleeck, Mary Van 293
 Klein, Kerwin Lee 177
 Kluckhohn, Florence Rockwood 284
 Knight, Frank H. 347
 Kollock, Peter 388, 403
 Komarovskiy, Mirra 187, 206
 Kornblum, William 75, 77, 372, 380,
 397
 Kornhauser, William 153n
 Kraybill, Ron 53
 Kroeber, A.L. 146, 155
 Kuklick, Henrika 148n, 173
 Kunde, James E. 53
 Kurtz, Lester R. 31, 178, 181
 Kuznets, S. 97

 Ladner, Joyce A. 188, 201
 Lambeth, Helena Carney 130n
 Lantz, Herman R. 396
 Lanverre, Michael S. 403
 Lasker, Gabriel 104
 Lathrop, Julia 32, 35
 Laue, James 46, 52ff., 55
 Laumann, Edward 388
 Lavey, Parick B. 112n
 Lawson, Charlotte Price 130
 Lawson, Jesse 125, 127ff.
 Lawson, Jesse, Sr. 130
 Lawson, Rosetta E. Coakley 130, 132
 Laxer, Gordon 345
 Lazarsfeld, Paul 379
 Le Conte, Joseph 156n
 Leacock, Stephen 347
 Lee, Alfred McClung 45, 206
 Lee, Elizabeth Briant 45, 206
 Lee, Frank F. 380, 395
 LeFavour, Henry 301, 316
 Lemert, Charles 232
 Lengermann, Patricia Madoo 18, 33,
 127n, 129, 148n, 159, 260, 306
 Lenin, V.I. 97–98
 Leo, John 139, 201, 202
 Leo XIII, Pope 113, 115n
 Lescher, Bruce H. 112n, 113
 Levine, Donald N. 111n, 148n, 170,
 174

- Levine, Hillel 400
 Levine, Rhonda F. 366
 Levy, Marion J., Jr. 343n
 Lewis, David L. 266, 269
 Lewis, Hylan 275, 383, 394
 Liebow, Elliott 372, 380–81, 395
 Lin, Jan 381, 402
 Lincoln, Abraham 261n
 Lincoln, C. Eric 81, 93
 Lind, Andrew W. 360–63, 365–67
 Lindner, Rolf 33, 35
 Lindsay, Samuel McCune 320
 Linnekin, Jocelyn 368
 Lipset, Seymour Martin 97, 144, 153, 176, 356–57
 Lobb, John 298, 315
 Locke, Alain 29
 Lofland, John 384, 395
 Loomis, Charles P. 139, 202–203
 Loosley, Elizabeth W. 394
 Lovejoy, Arthur O. 147
 Lowenthal, Esther 291, 292n
 Lowenthal, Leo 153n
 Lowie, Robert H. 155
 Luison, Lucio 42
 Luker, Ralph E. 134
 Lumpkin, Katharine DuPre 65ff., 72–73
 Lunt, Paul S. 393
 Luxemburg, Rosa 98
 Lybarger, Michael 272
 Lyman, Stanford 33, 35, 144, 157n, 260, 263, 272, 304, 374
 Lynd, Helen Merrell 330, 331n, 373, 376, 380–381, 385, 392–93
 Lynd, Robert S. 186, 330, 331n, 373, 376, 379–81, 385, 392–93
 Lyon, David 371
 Lyon, Mary 295

 Macfarland, H.B.F. 140
 MacFarlane, Alan 388
 Macionis, John 388
 MacIver, Robert M. 320, 377–78
 Mack, Julian 32
 MacKintosh, W.A. 344n
 MacLean, Annie Marion 136, 303, 321
 MacLean, Vicky M. 126, 337
 MacLear, Martha 309
 Macpherson, C.B. 358
 MacRury, Norma Olive 284
 Madge, John 260
 Magny, Cl. 42

 Mahoney, Kathleen A. 114–15
 Mainiero, Lina 64
 Maline, Mindi 262
 Mamiya, Lawrence H. 81, 93
 Manicas, Peter T. 142n
 Mannheim, Karl 335, 339
 Marcel, Jean-Christophe 324n, 325–27, 329–30, 335
 Marley, Bob 207
 Marrett, Cora Bagley 191n
 Marsh, Margaret Alexander 295, 314
 Marshall, Alfred 148n, 174
 Martindale, Don 318
 Martineau, Harriet 204
 Martinez, Geronimo C. 106
 Marx, Karl 9, 74, 115–16, 120, 268, 286, 288, 339, 342, 344a, 348n, 356
 Masuoka, Jitzuichi 362
 Mathiasen, Otto F. 308
 Mather, Frank L. 131
 Matthews, Fred H. 18, 33, 13, 363–64, 367
 Mattson, Vernon 347
 Matza, David 153n
 Mauss, Marcel 28
 May, Herbert F. 146
 Mayo-Smith, Richmond 79, 267, 319
 Mays, Benjamin E. 81, 93
 Mazzini, Giuseppe 12, 16
 McAfee, Mildred 288n
 McDonagh, Edward 45
 McDonald, Terrence 176–77
 McDougall, Harold 382, 400
 McDowell, Mary 136
 McHugh, Mrs. R.J. (Kerby) 113n
 McKenzie, Fayette 277
 McKenzie, Roderick D. 330
 McKenzie King, William Lyon 347
 McKinney, William 82
 McLuhan, Marshall 340
 McQueen, Albert J. 223n
 McRoberts, Omar M. 92
 Mead, George Herbert xviii, 1, 19–20, 35n, 119, 128, 157n, 160n, 180, 188, 190, 344n
 Mead, Mary Castle 29
 Medoff, Peter 381, 401
 Mercier, Désiré 115n
 Meredith, James 209
 Merton, Robert K. 83, 148, 169n, 186, 284, 312
 Meyers, George A. 134n
 Mill, John Stuart 101, 344n
 Miller, Herbert A. 37n, 161

- Miller, Elizabeth Roberts 233
 Miller, Kelly, Jr. 131, 133, 134n,
 135, 137, 191, 230, 233–34, 247,
 251, 253, 259, 273ff., 280, 309
 Miller, Kelly, Sr. 233
 Mills, C. Wright 34, 91, 186, 220,
 264, 339–40, 348, 359
 Mitchell, Ross 337, 341, 355
 Modibo, Najja 227
 Molyneaux, Lambert 239
 Monti, Daniel J. 381, 400
 Moore, Alwina Jane 284
 Moore, Jacqueline 134n
 Moore, Vida Frank 296
 Moore, Wilbert E. 202
 Morgan, Gordon D. 260
 Morgan, H. Gerthou 394
 Moses, Bernard 146
 Moses, Mabelle 302
 Moss, Alfred A. 134n, 135
 Mowbray, Paul Franklin 277, 310
 Moynihan, Daniel Patrick 385
 Mullins, Nicholas C. 318
 Murray, c.s.c., Raymond W. 122
 Murray, Stephen 146, 155n, 158–59
 Mussey, Henry Raymond 287–88
 Myrdal, Gunnar 275

 Neill, Robin 344, 347, 349
 Nelson, Margaret K. 403
 Nerad, Maresi 156n
 Newby, Howard 385, 387
 Newcomb, Simon 233
 Newell, Jane Isabel 287, 312
 Nichols, Charles W. 21
 Nichols, Lawrence T. 263, 282–84
 Nicholson, Joseph W. 81, 93
 Niebrugge-Brantley, Jill 18, 33, 129,
 260, 306
 Nisbet, Robert A. 14, 146–47, 155,
 157, 159, 160n
 Nonet, Philipe 153n
 Nordyke, Eleanor C. 368
 Noss, Theodore K. 19
 Novick, Peter 150, 172
 Nuesse, C. Joseph 111n, 112n

 O'Connell, Pezavia 309
 Odum, Howard W. 67, 149, 170,
 236–38, 240, 245, 247, 254, 256,
 258–60, 290, 292, 318, 377, 385
 Ogburn, William F. 27, 186, 238,
 327, 329, 335

 Oldham, J.H. 272
 Orenstein, David M. 348n
 Orser, W. Edward 401

 Padilla, Felix M. 398
 Page, Charles H. 260, 378
 Palmieri, Patricia Ann 282, 284, 303
 Pappi, Franz 388
 Pareto, Vilfredo 143n, 148n, 174,
 344n
 Park, Clara Cahill 2, 19ff.
 Park, Robert Ezra 1, 18ff., 92, 129,
 143, 145, 149, 159, 161, 170–73,
 186, 190, 199–200, 275, 278–79,
 320, 325–26, 329–30, 332, 334, 337,
 361ff., 376, 384
 Parks, Rosa 216
 Parsons, Talcott xviii, 142, 143n, 148,
 153n, 172–75, 284, 312
 Patillo-McCoy, Mary 403
 Patten, Simon Nelson 320
 Patterson, David L. 47
 Peabody, Francis G. 272n, 311, 319
 Petersen, William 153n
 Peixotto, Jessica 156
 Perkins, Frances 297
 Pigors, Paul J. 311
 Platt, Anthony M. 275–76
 Poplin, Dennis E. 385
 Portes, Alejandro 101, 104, 107–108
 Porteus, Stanley D. 361, 363
 Potts, David B. 284
 Pound, Roscoe 132
 Powell, William S. 239
 Powers, Harry H. 290
 Pratt, Butler 309
 Pratt, David Butler 309
 Price, Daniel O. 240
 Pridmore, Jay 197
 Putnam, Robert D. 370, 374

 Quadagno, Jill 206

 Rae, John 344n
 Rainwater, Lee 380, 385, 396
 Ranke, Leopold von 142, 150
 Ratzenhofer, Gustav 115
 Rauschenbush, Winifred 19, 21–24,
 33, 35, 37
 Redfield, Margaret Park 23
 Reid, Ira DeAugustine 258, 268, 280,
 307
 Reskin, Barbara F. 206

- Rheume, Jacques 42
 Rhoades, Lawrence J. 127n, 137
 Ricardo, David 344n
 Richmond, Mary 26
 Rickert, Heinrich 142
 Riecken, H.W. 394
 Riesman, David 153n
 Riley, John W., Jr. 206
 Riley, Matilda White 206
 Rios, Victor, Jr. 57, 106
 Robbins, Richard 242
 Roberts, Mary Elizabeth Burroughs:
 See Coolidge, Mary E.B. Roberts
 Robinson, James Harvey 149–51, 159
 Rodriguez, Nestor P. 399
 Rogers-Rose, LaFrancis 62, 211
 Roosevelt, Franklin Delano 64, 297
 Roosevelt, Theodore 25–26
 Roscoe, Janice 158
 Rose, Arnold M. 186, 206
 Rose, Caroline 186, 206
 Rose, Dan 380, 399
 Rosenberg, Rosalind 49n
 Ross, Dorothy 143n, 145, 150n, 153,
 170, 172n, 175
 Ross, Edward A. 183–84, 302, 317,
 319, 339
 Rossi, Alice S. 187, 206
 Rossi, Peter H. 206
 Rouse, Jacqueline Anne 198
 Roy, Donald 372
 Roy, Shirley 42
 Royce, Josiah 156n
 Ruch, Libby O. 368
 Rudwick, Elliott 235
 Ruskin, John 21
 Ryan, John A. 122
 Ryder, Arthur W. 146
 Rynbrandt, Linda J. 31, 179

 Salamon, Sonya 404
 Samora, Julian 57, 96, 104–107
 Sanborn, Franklin B. 319
 Sanjek, Roger 381, 383, 402
 Sassen, Saskia 103
 Saur, Carl 155
 Schachter, Joseph P. 370
 Schachter, S. 394
 Scharnhorst, Gary 180
 Scheler, Max
 Scherer, Jacqueline 374
 Schmitt, Robert C. 368
 Schmoller, Gustav 75, 116, 123,
 267n, 348
 Schraml, Lisa A. 101, 103
 Schulz, David A. 396
 Schumpeter, Joseph A. 342
 Schurman, Franz 153n
 Schutz, Alfred 185, 190
 Schwager, Sally 282–83
 Schwieder, Dorothy 380, 383, 398
 Schwieder, Elmer 398
 Scott, Ann Firor 68
 Scott, Joseph W. 218
 Scudder, Vida 285
 Seeley, John R. 381, 383, 385, 394
 Selvin, Hanan 153n
 Selznick, Philip 144, 153
 Seigny, Robert 42
 Sewell, William 223
 Shaw, Clifford 44, 332
 Shelton, Beth Anne 380, 382, 399
 Shils, Edward 33
 Shotwell, J.T. 159
 Siegfried, Charlene Haddock 31
 Sim, Alexander R. 344
 Simmel, Georg 111, 116–17, 119,
 144, 160n, 344n
 Simmons, John 300
 Simon, Rita 204
 Simpson, Ida Harper 128n
 Sims, Newell L. 376, 392
 Skelton, O.D. 344n
 Sklar, Holly 381, 401
 Skocpol, Theda 18, 20, 26–27, 31,
 34–35
 Skolnick, Jerome 153n
 Small, Albion 55–56, 149, 159, 169,
 183, 220, 267n, 273–74, 297, 319
 Smelser, Neil J. 144, 153n, 176
 Smith, Adam 344n, 356
 Smith, Carolyn D. 75, 77
 Smith, Charles U. 211, 218, 222
 Smith, Dorothy 173, 176, 278
 Smith, Jessie Carney 65
 Smith, Joan 403
 Smith, Marc A. 388, 403
 Smith, Mark C. 143n, 150n, 153
 Smith, Sophia 289
 Smith, Stanley H. 248, 279
 Smith, W.B. 347
 Smock, Raymond W. 133
 Snyder, Mary G. 401
 Slomon, Barbara Miller 261–62
 Sombart, Werner 344n, 348
 Sorokin, Pitirim A. 148n, 149, 152,
 153n, 154, 159, 164–65, 173, 284,
 312

- Soule, Annah May 296–97, 305
 Spectorosky, A.C. 395
 Spencer, Anna Garlin 136
 Spencer, Herbert xviii, 27, 115–16, 143, 288, 290, 339, 344
 Spradley, James P. 380–81, 396
 Sproul, Robert G. 153n, 155, 166–67
 Squires, Sharon 227
 Stacey, Margaret 374
 Stack, Carol 380, 382, 388, 397
 Stanfield, John H. 129
 Stark, Rodney 74–75, 84
 Starr, Ellen Gates 47
 Stein, Maurice R. 385
 Stellway, Richard 400
 Stephens, Henry Morse 146–47
 Stinchcombe, Arthur 153n
 Stoecker, Randy 381, 401
 Stonecall, Linda 385–86
 Stonequist, Everett 362
 Stow, Sarah D. 296
 Straight, Mrs. Willard 298
 Straus, Roger A. 46
 Strauss, Anselm 372
 Strong, Edward 158, 268
 Strong, Hersey H. 307
 Sugrue, Thomas J. 387
 Sumner, William Graham 125, 288, 317, 321
 Susser, Ida 398
 Suttles, Gerald D. 372, 378–80
 Swanson, Guy 153n
 Sweez, Paul M. 342
 Szlajfer, Henryk 342
 Taber, H.P. 22
 Takaki, Roinald 368
 Talbot, Marion 136
 Tatum, Beverly D. 380, 398
 Taylor, Mary 298
 Taylor, Paul Schuster 157
 Teggart, Frederick J. 125, 141ff., 317
 Terrell, Mary Church 194–95
 Theodorson, George A. 55
 Thomas, Dorothy Swain 157–58, 186–87, 206
 Thomas, Robert D. 399
 Thomas, William I. xviii, 1, 24, 37n, 116, 143, 150, 159, 160n, 161, 170, 180, 186, 206, 285, 371–72
 Thompson, Edgar T. 360, 362
 Thompson, Robert E. 319, 321
 Thrasher, Frederic 332
 Tienda, Marta 204
 Tilman, Rock 347
 Timasheff, Nicholas S. 55
 Tiryakian, Edward 369
 Tocqueville, Alexis de 160n
 Todd, Arthur J. 154n
 Tolman, Frank L. 264–65, 318
 Tönnies, Ferdinand 115, 159, 160n
 Toppin, Edgar Allen 237
 Tosi, Michelina 42
 Toynbee, Arnold 12
 Trask, Haunani-Kay 368
 Treudley, Mary Bosworth 288, 313
 Trow, Martin 153n, 175n
 Turner, Frederick Jackson 149, 347
 Turner, Jonathan H. 148n
 Turner, Ralph H. 366
 Turner, Stephen Park 148n
 Valien, Preston 242
 VanAntwerpen, Jonathan 56, 125
 Vance, Rupert 236, 244–45, 255, 257–59
 Vassar, Matthew 261n
 Vaughn, Gerald F. 343, 353
 Veblen, Thorstein xviii, 337, 339ff.
 Vera, Hernan 18, 27n, 128–29, 184, 190, 201, 204
 Vidich, Arthur J. 260, 263, 272, 304, 374, 380, 383–84, 386, 395
 Vincent, George E. 273
 Vincent, John H. 130
 Vorse, Mary Heaton 23–24
 Vromen, Suzanne 126, 326–27, 331, 334
 Wahl, Ana-Maria 21
 Waller, Owen Meredith 135
 Walls, Ellie Alma 310
 Walton, John 101
 Ward, Lester F. 116, 183–84, 220, 319
 Ware, Caroline Farrar 380, 382, 385, 393
 Warner, W. Lloyd 373–74, 376, 379–80, 382, 385, 393–94
 Washington, Booker T. 22, 38, 51, 129, 131, 133–35, 140, 189, 196, 200, 269, 269n–70n, 272, 275, 277
 Washington, Margaret Murray 194, 195–96, 199
 Watkins, Mark Hanna 279, 310
 Watkins, William H. 272, 280
 Watson, A.J. 344
 Watson, Wilbur H. 383, 399

- Wayland, Francis 296
 Webb, Beatrice Potter 49, 301
 Webb, Sidney 49
 Weber, Max xviii, 75–76, 115, 117,
 142, 148n, 160n, 174, 339, 344n
 Weiner, Myron 97
 Weiss, Nancy J. 277
 Wells, David Collin 321
 Wells-Barnett, Ida Bell 61–63, 71, 73,
 133, 189, 194–95, 230, 232–33, 251,
 253
 Wernick, Iddo K. 349
 West, Cornel 190
 West, James 380, 383, 394
 Wexler, Sanford 209–210
 Wheeler, Benjamin Ide 146–47
 White, Eartha M.M. 136
 White, Georgia 290–91
 Whitehead, Alfred North 148
 Whittaker, Elvi 368
 Whyte, William Foote 372–73, 383,
 393
 Whyte, William H., Jr. 394
 Wilensky, Harold 153n
 Willems-Brown, Bruce 359
 Williams, Brett 380, 399
 Williams, Fannie Barrier 131, 189,
 194–95
 Williams, James M. 376–77, 391–92
 Williams, Joyce E. 126, 337, 380,
 387, 396
 Williams, S. Laing 131
 Williamson, Magaret Holmes 398
 Wilson, Frances Rusan 63
 Wilson, George F. 321
 Wilson, Warren H. 375–77, 391–92
 Wilson, William Julius 191, 206
 Windelband, Wilhelm 142
 Winston, Michael R. 234
 Winternitz, Milton C. 42–43
 Wirth, Louis 43–45, 156, 186, 332,
 334, 376–77, 380, 382, 392
 Wise, Stephen 25
 Wolff, Kurt H. 387
 Wood, Charles H. 102–103
 Woodhouse, Chase Going 291, 313
 Woofter, Thomas J. 393
 Woolever, Cynthia 93
 Woolston, Howard B. 391
 Work, Monroe 128, 191, 199–200
 Works, Ernest 218
 Wortham, Robert A. 57
 Wright, E., II 75, 78, 80, 90–91
 Wundt, Wilhelm Max 115–16
 Wylie, Mary Lou 69n
 Yamamura, Douglas 367
 Young, Alford A., Jr. 266, 280
 Young, Kimball 318
 Young, Whitney 201
 Youngman, Anna Prichitt 286, 305,
 312
 Zehner, Robert B. 380, 397
 Zimmerman, Carle 284, 312, 377
 Znaniecki, Florian 161, 285, 320,
 371–72
 Zolberg, Aristide R. 104
 Zorbaugh, Harvey Warren 44, 55,
 332, 334, 372, 376, 382
 Zuckerman, Phillip 78, 81
 Zueblin, Charles 33

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

- A. Wade Smith Award 226
 Adelphi University 319
 African Americans in the A.S.A.
 188ff.
 Alley Improvement Association (DC)
 130
 Alpha Suffrage Club 153
 American Academy of Political and
 Social Science 130
American Anthropologist 245
 American Association of University
 Professors 147
American Ecclesiastical Review 112
 American Economic Association 1,
 345
American Journal of Sociology 29, 44, 47,
 55, 155, 159, 164, 167, 176, 178,
 183, 186, 189, 204, 214, 245, 292,
 302, 375
 American Missionary Society 248,
 261, 266, 276
 American Negro Academy 134, 153
 American Political Science Association
 211
 American Psychological Association
 202, 211
 American Sociological Association 1,
 47, 67, 73, 111, 125–27, 132–33,
 136–37, 156, 158–59, 178ff., 207ff.,
 238, 239–40, 242–44, 246, 260,
 275, 290, 292, 376
 Theory Section 369
American Sociological Review 127n, 148n,
 159, 189, 204, 214–15, 245, 288,
 292
American Anthropologist 217
 Amherst College (MA) 289, 319
 Andover Newton Theological School
 (MA) 321
Annales d'histoire économique et sociale 323
Annales de l'Institut de Sociologie 127n
*Annals of the American Academy of Political
 and Social Science* 245
 Antioch College 45–46
 Association for Social and Behavioral
 Sciences 192
 Association for Humanist Sociology
 45
 Association for the Study of Negro Life
 and History 64, 73
 Association internationale des
 sociologues de la langue française
 42
 Association of Black Sociologists 126,
 207ff., 224ff.
 Association of Negro Colleges and
 Universities 237
 Atlanta Baptist College: See Morehouse
 College
 Atlanta University (GA) 72, 74–75,
 78, 90–91, 189, 198, 201, 235,
 247–48, 259, 265, 266ff., 273, 276,
 280–81, 305, 307, 321
 School of Social Work 197, 243
 Sociological Laboratory 79ff.,
 90–91, 267, 305, 307, 321
 See also Clark Atlanta University
Atlanta University Studies (Conferences)
 76–78, 80, 81ff., 92, 198, 252, 267
Atlantic Monthly 234
 Avante Systems, Inc. 104

 Baptist Foreign Missions 36
 Barber-Scotia College (NC) 262n
 Barnard College (NY) 261–62,
 265n
 Baylor University (TX) 245, 255
 Bennett College (NC) 262n
 Bethel Literary and Historical
 Association 131
 Bethlehem Center (Nashville) 277
 Bethune-Cookman College (School)
 (FL) 64, 73, 197–98
 Blackburn College (IL) 321
 Boston School for Social Work 301
 Bowdoin College (ME) 321
 Brenau University (GA) 72
 Brooklyn Institute of Arts and Sciences
 134
Brown v. Board of Education 209
 Brown University (RI) 154, 262, 319,
 321

- Bryn Mawr College (PA) 72, 240,
 261, 262, 285, 302, 303, 377
 Bucknell University (PA) 321

 Carleton College (MN) 341
 Carnegie Institute 80, 83
 Carolina Cotton and Woolen Mill
 241
 Case Western Reserve University:
 See Western Reserve University
 Catholic University of America (DC)
 58, 111–16, 319–20
 Catholic University of Lille (France)
 114n
 Caucus of Black Sociologists (A.S.A.)
 126, 201ff., 215, 216ff., 228
 Chautauqua Literary and Scientific
 Circle 130
 Cheyney University (PA) 261n
 Chicago *Broadaxe* 140
 Chicago Commission on Race
 Relations 241, 278
 Chicago Public Library 48
 Chicago Urban League 197, 241, 278
 Chicago Women's Club 29
 Civic Federation of Chicago 50
 Civil Rights Movement 51, 74, 201,
 209–10, 219, 380
 Clark Atlanta University (GA) 266
 Clark University (MA) 237, 242, 255,
 275, 288, 292
 Clemson University (Agricultural
 College) (SC) 238
 Clinic for the Social Adjustment of the
 Gifted 44
 Clinical Sociology Association 46
 Clinical sociology 40ff.
Clinical Sociology Review 46
Colored American 130, 140
 Columbia University (NY) 64, 72,
 148, 153n, 154, 186–87, 232,
 237–38, 247, 262–63, 272, 277–78,
 288, 292, 300–303, 305, 319–21,
 376
 School of Philanthropy 198
 Columbian College (DC) 319
 Commission on Interracial Cooperation
 286
 Committee on Social Studies (federal)
 272
 Committee on the Status of Racial and
 Ethnic Minorities in the Profession
 (A.S.A.) 223

 Community Relations Service (federal)
 52
 Community studies 337, 370ff.
 Congo Reform Association 22, 36
 Congress of Mothers 27
Contemporary Sociology 379n
 Cooperative Commonwealth Federation
 (Canada) 355
 Core-periphery development 353
 Cornell University 31, 286, 317,
 319–20
 Council of National Defense 299
 Council on African Affairs 253
Crisis 189, 235, 253, 268
 Cumberland College (KY) 321
 Curriculum 47, 263, 266ff., 275, 280,
 307ff.

 DC Sociological Society 73, 243, 258
 Daytona Normal and Industrial
 Institute: See Bethune-Cookman
 College
 Denison Settlement House (Boston)
 285
 Department of Agriculture (federal)
 66, 68, 73
 Department of Health, Education, and
 Welfare (federal) 385
 Department of Labor (federal) 65, 79,
 237, 254, 278, 297, 299
 DePauw University (IN) 321
 Development theory 97ff.
Dial 356
 Division of Negro Affairs (federal) 64
 DuBois-Johnson-Frazier Award (A.S.A.)
 202, 221, 223, 226
 Duke University (NC) 321
 Dunbar High School: See M Street
 High School

 Eastern Sociological Society 243, 258,
 292
 Ecole Normale Superior (Paris) 331
Education Review 234
 Elmira College (NY) 321
 Emory College (GA) 237
 Emory University (GA) 72, 238–39
 Ethics, professional 383–84
 Evelyn College (NJ) 262

 Federal Council of the Churches of
 Christ in America 45, 278
 Federal Emergency Relief Act 385

- Federal Reserve Board 286n
 Fisk University (TN) 37, 51, 64, 71,
 233-37, 242-43, 247-48, 251, 254,
 259, 265-66, 275, 276ff., 280-81,
 305, 310-11
Footnotes (A.S.A.) 204
Free Speech and Highlight 233
 Free Speech Movement 158n
 Freedmen's Bureau (federal) 261, 266,
 269, 273, 276
 Frelinghuysen University (DC) 73,
 130-32, 232, 253
 Functionalism xviii
- Geneva College (PA) 264n
 George Mason University (VA) 52
 Georgia Prison Commission 85
Gomillion v. Lightfoot 51-52
 Goucher College (MD) 72, 239, 297,
 321
 Gregorian University (Rome) 114n
 Guilde Internationale (Paris) 232
- Hamilton College (NY) 319, 321
 Hampton Institute (University) (VA)
 71, 265-66, 269ff., 280-81, 305,
 308
 Harlem Renaissance 28-29, 279
 Harvard Annex: See Radcliffe College
 Harvard University (MA) 22, 75, 114,
 148, 153n, 154, 173, 235, 251,
 262-63, 266, 272, 276, 282ff., 301,
 305, 319, 344n
 Hawaii Social Research Laboratory:
 See Romanzo Adams Social
 Research Laboratory
 Hawai'i Sociological Association 368
 Henderson-Brown College (Henderson
 State University, AR) 244, 255
Horizon 189
 Howard University (DC) 89, 130-31,
 137, 227, 233-34, 242-43, 246-48,
 251, 255, 259, 265, 270n, 273ff.,
 277, 280, 305, 309-10
 Hudson's Bay Company 354
 Hull-House (Chicago) 6-7, 29-30, 35,
 38, 48ff., 179-80, 183-84, 189,
 197-98, 277n, 303, 329, 371,
 374-75, 377, 391
- Illinois State Penitentiary 45
 Indiana University 317
 Indianapolis *Freeman* 140
- Institute of Social and Religious
 Research 384
 Interdenominational Theological Center
 (GA) 266
 International Anti-Lynching Crusade
 253
 International Bible College and
 Institute for Civic and Social
 Betterment (DC) 131
 International Congress of Women:
 See Women's International League
 for Peace and Freedom
 International Sociological Association
 42
 International Thorstein Veblen
 Association 341n
- John F. Slater Fund 80
 Johns Hopkins University (MD)
 233-34, 243, 251, 317, 319-21, 341
 Joseph Himes Award 226
Journal of Applied Sociology 36, 302
Journal of Educational Sociology 45, 288
Journal of Health and Social Behavior 223
Journal of Political Economy 347
 Julius Rosenwald Fund 248
 Justice: See Social Justice
- Kansas Conference of Charities and
 Corrections 47
 Kettering Foundation 53
 Knights of Labor 113
 Knoxville College (TN) 95n
 Krakow, University at (Jagiellonian)
 320
- Labor movement 3ff., 49
 Laura Spelman Rockefeller Fund 248
 League of Nations 185
 League of Women Voters 197
 Lemoyne Institute (Lemoyne-Owen
 College) (TN) 71, 233, 251, 261n
 Lincoln University (Institute) (MO)
 232
 Lincoln University (PA) 261n
 Lincoln Temple Congregational
 Church (DC) 138
 Locust Street Social Settlement (VA)
 63
 Loras College: See St. Joseph's
 College
 Louisville National Medical College
 89

- Louvain, l'Université Catholique de (Belgium) 115, 116, 320
 Lower North Side Child Guidance Clinic (Chicago) 43-44
 Loyalty oath controversy 158n
 Lynchburg College (VA) 72
 Lynching 63
- M Street High School (DC) 62, 231-32, 234
Manufacturers Record 294
 Massachusetts Commission on Industrial and Technical Education 301-302
 Massachusetts Minimum Wage Commission 299
 McGill University (Quebec) 347
 McMaster University (Ontario) 344
 Meharry Medical College (TN) 89
 Memphis State University (TN) 60
 Meredith College (NC) 72, 280
 Metropolitan A.M.E. Church (DC) 138
 Middlebury College (VT) 264n
 Midland College (NE) 321
 Midwest Sociological Society 186
 Minority Fellowship Program (A.S.A.) 222, 226
 Modernization theory 97
 Morehouse College (GA) 197, 243, 266, 268
 Morgan State College (MD) 67
 Morris Brown College (GA) 266
 Mount Holyoke College (Seminary) (MA) 261, 265, 281, 295ff., 303-305, 315
- National Association for the Advancement of Colored People 74, 80, 189, 235, 253, 268-69
 National Association of Colored Women 130
 National Catholic School of Social Work (DC) 112
 National Community Center Association 37
 National Conference of Catholic Charities 112
 National Council of Churches
 National Council of Congregational Churches 261n
 National Emancipation Commemoration Society 132
 National Federation of Afro-American Women 130
 National Institutes of Health (federal) 385
 National League of Colored Women 130
 National Peace Foundation 53
 National Sociological Society 125, 127ff.
 National Youth Administration (federal) 64, 73
 Natural resource development 350
 Negotiated Investment Strategy 53
 Negro Conference Movement 266
 Neighborhood Union (Atlanta) 197, 198
 Network analysis 388
 New history 149, 168, 174
 New Orleans Child Guidance Clinic 43
 New Orleans University 89
 New School University (New School for Social Research) 341, 347
 New York Bureau of Social Research 277
 New York School of Philanthropy 237, 277
 New York University 43-44
 Niagara Movement 74, 235, 253, 268
 Nineteenth Street Baptist Church (DC) 138
 North Carolina Sociological Association 92
 Northwest Company 354
 Northwestern University (IL) 154, 321
- Oberlin College (OH) 62, 71, 231, 251, 321
 Ohio State University 51
 Ohio Wesleyan University 245, 321
Opportunity 241
- Paine College (GA) 51
 Park House (Chicago) 37
 Pembroke College (State University) (NC) 262
Perspectives 369
 Phelps-Stokes Fund 272, 385
Phylon 68, 73, 189, 235, 253, 269
 Population Association of America 68, 73, 258
 Population Reference Bureau 370

- Princeton University (NJ) 42, 262, 321
 Progressive Party 21
 Public sociology 56
 Pullman Strike 49–50

Quarterly Journal of Sociology 299
 Queens College (NY) 72
 Queens University (Ontario) 344n

Race & Society 225
 Radcliffe College (MA) 72, 240, 261–62, 265, 282ff., 299, 303–304, 311–12, 321
 Reflexive sociology 386–87
 Rockefeller Foundation 329, 384
 Romanzo Adams Social Research Laboratory 362
 Rural Sociological Society 68, 73
 Russell Sage Foundation 64, 293n
 Rust College (MS) 232

 St. Augustine's Normal School and Collegiate Institute (NC) 231
 St. Francis Seminary (WI) 113
 St. Joseph's (Loras) College (IA) 113, 115
 St. Patrick's College (Ireland) 113
Scientific Monthly 234
 Scotia College (Seminary):
 See Barber-Scotia College
 Second Baptist Church Lyceum (DC) 131
 Seton Hall University (College) 264n
 Settlement house 3ff., 304, 374
 Shaw University (NC) 89
 Simmons College (MA) 265, 300ff., 305, 316
 Smith College (MA) 67, 261, 265, 281, 287, 289ff., 299, 303–304, 313–14
 Social Credit Party 355
Social Forces 66–67, 73, 147, 171, 238, 240, 245, 288, 292, 299, 302, 375
 Social Gospel Movement 262–63, 274
 Social justice 40–42, 46, 54–55
Social Process in Hawaii 362n, 363, 367
 Social Science Association (Honolulu) 361
 Social Science Movement xvii, 1
 Socialist Party of Canada 356
 Socialization 119–21

 Society for the Collegiate Instruction of Women 282
 Society for the Study of Social Problems 45, 217
Sociological Origins 194
Sociological Papers 127n
Sociological Practice 46
 Sociological Practice Association 45
 Sociological Society of London 127n
 Sociologists for Women in Society 187, 217
Sociology and Social Research 45
 Sophie Newcomb College (LA) 262
 South Side Child Guidance Clinic (Chicago) 43–44
 Southern Sociological Congress 64, 128–29, 132–33, 199, 244
 Southern Sociological Society 67, 69n, 73, 211, 235, 240, 242, 246
Southern Workman 271
 Spelman College (GA) 262n, 266, 268
 Standard Oil of New Jersey 45
 Stanford University (CA) 146, 184, 301–302, 317, 321, 341, 347
 State University of Ann Arbor:
 See University of Michigan
 Stetson University (FL) 321
 Stratification 382
 Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee 210
Survey 36, 302
 Sweet Briar College (VA) 66, 239
 Symbolic interactionism xviii, 372
 Syracuse University (NY) 319–320

 Tulane University (LA) 43, 262
 Tuskegee Civic Association 51–52
 Tuskegee Institute (University) (AL) 22, 23, 51, 269

 Undocumented immigrants 96ff.
 Union College (NY) 319, 321
 Union Theological Seminary (NY) 319, 321
 United Farmers of Alberta 355
 United States Bureau of Pensions (federal) 131, 233
 United States Bureau of the Census (federal) 272
 United States Institute of Peace 53
 United States Naval Observatory 233
 University of Alberta 353

- University of Berlin (Germany) 75, 267, 285, 297, 301n, 305
 University of California, Berkeley 125, 141ff., 239
 University of Chicago (IL) 24, 28–31, 36–37, 42–44, 48, 55, 64, 126, 153n, 154, 169, 178ff., 186–87, 197, 200, 201n, 204, 223–24, 236, 238, 241, 243, 245, 247, 255, 263, 268, 275, 277–78, 284n, 285–86, 288, 297, 305, 319–21, 323ff., 341, 344–45, 347, 349, 361, 376
 Extension 302
 Society for Social Research 325–26
 University of Chicago Social Settlement 35n
 University of Edinburgh (Scotland) 320
 University of Georgia 238, 254
 University of Halle (Germany) 320
 University of Havana (Cuba) 72
 University of Hawaii 360–61, 363, 366
 University of Heidelberg (Germany) 319, 320
 University of Illinois 320
 University of Kansas 46ff., 288, 319
 University of Michigan 154, 263, 286, 296, 319, 361
 University of Minnesota 72, 154, 290
 University of Mississippi 237
 University of Missouri, Columbia 321, 341, 347, 349
 University of Missouri, St. Louis 52, 53
 University of Nebraska 302, 317
 University of Nevada 361
 University of North Carolina 66, 72, 154, 238–40, 244, 245, 247–48, 254
 Institute for Research in the Social Sciences 238–41, 244–45, 254–55, 259
 University of North Dakota 321
 University of Notre Dame 96n, 104, 107, 122
 University of Paris (France) 62, 232, 251, 285
 University of Pennsylvania 72, 74, 76, 154, 158, 235, 239, 278, 319–21
 University of Pittsburgh (PA) 268
 University of South Carolina 238–39, 254
 University of Southern California 154
 University of Strasbourg (France) 323, 328
 University of the Pacific (CA) 321
 University of Toronto (Ontario) 345, 349, 357–58
 University of Vermont 319, 321
 University of Virginia 239, 247–48, 254, 259
 Institute for Research in Social Science 239–40, 254
 University of Washington 154
 University of Wisconsin 72, 152, 154, 239, 263, 287, 317, 320
 Urban League, National 28, 45, 201, 237, 241, 254, 268, 277
 Value neutrality 76, 149
 Vanderbilt University (TN) 244, 255
 Vassar College (NY) 261, 265n
 Virginia Industrial School for Colored Girls 63–64
 Virginia Social Science Association 68, 73
 Virginia Union University 241, 255, 273, 278
 Walden University (TN) 89
 War Research Laboratory (Hawaii):
 See Romanzo Adams Social Research Laboratory
 Washington *Bee* 140
 Washington University (MO) 52, 96n
 Wellesley College (MA) 185, 261, 265, 281, 284ff., 299, 303–305, 312–13
 Wells College (NY) 67
Western Clarion 356
 Western Reserve University (Case Western Reserve University) 321
 Wheat Pool 355
 Widow's pensions 24ff.
 Wilberforce University (OH) 75–76, 231, 235, 261n, 273
 Willamette University (OR) 321
 Women 59ff., 136, 178ff., 193ff., 281ff.
 Women's Bureau of Industrial Service 293n
 Women's Christian Temperance Union 130
 Women's Educational and Industrial Union of Boston 300, 302–304

- Women's International League for Peace and Freedom 185, 197, 287
Working People's Social Science Club 48
Works Progress Administration (federal) 385
World Missionary Conference 272
World-system theory 99–100, 368
Y.W.C.A. 65
Yale Divinity School 236
Yale Medical School 42
Yale University 125, 154, 236, 277, 319–21, 341
Yenching University (Beijing, China) 287