



TIMELINES

HISTORY OF SOCIOLOGY
AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

November 2007

E-Newsletter No.9

Message from the Chair

Jennifer Platt, University of Sussex

“How to Get More Space on the ASA Meeting Program”

This letter is devoted to the ways in which we can find space in the ASA’s program for activities related to our interests. Recently the Centennial activities have been rich in historical material, but those are now over, and it is time to think of more routine possibilities. Our section Program Committees have been learning more about these, sometimes by error as well as trial, so this is to share experience and encourage a wider range of members of the Section to put forward proposals. Crucial to success is to think ahead, as the lead times are long; right now we should already be thinking about the 2009 meeting – see below.

As a Section, our size at present only qualifies us for one official session, although part of the Business Meeting slot has sometimes also been used for papers. (If we could get our membership up to 300, we would gain another. Recruit your colleagues and graduate students to help improve this!) The official session has traditionally been on an invitation-only basis, with a theme chosen by the Chair, probably one which it is hoped will be of some interest outside the Section too. (For 2008, it will be ‘Theorising the history of sociology’.) Suggestions from members of future topics suitable for that slot would be welcomed.

In addition to that, however, the list of ‘Regular Session’ topics normally includes one on the history of sociology, not formally associated with the section, and if sufficient good papers are submitted the organiser (commonly in practice a Section member) can make the case for a second slot. How are the organisers chosen? Volunteers are being invited now for the 2009 meeting; the deadline is Feb. 1. [For details of how to apply for the role, see http://www.asanet.org/cs/root/leftnav/meetings/future_meetings/regular_session_organizers_needed]. Regular sessions are open-submission ones, with the deadline to submit papers for consideration in January.

There are also a number of other types of session, in any of which historical topics might appear:

[Thematic Sessions](#), relating to the official conference theme. (One of these has been organised for 2008 on the history of the sociology of work.)

[Special Sessions](#) ‘focus on new areas of sociological work or other timely topics, which may or may not relate to the theme’; those could probably include, for instance, important sociological anniversaries, or relations with other disciplines.

(Continued on page 2)

In this issue			
Message from the Chair	1-2	Council Members and Call for Nominations	5
Support Student Memberships	2	History of Sociology Book Award Remarks	6
Transatlantic Crossings	3	Distinguished Scholarly Achievement Award Remarks	7-8
Membership News	4		

(Continued from page 1)

[Regional Spotlight Sessions](#), which relate to matters of local relevance to the region where the meeting is being held. (One of these was held in 2007, on archival resources for the history of sociology in the New York area.)

[Author Meets Critics Sessions](#), on books 'deemed to be important contributions to the discipline' published in the previous three years; they do not have to be by ASA members.

[Workshops](#) 'provide the opportunity to learn about developments in research, theory, teaching, and practice', and anyone may volunteer to lead one. (In 2008, there was one on teaching the history of sociology.)

[Didactic Seminars](#), 'designed to keep sociologists abreast of recent scholarly trends and developments... led by expert instructors who are considered to be at the forefront of a given field'. In 2006 there was one of these on 'Methodologies of the History of Sociology'; narrower and more specialised issues than that could be proposed.

For all those formats, proposals may be made by any ASA member, though they have to be approved by the central Program Committee. The deadline for Thematic Session proposals for 2009 was Nov. 15 2007, while for the other types of session it is Feb. 1 2008. Every detail of the final arrangements does not necessarily have to be sorted at the time of first proposal. (For the formats required, see http://www.asanet.org/cs/root/leftnav/meetings/future_meetings/2009_session_proposal_guidelines.)

There are also Open Refereed Roundtables (submissions on any topic are eligible; the roundtable organizer

groups papers by topic areas – so one cannot propose one in advance - in a "mini-session" format; papers not accepted for a Regular session may be passed on for submission here, and authorships appear in the program listing). This provides another format where papers of historical interest may find a home.

For paper sessions, a final possibility worth serious consideration is to plan a joint session with another section. A problem here is that joint sessions have to come from someone's quota, and since we have only one that is all our own we might hesitate to allocate it to that use. But many other sections have more, and might be interested to have one on a historical topic. (For 2008, it is hoped that the Section on Teaching and Learning will, with our support, have one on the history of sociology teaching, an important and neglected topic.) The history of specialisms too has been largely neglected in general work on the history of sociology, which looks odder as comments about disciplinary fragmentation increase; the creation of increased knowledge of more specialised areas would be a valuable contribution, and well worth encouragement. Many readers will also belong to other Sections, and might think of initiating a proposal for a session on the history of their specialist field. Has your other Section's area's history been adequately researched? Is there no interesting controversy over its history?

But not all the meeting activities involve papers, and in some cities tours on historical topics could be arranged; the Harriet Martineau Society has established a fine tradition here which we might emulate. Unfortunately the North End of Boston has fallen to urban renewal and is no more, so the idea of proposing an [Urban Villagers](#) tour has on Herbert Gans' advice lapsed, but surely there will be some good ideas for San Francisco?

SUPPORT STUDENT MEMBERSHIPS

In an effort to increase our membership, and to get the work of HOS out to graduate students and the work of more graduate students into HOS, the Section invites contributions from members to support student membership (we are not allowed to use our ASA funding for this purpose). If you know graduate students who would be interested, we continue to encourage you to sponsor memberships for them directly. However, for members who do not know any, this is an opportunity to sponsor graduate students elsewhere who might have a lot to offer, and for whom HOS could be an important opportunity. Over the winter, we will be contacting graduate departments across the country and asking them to recommend Section membership to their students, particularly those enrolled in Classical Theory courses, and the Section will offer to support as many of those memberships as we can. Student membership is only \$5; we welcome contributions in any multiple of this amount to support the student membership endeavor. Checks for contributions can be made out to Mikaila Mariel Lemonik Arthur, Secretary-Treasurer of the Section, and mailed to her at Department of Sociology, Hamilton College, 198 College Hill Road, Clinton, NY, 13323; they will be forwarded on to ASA as we establish a fund for this purpose. Questions? Email marthur@hamilton.edu.

Transatlantic Crossings: A Conference and Some Reflections

Jennifer Platt

At the end of May a conference on ‘Voyages transatlantiques’ in sociology was held at the University of Nancy in France, organised by Dr. Cherry Schrecker. This was an occasion of considerable interest for the history of sociology. The theme was broadly construed, and the participants were impressively mixed, bringing together some who already knew each other’s work and others with related interests who had not previously moved in the same circles. In addition to Europeans from Poland to Norway, there were also speakers from as far away as Australia, Canada and the USA. But not everybody was researching their own national sociology, and areas of work were more important than national identities.

A particularly valuable feature of a very mixed audience with shared interests was the extent to which members of the audience could contribute actively to speakers’ work by making connections which might not have been anticipated. Thus, for instance, Alexia Arnold of Heidelberg spoke on Nels Anderson’s little-known post-war role in Germany, which included organising a community study some of whose data came from the first survey in Germany using a random sample, and Uta Gerhardt was able to add more detailed information about some of that research. Suzie Guth of France’s talk was on the role Everett Hughes also had in Germany - but Christian Fleck suggested that he was less successful than Anderson in transmitting research methods there, because his style of fieldwork could not be taught as a set of fixed procedures, while Hans Petter Sand of Norway related Anderson’s better-known activity as hobo to his family – his father too had been a hobo – and Swedish social and political background. (Unfortunately time ran too short for his proposed rendering of ‘I Dreamed I Saw Joe Hill Last Night’.) The Chicago School appeared in some other unfamiliar contexts: Licia Valladares had discovered records in Brazil of Robert Park’s visit and influence there, Stina Lyon connected it with the work of Gunnar and Alva Myrdal, and Stephen Turner suggested that Charles Ellwood should have been treated as more important than G. H. Mead in the development of symbolic interactionism. That is only a few examples. It is hoped that there will be a collective publication of the papers presented.

The Chicago School here, as elsewhere in work on the history of sociology, perhaps appeared disproportionately often. It was, however, a refreshing change that authors such as Bourdieu, Eisenstadt and Coser also figured in the titles of papers – as did Gustave de Beaumont (who? Andreas Hess’s paper was in a parallel session, so I know no more about him than Wikipedia’s information that he travelled with Tocqueville). Not surprising in that setting, but very welcome, were other papers on French travellers, such as Patricia Vannier’s work on French postwar sociological visitors who went to the US on ‘missions de productivité’. The set of papers as a whole, however, remains open to the criticism of work in the field that too many – about twice as many - were focused on particular individuals rather than on wider social categories and situations. It remains, too, that such topics of potential relevance to our explanations of influence and national character as the ways in which foreign ideas are understood by those who have not travelled, and the failure of some travellers to be influenced, are neglected. The reception of foreign ideas is an important area of work, and one which bears directly on our discussion of globalisation. There is a French literature of critique of Anglo-Saxon misinterpretations of authors such as Bourdieu and Foucault – but where is the Anglo-Saxon critique of what the French have done to Parsons, ethnomethodology, or the Chicago School?

Language competences apart, the national viewpoint makes a difference to what we see as problems, and there are still plenty of gaps to fill. Among the sponsors of the conference was the ISA Research Committee on the History of Sociology, to which many of the non-US participants belong. It meets next year on August 21-24 in Umeå in Sweden, and HOS members might well be interested in attending; for information, contact Per.Wisselgren@histstud.umu.se.

Membership News

Member Publications

Stephen Steinberg, *Race Relations: A Critique*. Stanford University Press. September, 2007. A trenchant critique of the race relations paradigm from its inception at the University of Chicago in the 1910s to President Clinton's failed race initiative.

Anthony J. Blasi, ed., *American Sociology of Religion: Histories*. Leiden/Boston: Brill. Ch.1 by Blasi, "Early Dissertations," reports pre-1930 sociology dissertations in the U.S. on religious phenomena.

David Haney has authored a book on public sociology that Temple University Press will release in January of 2008. The work focuses on the twenty years immediately following World War II and explores the scientific (and Dr. Haney argues, exclusionary) identity for sociology that influential scholars at Columbia and Harvard asserted in order to establish the discipline's professional authority. More information can be found at www.temple.edu/tempress/titles/1945_reg_print.html.

Member Promotions and Awards

Silvia Pedraza, University of Michigan was promoted to full professor. Congratulations Silvia!!

Opportunities

- The 'regular' sessions at next year's ASA meeting will include one on the history of sociology/social thought, organized by Mary Jo Deegan. Bear in mind that papers which cannot be fitted in there may be sent on to other general sessions or roundtable organizers, so you have more than one chance. For details of how and when to submit a paper, see: http://www.asanet.org/cs/root/leftnav/meetings/2008_participation_policies
- Graduate student members are warmly invited to send in the titles of their historical dissertations, along with a brief abstract, as we would like to have a special item on this important new work in the field in the next issue of *Timelines*.

Section Officers 2007—2008

Chair: Jennifer Platt, University of Sussex
Chair-Elect: Charles Camic, Northwestern University
Past Chair: Eleanor Townsley, Mount Holyoke College
Secretary-Treasurer: Mikaila Mariel Lemonik Arthur, Hamilton College
Council:

Uta Gerhardt, Heidelberg University (2005-2008)
Betsy Lucal, Indiana University-South Bend (2005-2008)
Silvia Pedraza, University of Michigan (2006-2009)
Alford A. Young Jr., University of Michigan (2006-2009)
Marcel Fournier, Université de Montréal (2007-2010)
Richard Swedberg, Cornell University (2007-2010)

Student Representatives:
Anna Xiao Dong Sun, Princeton University (2005-2008)
Bart Bonikowski, Princeton University (2005-2008)

Section Committees, 2007-2008

Program

Chair: Jennifer Platt (Sussex)
j.platt@sussex.ac.uk

- Charles Camic (Northwestern)
- Jonathan VanAntwerpen (SSRC)
- Stephen Turner (South Florida)

Membership

Chair: Mikaila Arthur (Hamilton)
marthur@hamilton.edu

- Silvia Pedraza (Michigan)
- Mary Tressider (Columbia)
- Bill Buxton (Concordia)

Nominations

Chair: Eleanor Townsley (Mount Holyoke)
etownsle@mtholyoke.edu

- Larry Nichols (West Virginia)
- Michael Hill (Sociological Origins)
- Neil McLaughlin (McMaster)

Awards

Chair: Charles Camic (Northwestern)
c-camic@northwestern.edu

Distinguished achievement
Chair: Charles Camic

- Valerie Haines, (Calgary)
- Alford Young (Michigan)

Distinguished scholarly book/article
Chair: Richard Swedberg (Cornell)
rs328@cornell.edu

- Marcel Fournier, (Montreal)
- Chandra Mukerji (UC San Diego)

Graduate student paper
Chair: Bart Bonikowski (Princeton),
bartb@Princeton.edu

- Zandria F. Robinson (Northwestern)
- Anna Xiao Dong Sun (Princeton)

Council Members for 2008—2009 Call for Nominations

The Section's Nominations Committee has the duty to prepare a slate of candidates for the 2008 election, to fill the vacancies arising as Council members reach the end of their terms of office. All members are invited to suggest the names of candidates for nomination. Self-nominations are encouraged and very welcome. We are seeking candidates for Chair-Elect, Members of Council (2), and Graduate Representative (1). Please direct all suggestions to Eleanor Townsley, Chair Elect, etownsle@mtholyoke.edu.

History of Sociology Section Call for Award Nominations

Graduate Student Paper Award

This award recognizes excellence in graduate student research in the field of history of sociology. Students who are actively enrolled (full- or part-time) in a graduate sociology program as of December 15, 2007 may submit one scholarly paper for consideration for this award. The submission may be an unpublished manuscript, an article submitted or accepted for publication, or a single chapter from a thesis or dissertation, and should address a theoretical or empirical problem central to the history of sociology. The paper along with a cover letter must be submitted electronically to the selection committee chair, Bart Bonikowski (bartb@princeton.edu), no later than **March 1, 2008**. (Members of the current Graduate Student Paper Award Committee are ineligible for the award.) Nominees will be notified of the committee's decision at the beginning of May 2008.

Distinguished Scholarly Book or Article Award

This award honors sociologists who have made significant contributions to the history of sociology on the 'cutting edge' of sociological inquiry. Only articles, monographs or edited works published in 2006 or 2007 are eligible for consideration. The author(s) or editor(s) must be sociologists. (Members of the current Distinguished Scholarly Book or Article Award Committee are ineligible). Books or articles submitted for consideration should be proposed in a letter of nomination; self-nominations are welcome if accompanied by a letter of support from another member of the ASA. To nominate a book or article, write highlighting the item's significant contribution to the history of sociology to the committee chair Prof. Richard Swedberg (rs328@cornell.edu) to arrive no later than **March 1, 2008**.

Distinguished Achievement Award

This award recognizes sociologists who have made outstanding contributions to the history of sociology throughout their careers, or who have made ground-breaking innovations or produced significant bodies of scholarly work in the history of sociology. Nominees must be sociologists. (Members of the current Distinguished Achievement Award Committee are ineligible for the award.) Letters of nomination should highlight the nominee's outstanding innovation(s), career and contributions to the history of sociology. Self-nominations are welcome if accompanied by a letter of support from another member of the ASA. To nominate a person, send (in electronic form or in 3 copies) a nomination letter, the nominee's vitae, and samples of the nominee's work to the committee chair, Charles Camic (c-camic@northwestern.edu; Department of Sociology, Northwestern University, 1810 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, IL 60208), to arrive no later than **February 29, 2008**.

History of Sociology Book Award Remarks at the 2007 ASA Conference

On behalf of the Distinguished Scholarly Book Award Committee, Silvia Pedraza, Alan Sica, and myself, I am pleased to announce that this year's award has been given to "Sociology in America: A History," edited by Craig Calhoun, and published by the University of Chicago Press in 2007.

The committee believes that this volume is an exceptional work that is likely to remain an important reference point for historical scholarship in the field for the foreseeable future. It is unusually ambitious, in the best sense, and the product of extensive collaboration.

We are impressed with the book's breadth of perspective, covering two centuries, with consideration of multiple subfields of the discipline, from multiple perspectives. Among the 27 chapters, we find treatments of American Spencerians, as well as feminists; analyses of the great depression of the 1930s and the tumultuous 1960s; there are examinations of the subfields of race, of sociology of education, of criminology, and of the intersections of race, gender, and class. The book's 21 authors, already recognized for their special expertise, maintain a high level of discussion and writing.

In the committee's view, the work goes beyond the mere chronicling of events, and provides insightful analysis while also conveying a sense of the challenge of sustaining the sociological enterprise within a rapidly changing societal and global context.

We believe that "Sociology in America" will stimulate further reflection and scholarship on our shared roots and emergent disciplinary identity, and will contribute to a richer historical understanding of our work, especially in the United States.

On behalf of the committee, I would like to extend congratulations to Craig Calhoun and his collaborators on this fine achievement.

Lawrence T. Nichols (Chair)

Section on History of Sociology Mission Statement

The purpose of the Section on the History of Sociology is to provide a forum for sociologists and other scholars interested in the study of the historically specific processes shaping the development of sociology as a profession, an academic discipline, an organization, a community, and an intellectual endeavor. The Section serves its members as a structure 1) to disseminate information of professional interest, 2) to assist in the exchange of ideas and the search for research collaborators, 3) to obtain information about the location of archival materials, 4) to support efforts to expand such research resources and to preserve documents important to the history of sociology, and 5) to ensure that the scholarship of this group can be shared with the profession through programming at both regional and national meetings.

Remarks on Receiving the
“Distinguished Scholarly Achievement Award”
from the Section on the History of Sociology at the ASA Meetings
in New York City on Aug. 11, 2007.

Guenther Roth

Jennifer Platt suggested that I might make some remarks on “my concerns with the history of sociology, and perhaps how those relate to recent and possible future developments.” I will try to comment briefly on the approaches of systematic theory, biography, social history and gender and very selectively mention some recent Weber studies..

1. At the end of his long career my co-author (of “Max Weber’s Vision of History”) Wolfgang Schluchter has just presented us with a “history of theory with systematic intent,” this the subtitle of his investigation of three basic foundational programs: sociological Hegelianism—Marx, sociological Kantianism—Durkheim, and Kantianizing sociology—Weber’s “individualist-structuralist interpretive sociology.” This kind of effort requires thorough philosophical knowledge, which most of us lack. These three basic approaches remain “foundational,” in Schluchter’s eyes, in relation to the newer second or third generation systems and linguistic theories from Habermas to Luhmann, which in turn have transcended G. H. Mead and T. Parsons. (See Wolfgang Schluchter, “Grundlegungen der Soziologie. Eine Theoriegeschichte in systematischer Absicht,” Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007, two vols.)

2. On the biographical level, which requires considerable literary skills, we have Joachim Radkau’s ambitious new biography, a bestseller on the German book market, which will

appear in an abridged version in English (“Max Weber. Die Leidenschaft des Denkens,” Munich: Hanser, 2005). Radkau (U. of Bielefeld), a historian of the environment and author of “The Age of Nervousness. Germany Between Bismarck and Hitler” (with Weber in between), drew extensively on my study of the Weber families, but his interest differs from mine in focusing relentlessly on the compulsiveness, the suppression and the liberation of Weber’s creative energies. With great rhetorical gusto he dramatizes Weber’s tortured relationship to nature in general and his own sexual nature in particular. But it remains enormously difficult to connect work and person closely or convincingly. It is now Dirk Kaesler’s and Sam Whimster’s turn to try their hand. Like Radkau, both have been resistant to my warning that they may try the impossible.

3. In recent years I have chosen a third approach to the history of sociology and social theory, a social history which pays special attention to archival sources from several periods in various countries. This requires relative freedom from publishing pressures, because it involves the time-consuming locating and deciphering of many letters, business records and testaments, and the search for forgotten manuscripts. I retired relatively early at age 66 in order to finish (by 2001 and before turning 70) a ten-year study of Weber’s Anglo-German family history, which comprised four generations: “Max Webers deutsch-englische Familiengeschichte. 1800-1950” (Tübingen:

Mohr Siebeck, 2001). Here Weber appears, in intellectual and material terms, as the late descendant of the cosmopolitan bourgeoisie that effected the great globalization of the 19th century. He could not have pursued his scholarship (and partisanship) without his mother Helene being heir to part of the vast fortune accumulated world-wide by his Anglo-German ancestors from London and Manchester and later without Marianne's profits from the Bielefeld textile factory, of which she became co-owner. This allowed Max to live as a capitalist rentier and to transcend academic boundaries creatively. In an age of intensifying nationalism this heritage made Weber a cosmopolitan nationalist (as I have called him) advocating Germany's integration into the world economy, in opposition to isolationist and autarkic nationalism. It was discovered only recently that in 1906 he addressed for the first and only time a wide American audience in two long entries in the *Encyclopedia Americana*, championing peaceful competition in the arena of the world economy and opposing the high tariff policies of the US, Imperial Germany and Joseph Chamberlain's project of Imperial preference tariffs. (The Weber texts with my introduction have appeared in "Max Weber Studies," 6.2, July 2006.)

Weber never ceased being engaged with economic policy notwithstanding his gradually emerging analytic interest in a new kind of sociology. One important place in which his neo-liberal position (in today's terms) is reflected is in the longest chapter of the 1920 version of ES, the chapter on the sociological categories of economic action that few sociologists have ever read. Between abstract definitions, he advocates restoration of the world economy and the gold standard, quick dismantling of the war economy and firm opposition to economic state control and the spread of a rent-seeking mentality in all strata of the population. In an age of contested globalization this has created another facet of

interest in Weber, as many sociologists have moved toward economics and economic policy issues and away from what used to be mainline sociology.

4. Lastly, the dimension of gender studies. There have been advances in our understanding of Marianne Weber's importance in the context of gender issues. Following up my own effort of twenty years ago, Bärbel Meurer (Bielefeld) is working on a comprehensive biography, after editing a volume on Marianne and her contemporaries in 1904 ("Marianne Weber," Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004). Very ambitious are the goals of the recently established and aptly named Franco-German "Groupe Marianne," which is based on team collaboration between Paris and Erfurt under the leadership of Michel Lallement (Paris) and Theresa Wobbe (Erfurt). Broadly speaking, the group proposes extensive investigations of the category of gender in classical sociology in Germany and France from 1890-1933, making use among others of my only Durkheim venture, "Durkheim and the Principles of 1789: The Issue of Gender Equality" (1989).

I leave you with the thought that Weber scholarship continues to explore new avenues and to achieve some new insights, in spite of paying the price for being an academic industry with its inevitable tendencies toward routinization. But fortunately, there is also no end to the benefits of what I called almost forty years ago the "creative misinterpretation" of Weber's work.