Starting with a personal anecdote is not my preferred way to begin, but the episode is telling. Several months ago, my amiable colleague and fellow HoS section member, Gary Fine, currently the editor of Social Psychology Quarterly, invited me to submit to SPQ a short essay in connection with the centenary this year of two of the early classics of social psychology, E.A. Ross’s Social Psychology (1908) and William McDougall’s An Introduction to Social Psychology (1908). Admiring Gary’s history-mindedness, I accepted this invitation, which led to a very enjoyable little writing project. While working on it, however, I noticed something. Doing some background reading, I came across several very solid and informative modern historical accounts of the field of social psychology: Robert Farr’s The Roots of Modern Social Psychology (1999), and a special issue of The Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences (2000). These works differ among themselves in a number of ways. Nevertheless, what they all have in common – and this was the point that soon dawned on me – is that none of them is authored by any of us.

By “us,” I mean members of the ASA’s History of Sociology section plus unaffiliated sociologists whose principal concern also is the history of sociology. While the subfield of social psychology has had exactly the same century-long lifespan inside the discipline of sociology as it has had inside the discipline of psychology, scholars with roots in psychology seem to command the lead in producing books on the history of social psychology and conducting research on the subject. Farr’s The Roots of Modern Social Psychology (1996), John of the explanation probably lies Greenwood’s The Disappearance of simply in the psychology’s size the Social in American Social advantage. Relative to sociology, Psychology (2004), Gustav Jahoda’s psychology is a larger (as well as A History of Social Psychology older) discipline and, as such, has (2007), Aroldo Rodrigues and a larger contingent of historians, Robert Levine’s Reflections on 100 whose work arguably forms a more established and respected type of research than scholarship on the history of sociology. Insofar as there are more historians of psychology than historians of sociology, the chances increase that the former, rather than the latter, will gravitate with some frequency to writing the history of social psychology.

Even so, as I thought about this disparity, I remembered a pointed observation that Jennifer Platt made in the last issue of Timelines (June 2008) as part of her “ABC for the History of Sociology”: namely, her comment that specialties and subfields in sociology have received little historical study by scholars interested in the history of sociology. Looking back to earlier issues of Timelines, I noticed that when Ed Tiryakian wrote his “chair’s message” to this section in 2005 and when Eleanor Townsley did likewise in 2006, they too remarked on this same... (Continued on page 2)
lacuna within the history of sociology. Viewed in this light, my realization that historians of sociology have tended to neglect the history of social psychology was to be expected. This neglect was merely another illustration of the more general disinclination on the part of historians of sociology to examine the history of the subfields of sociology.

Since I am less subtle and more heavy-handed than Jennifer, Eleanor, and Ed, I want to be louder and more insistent about this shortcoming and about the need for us to do something about it soon. For this purpose, I want to propose that we should understand of our own subfield as bi-focal enterprise: a body of scholarship whose task is to look in two different directions.

The first of these is a direction familiar to all of us and well-represented in existing work on the history of sociology. This is the tendency for historians of sociology to write for one another about topics of shared intellectual interest that hold an established place in the literature of the history of sociology: i.e., about the various ideas, theories, concepts, intellectual traditions, schools of thought, and (more recently) research methods that were important in the development of Sociology-at-large; about the various women and men who were part of - or were excluded from - this development; and about the various transnational, national, and local institutions through which it occurred at various decisive moments. Obviously, this is a salutary tendency, one that has generated a vast body of valuable scholarship and, we should hope, will continue to do so deep into the future. Arrest this tendency and the history of sociology would immediately collapse as a field of specialization.

We should not wonder, though, that work in this vein has restricted appeal outside the borders of the history of sociology, however much HoS section members bemoan this situation. Written by specialists primarily for specialists, its attraction to sociologists who are not historians of sociology and who, at best, are interested in the development of Sociology-at-large only occasionally - is necessarily limited, regardless of how frequently we tell them that they would all be healthier if they consumed more of the wholesome and nourishing historical vegetables that we so carefully prepare.

But why not try to vary the fare by channeling more of our attention in a different direction? Why not turn outward from the traditional internal concerns addressed in the literature of the history of sociology in order to study also the history of social psychology, political sociology, social stratification, demography, the sociology of migration, and the dozens of other subfields where the majority of sociologists live out their professional lives, as most have been doing for the last century? Insofar as sociologists, now as in the past, develop their theories, concepts, methods, research practices, institutional infrastructures, and so on primarily in the context of their specialty areas, shouldn’t we, as historians of sociology, be investigating more regularly, systematically, and closely the development of sociology at precisely these sites?

At the 2008 ASA meeting in Boston, Jennifer Platt organized an eye-opening panel on the sociology of work, and (in collaboration with Olaf Larson) HoS section member Julie Zimmerman has recently written a wonderful book on the early history of rural sociology (Sociology in Government: The Galpin-Taylor Years in the U.S. Department of Agriculture [2003]). But projects like these are few and far between among historians of sociology. As I learned with regard to social psychology, most of the extant literature on the history of the subfields of sociology comes from scholars outside of sociology, though on anniversary and other ritual occasions subfield practitioners themselves sometimes reflect on the history of their own field – though with a fairly slight grasp of nature of historical research and the requirements of writing history. Yet, as I will argue in the next issue of Timelines, historians of sociology and sociologists in other subfields both have much to gain, intellectually and institutionally, from greater attention to subfield history.

Ideally, of course, the inward-looking and the outward-looking sides of research on the history of sociology would inform one another. This bi-focality is one of the many strengths of Craig Calhoun’s Sociology in America: A History, which received our section’s Distinguished Scholarship Award in 2007. In this volume, chapters on the development of Sociology-at-large during different periods in American history instructively appear alongside chapters on the history of the sociology of education, criminology, and the sociological study of gender and race. Unsurprisingly, though, while familiar HoS names wrote the chapters that fall in the first cluster, to find appropriate authors for chapters of the second type the editor had to look beyond HoS to those unusual scholars from the actual specialty areas who were able and willing to undertake historical research on developments within sociology.
1. The HoS Business Meeting Minutes of 2005 show that I proposed and the Section unanimously passed a suggestion that the Section ask ASA officially to endorse the teaching of the history of sociology. I was asked to write such a resolution, which was presented and passed at the ASA Business Meeting Tuesday, August 16, 2005.

2. The resolution was eventually given for implementation to Carla Howery, the then-Deputy Executive Officer of the ASA, who served as liaison to the Task Force on the Undergraduate Major and who had institutionalized the Teaching Resource Manuals.

3. Carla Howery contacted me and my co-author Patricia Lengermann in late December 2005 with two proposals—one, that as a way to begin to implement the resolution, we produce a Teaching Resource Manual for the History of Sociology, and two (which was more by way of a request), that we agree to edit the Theory Teaching Resource Manual (TRM) as the previous edition’s editor had to withdraw from the next (5th) edition. We agreed to do both—partly feeling that what we learned doing the 5th edition of the Theory TRM would be useful for the History TRM.

4. In January 2006 we issued calls for contributions to both teaching resource manuals. The Theory response was excellent and we spent the next year editing that volume. However, the HOS response, despite repeated calls and our making individual appeals (many of which fell on "deaf" ears or at least overburdened ones) did not yield enough response for a volume in the first round. Some of what we received fit better with the Theory volume; this overlap, of course, arises from the fact that the history of sociology is so often subsumed under "a history of its great ideas." We were and remain particularly opposed to doing this presentation of the history of sociology.

5. We (Pat and myself) have decided to try a new approach in order to produce a volume that will encourage the teaching of the history of sociology in all sociology courses and also build support for adding a general course dedicated to the history of the field to the standard curriculum offered by sociology departments. This new approach, which we are carrying out this fall (Fall 2008), involves reaching out beyond the History of Sociology Section membership to all sections to discover what teaching of the history of their specialty is being done. We are conferring with Michael Murphy, ASA Governance liaison, about the best way to reach each Section. Our proposed plan is to e-mail each Section Chair an announcement suitable either for e-mail or newsletter transmission, asking for contributions of lectures or units (and the syllabi that contain them) in individual subfields, such as medical sociology, criminology, etc. We also plan to reissue a call to the History of Sociology membership for contributions. We feel that perhaps our previous call emerged as too aimed at syllabi, of which there are few because the course is, as you well know, rarely taught. We did manage to acquire in that first call some fine aids in the form of PowerPoint lectures. But we felt we were getting too many offers of essays which—while excellent in themselves—did not lend themselves easily as a teaching tool in the classroom.

6. What we have accomplished as a Section, then, is to gain full ASA support of the project of teaching the history of sociology as a discipline. "In progress" we have a first attempt to implement this general goal through a Teaching Resource Manual. We have, now, a hoped for completion date of June 2009. The interest of the Business Meeting in this project is most encouraging.
The University of Umeå in Sweden seemed quite central this August, even though it is close to the Arctic Circle. More than 20 nations were represented among conference participants, some from as far away as Latin America, western Africa and Australia; the theme seemed really to have struck a chord. Attendance was small enough for a high proportion of those present to give papers, and for anyone to meet most of those there. Lots of talk and ideas and good food made for trans-national communication of the most productive kind – all supported by Swedish resources, and with very efficient local organisation. The social programme included a sample of traditional singing from the local reindeer herders, and a highly memorable ‘conference dinner’ of barbequed herring and local cheese eaten on the cliffs of the northern Baltic. Indeed, that night ended with spontaneous singing around the camp fire! Four plenary speakers were Raewyn Connell, Eileen Yeo, Said Arjomand and Johan Heilbron, all raising themes of general importance for work on the history of sociology: the importance of analyses produced on the periphery, including work by thinkers not classifiable as academic sociologists; the importance of understanding and conceptualizing the impact of ‘peripheries’ created by class and gender relations which are often forgotten in historical work; the possibility of peripheral concepts provincialising metropolitan theory to redeem comparative sociology; and the need to understand national sociologies in their trans-national contexts of organisations and migrations.

A large number of other papers also made interesting contributions, too many to attempt to list, but some examples of various kinds may be offered:

- Robert Park’s doctoral thesis was done at Strasbourg and under the supervision of the German philosopher Windelband, not of Simmel as is often assumed. Some of his ‘Chicago’ concepts such as assimilation arose in the Mitteleuropa context of the role of nationalities within the Habsburg empire.
- International harmonisation of statistics has sometimes led to the abandonment of collection of nationally specific data; this is done in the interest of facilitating comparative work, but it may do so at the cost of eliminating data on the real national differences which make comparison of interest.
- Figures such as Gumplowicz and Rokkan were active internationally in part because of their relative lack of success at home.
- The translation into French of Sorokin’s Fads and Foibles... was re-titled to make it refer only to American sociology.
- Comparative study of the national sociologies of Belgium and the Netherlands, or of Hong Kong and Taiwan, shows that even what one might expect to be closely similar intellectual environments have diverged in ways that respond to local historical circumstances, and relate to the ‘metropole’ in different ways.
- Swedish geographer and political scientist Rudolf Kjellén (1864-1922) developed his ideas from the perspective of a small European nation state in an increasingly dangerous Europe. An alternative geographical imagination developed in large territories on the European peripheries, such as Russia, Brazil and the United States, where modernity was imagined in terms of the frontier, with new men creating civilization or modernity beyond European, urban concerns with manners and civility.

Continued on page 11
Opportunities to teach and conduct research on the local disciplinary history of sociology at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln are limited only by one's imagination and the pragmatic realities of classroom constraints. Over the years, I have been privileged to introduce Nebraska students to many particulars of the local sociological record via guest lectures in courses and colloquia, standalone PowerPoint slide shows, archival displays, informational brochures, various publications, and by distributing extensive compilations of pertinent documents on compact discs. Most recently, I included a one-and-a-half-week segment on the history of Nebraska sociology in an Introduction to Sociology course (Hill 2007c), employing a reader based in part on archival writings and documentary photographs (Hill 2007d). An independent study course on life-history documents focused on discovering and interpreting relevant archival data (Hill 2007e). More informally, I recently organized a two-hour tour for the Nebraska Undergraduate Sociology Organization, escorting its members to sociologically significant sites and landmarks on the campus, including a visit to the university archives. Tour participants were provided with a printed map and guide (Hill 2007f). The ability and opportunity to weave parochial disciplinary history into the local academic scene hinges in part on the locally-available resources, on having a history to document and explicate, and on possessing a continuing and active interest in one's early sociological predecessors.

The University of Nebraska-Lincoln (UNL) enjoys both a rich sociological history and a wealth of local archival and related resources through which to document and teach about its venerable disciplinary record. Researchers and students on the Nebraska campus find ready access to: (1) Love Library and the University of Nebraska Archives and (2) the Library and Archives of the State Historical Society. Slightly farther afield, one finds additional resources at (3) the Heritage Room at Bennett Martin Public Library, (4) the Nebraska Library Commission, (5) the Nebraska State Law Library; (6) the morgue of the Lincoln Journal, (7) Nebraska Wesleyan University, (8) Union College, (9) the regional genealogical services of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, and (10) the American Historical Society of Germans from Russia. As the state capital, many centralized public records are located in Lincoln, including (11) the vital records division of the Nebraska State Department of Health and Human Services.

The founders of Nebraska sociology were major leaders in the then new discipline of sociology. Three early members of the UNL faculty eventually became presidents of the American Sociological Society (ASS): Edward Alsworth Ross (1914-1915), George Elliott Howard (1917) and Charles Abram Ellwood (1924). It is noteworthy that three other ASS presidents also had connections to the state: Henry P. Fairchild (from Crete, 1936), Edwin H. Sutherland (from Grand Island, 1939) and Louis Wirth (from South Omaha, 1947). In its early years, Nebraska produced intellectual leaders far out of proportion to its population size (Hollingworth 1938). In Lincoln, other Nebraskans of early sociological note included: James Irving Manatt, Mary Adell Tremain, Amos Griswold Warner, Roscoe Pound, Edith Abbott, Anderson William Clark, Hutton Webster, Lucile Eaves, Hattie Plum Williams, Vera Chandler Foster, Leta Stetter Hollingworth, Jacob Singer, Lowry Charles Wimberly, Joyce Oramel Hertzler, Addison E. Sheldon, Mari Sandoz, Willard Waller, August de Belmont Hollingshead, Paul Meadows, James Reinhardt, and Loren Eiseley, among others. When local wags and humorists called the University of Nebraska “the Harvard of the West,” they were only half joking.

Thus, teachers and students of disciplinary history at UNL discover a felicitous mix of interesting and important persons to study combined with a substantial local cache of archival and documentary resources on which to base such studies (for examples of completed researches, see the reference section, below). The
local papers of George Elliott Howard, Hattie Plum Williams, and Mari Sandoz are especially useful, as are smaller deposits for Edward A. Ross, Edith Abbott, Roscoe Pound, L.C. Wimberly, James Reinhardt, and Loren Eiseley, among others. An important cognate deposit includes the papers of economist Alvin S. Johnson, a co-founder of the New School for Social Research and the associate editor of the *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*. Among several microform resources that students can use to contextualize the development of sociology at Nebraska from a national perspective is UNL’s copy of the massive microfilm collection of the papers of Chicago’s well-known sociologist, Jane Addams.

Workable strategies and techniques for conducting archival research and studying disciplinary history have elsewhere been outlined in fair detail (e.g., Deegan 1988b, 1998; Hill 1993, 2000a, 2001, 2003, 2005b). It is important to emphasize that reconstructing early disciplinary history depends on the systematic discovery of many kinds of trace evidence, not just the materials and documents found in formal archives *per se*. Several resources typically found in libraries, such as city and campus newspapers, city directories, alumni and club directories, transcripts, court records, telephone books, school annuals, genealogical aids, biographies and autobiographies, local histories, and the like, should be routinely consulted and are readily available to students and researchers in the Lincoln area.

From a pedagogical perspective, instructors on the Lincoln campus can give students archival research assignments with few worries about cost or access. They can devise assignments within archival deposits with which they are already intimately familiar, on the one hand, or within materials which can be easily verified and double-checked subsequent to student reports, on the other. The archivists in the various Lincoln repositories have been uniformly welcoming and helpful both to faculty members and students who conduct archival researches.

Archival projects focused on local disciplinary history become hamstrung, however, if researchers and/or students rely entirely or primarily on locally available source material alone. Correspondence found in the George Elliott Howard papers, for example, consists primarily of letters written to Professor Howard. To learn what Howard wrote to other sociologists, one must typically seek materials located in non-local archives. For example, Howard’s letters to E.A. Ross are found in Ross’ papers in Madison, Wisconsin, and Howard’s communications with Roscoe Pound are found at the Harvard Law School Library in Cambridge, Massachusetts. Thorough archival study generally requires a multi-repository strategy, and this often lies well outside the time, travel, and cost constraints of most student assignments, at least at the undergraduate level.

An alternative to costly travel to non-local sites outside of Nebraska is available in those relatively few but fortuitous cases where major archival collections have been microfilmed. Thus, with reference to the example given above, diligent students can order, via interlibrary loan, portions of the microfilm editions of the E.A. Ross Papers and/or the Roscoe Pound Papers. Microfilm is a second-best substitute for looking at the “real thing,” but even a few hours’ browsing through a microfilm reel gives students an important lesson in the sobering and methodical discipline requisite to productive historical research and documentation.

The relative ease with which students can today locate materials via the Internet is both a boon and a boondoggle. It comes as a deep visceral shock to most students to realize that archival materials are rarely well indexed and are even more rarely comprehensively digitized. Indeed, it is often a genuine challenge for today’s students to just read cursive handwriting. Other than summary finding aids, most archival collections provide only limited hints as to what a given deposit contains, and the Nebraska deposits are no exception. For example, the Hattie Plum Williams papers are filled with student writings and research projects on numerous local organizations, but nowhere is there a list of the organizations studied. To find out if one of Williams’ students specifically investigated the activities of the American Red Cross, for example, one must systematically sift through dozens of archival cartons. At the same time, the Internet provides virtually instantaneous access to increasing numbers of archival finding aids, and increasing amounts of useful
trace materials, especially newspapers, are being rapidly digitized. Nonetheless, students need to be cautioned that most of the documentation they will need for a thorough disciplinary history project will require several hours of traditional, non-digital reading and searching in libraries and archival repositories. Teachers should also be advised that the newest generation of reference librarians tends to steer students away from traditional print materials and toward digital resources. In the case at hand, this is not always productive. The digital bias can be ameliorated however, by helping students to make direct, face-to-face contacts with local archivists.

To what extent can the University of Nebraska-Lincoln experience with local archives and the teaching of disciplinary history be generalized? Instructors in schools of similar size and age will likely find many parallel opportunities and resources. The possibilities multiply exponentially in larger universities possessing greater longevity. At the same time, openings for meaningful archival research and documentation also exist at most smaller schools and colleges. My own researches at Creighton University, Wayne State College, Doane College, Nebraska Wesleyan University, and the University of Nebraska at Omaha reveal that each institution has a local history of sociology waiting to be written. Even when formal archival materials are relatively thin, students can scour minutes of boards of trustees’ meetings, presidents’ papers, course catalogs, student publications, yearbooks, annual reports, etc. to construct departmental time lines and brief intellectual biographies of their school’s founding sociologists. Even the smallest school typically has someone, usually a librarian, who has charge of the institution’s records, photographs, and memorabilia. If my experience at Nebraska is any gauge, all you need to do is just start digging — and I think you’ll be pleasantly surprised by what you find.
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Jennifer Platt (Sussex) and Charles Crothers, (Auckland) have a joint project, with the official title 'Intellectual and social structures of international sociology', for which they are collating data on the sociologies of the USA, Britain, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Madrid, and South Africa, with a view to analysing the relations between them and exploring the extent to which they form a centre-and-periphery system; papers on parts of the data are being produced before they put the material together to make an overall picture.

The ISA has commissioned some work on ISA presidential addresses since its foundation. This potentially throws light on the history of world congresses and their conventional patterns, on the diagnoses of the general situation of sociology made at different dates, and on the topics and styles of work of individuals occupying internationally leading positions. However, the available archives are not complete, so if any colleagues have kept the printed programmes of World Congresses in Mexico, Toronto, or Bielefeld, or from the 1950s, we would

Mathieu Deflem (South Carolina) just published a book on the history and systematics of the sociology of law, Sociology of Law: Visions of a Scholarly Tradition (Cambridge University Press 2008). Related to this study, he is currently writing a paper on the sociology of law of Talcott Parsons, for which he relies on documents gathered from the Harvard University Archives. He is also preparing an English translation of Jacques Guilhaumou's 2006 article, "Sieyès et le non-dit de la sociologie: du mot à la chose" (Sieyès and what is unsaid about sociology: From the word to the thing), on the coinage of the word 'sociologie' by Sieyès some fifty years prior to Comte's neologism of our thing.

George Steinmetz (New School) is finishing a monograph called Sociology and the Question of Empire: Britain, France, Germany, and the United States, 1880-1960. He also edited a book, entitled Sociology and Empire, for Duke University Press (in press), containing chapters about the ways sociologists were influenced by and theorized empires, and with contributions by sociologists currently working on colonial and non-colonial

Mikaila Mariel Lemonik Arthur is now Assistant Professor of Sociology at Rhode Island College.

Enrique S. Pumar (Catholic University) has been elected President of the District of Columbia Sociological Society for 2008/09.

Neil McLaughlin (McMaster) recently published the following:

"Collaborative Circles and Their Discontents: Conflict and Creativity in Frankfurt School Critical Theory Revisited," Sociologica (Italy) forthcoming.


Richard Swedberg (Cornell) has just completed a book called *Tocqueville’s Political Economy*, which will appear in the spring of 2009. The book's key idea is that we can learn from Tocqueville's analysis of economic life - be it from what he has to say about the entrepreneurial economy as discussed in "Democracy in America" or from the way that he analyzes the stalled economy of 18th century France in "The Old Regime and the French Revolution". Swedberg argues that the first half of the 1800s is very interesting since it was at this time that the division of labor in modern social science started to come into being. Different strategies for how to proceed in social analyses were proposed by a number of people, including Marx, John Stuart Mill, Auguste Comte, Saint-Simon - and Tocqueville. He tries to show that Tocqueville had a very subtle way of thinking and especially how he tried to link up economic phenomena with non-economic phenomena in a counterintuitive and very creative fashion. He was also, contrary to what many people think, very careful in his research methods. Swedberg argues that he was a pioneer of sorts in collecting data and especially emphasize the interviews he made, and carefully recorded, with a number of inmates at the Eastern State Penitentiary in Philadelphia.

Ed Tiryakian (Duke) says that there is a move afoot to have the import of Sorokin's theoretical and empirical works get renewed attention. In particular, his late phase works on altruism seem particularly appropriate for greater sociological awareness. Ed, along with Larry Nichols, Vincent Jeffries, and others, is seeking to have a section on the Sociology of Altruism recognized by ASA.

Ed also notes that altruism ties in nicely with many things of current interest, including broad aspects of solidarity and globalization. As part of a volume edited by Jeffries, *Handbook of Public Sociology* (Rowman and Littlefield, forthcoming), he prepared a chapter "Global Altruism", and intends to pursue this in a research project that hopefully will end in a monograph. More immediately, Ed completed a volume of essays, *For Durkheim: Essays in Historical and Cultural Sociology*, to be published in 2009 by Ashgate Publishing Ltd.

Also at the October 10-12 International Conference at Oxford University sponsored by Durkheimian Studies, he presented a paper "Modernity and the Second Return of Mechanical Solidarity."

George Psathas (Boston University) gave two papers of interest at the 2008 ASA conference: "Why Goffman was not an Ethnomethodologist" and "Schutz and Goffman: A Non-Meeting of the Minds."

Recent Latin American work on Project Camelot and its relation to intellectual freedom sees it in a rather different light from the critical discussion of US writers in the 1970s, analysing the myth which developed associating all external funding for sociological research with espionage and with the intellectual subordination of the scientific aims of peripheral countries.

The development of public opinion research in Czechoslovakia was part of the liberalizing moment of the Prague Spring.

Overarching themes included issues of trans-national translation, the historical specification of the global, disciplinary, and public intellectual contexts of sociological work, and the importance of both taking into account the macro structures within which specific sociologies and sociological contributions emerge and attending to the local and distinctive historical detail.

We had a great time and there’s a rumour the next midterms are in Dublin. See you there!
CALL TO HOS MEMBERS

CALL FOR NOMINATIONS

The Section’s Nominations Committee invites suggestions of candidates for the nominations to be put forward for the Section posts needing to be filled for 2009-2010. This year, the posts for which nominations are required are Chair-Elect, Secretary/Treasurer, two members of Council, and one graduate student representative. The graduate representatives have two-year terms, and the other posts run for three years.

Our list has to be submitted before Christmas, and the Committee is responsible for establishing a full and balanced slate. We are anxious to draw on members’ knowledge to ensure wide representation of the range of the Section’s interests, by candidates (who must, of course, be Section members) prepared to make an input to its policy and activities - which may include yourself. We ask, therefore, for your suggestions, which should include basic information about the names put forward, and your reasons for proposing them. These should if possible reach the committee chair, Jennifer Platt [j.platt@sussex.ac.uk].

CALL FOR PAPERS

ADVANCES IN GENDER RESEARCH

An annual series published by Emerald Series
Co-Editors: Marcia Texler Segal and Vasilikie Demos

We are now seeking submissions for volume 14 to be published in 2010. We are interested in original manuscripts dealing with new developments in the study of gender informed by a variety of feminist frameworks. Articles that are theoretical, empirical or applied, dealing with any nation or region, or taking a comparative perspective are welcome. Four of the 13 essays in the most recent volume deal explicitly with the history of sociology. Additional attempts to add a gender-conscious perspective to the history of our discipline are most welcome.

Advances in Gender Research is an ideal venue for papers on gender, including those that are of a traditional journal-article length, as well as extended essays that explore topics in greater depth. Authors from all parts of the world are encouraged to submit manuscripts. However, all manuscripts must be in English and submitted electronically in MSWord or WordPerfect, and all contributors must be able to communicate with the editors and the publisher via e-mail.

Send one page abstracts or drafts of papers no later than January 15, 2009 to msegal@ius.edu and demosvp@morris.umn.edu