Message from the Chair

History of Sociology as the Working Memory of Sociology

Richard Swedberg,
Cornell University

One could easily put together a small book of the articles that have appeared in Timelines on the tasks of the history of sociology (all of which are available at our website). It would be a very readable book since the authors include such interesting people as Charles Camic, Irving Louis Horowitz, Jennifer Platt, George Ritzer, Charles Tilly, Edward Tiryakian, Eleanor Townsley and many more.

In these articles one can find arguments for studying schools of sociology, subfields in sociology, the role of errors in sociology, its relationship to other disciplines, and much more. The most elegant article is perhaps “An ABC for the History of Sociology”, in which Jennifer Platt goes through the whole of the alphabet, matching each letter to something of interest to the historian of sociology (June 2008, Newsletter No. 11). The article with the greatest title, and also one that comes close to my own view, is Eleanor Townsley’s “You Are History of Sociology” (December 2006, Newsletter No. 7).

The main task of the history of sociology, as expressed in these articles, is similar to the one that can be found in the mission statement of the Section on the History of Sociology. It is the notion that the history of sociology deals with “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.”

In this brief article I will try to present another view of what the history of sociology might deal with, in addition to the one that is outlined in the mission statement. The key idea is expressed in the title I have chosen; and it builds on a metaphor. It is the notion that one can see the history of sociology as the memory of sociology; and I shall start with this metaphor.

The study of memory has

Continued on page 11
British and French Sociology After 1945: The Colonial Connection

George Steinmetz, University of Michigan

Despite their shared ancestry, the disciplines of Anthropology and Sociology have moved far apart. Anthropology departments emerged out of sociology departments in many US universities, including Chicago (Stocking 1979). As a report by the ASA from 2006 reports, Historically, this combination [of sociology and anthropology] occurred somewhat more frequently in the Midwest and South for the PhD-granting schools. Among liberal arts institutions, 25 of the top 50 liberal arts institutions have a joint sociology/anthropology department, and the bulk of those are in the Northeast (Kain, Wagenaar, and Howery 2006: 3).¹

Valiant efforts have been made since WWII to unify or re-unify the two disciplines. Anthropology and Sociology were two of the three disciplines included in Parsons’ famous influential Social Relations Department at Harvard, and this model was emulated through joint programs and appointments (e.g. with the hiring of Anthropologists Horace Miner and David Aberle in the Michigan sociology department after 1945). Another major joint department of sociology and anthropology was at Heidelberg during the 1960s, under the leadership of Wilhelm Mühlimann, who was himself a student of ethno-sociologist Richard Thurnwald (Reimann 1986). More recently, the German-language social scientist Shalini Randeria, who was trained at Delhi, Oxford, and Berlin, oversaw the creation of a joint department of Sociology and Social Anthropology at Central European University in Budapest (von Thadden 2010; Randeria 2001).

Since anthropology is widely seen as a product of European colonialism, one might ask about the two countries that had the largest colonial empires in the 20th century. But while historians of British and French anthropology have detailed the ways in which the discipline emerged from the colonial nexus, historians of sociology have overlooked this context. A closer examination of the middle decades of the 20th century reveals that sociology was partly a product of the two countries’ colonial ministries, governments, policies, and research institutes.

Paying attention to these imperial connections to empire is not meant to besmirch sociology. Focusing on the colonial nexus helps to break down the “methodological nationalism” that has plagued the writing of disciplinary history, since imperial scientific fields are inherently transnational. National boundaries were also eroded in the colonial science, as specialists based in different empires came together for international conferences in Lusaka or Freetown or spent time together at research institutes or universities in Kampala or Accra. A history of British and French sociology in this period is of necessity an “entangled” history. Sociology in this period was already “postcolonial,” since sociologists from the colonies

⁰Continued on page 4

¹ In the United States, Sociology and Anthropology were often located in joint departments in the early years of the 20th century, and sociology was usually the dominant party. Before 1930 there were 33 degree-offering Anthropology programs in the United States, but most of these “were affiliated with other fields”—above all, sociology (Peace 2006: 7). Anthropology was well established as a free-standing department at just a handful of universities like Columbia and Minnesota.
Documenting our Future History: Contemporarily Making Social Science

Katelin Albert, University of Toronto

Within the history of sociology, there is a tendency to look backwards to see how sociology has developed, changed, advanced, and digressed. Our own mission statement states that our section “is 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.” With this in mind, I suggest that it would be equally useful to look forward, not just at the historical processes shaping sociology, but to how we are currently making and producing sociology – our present and future history. In this essay, I draw on my research on a Canadian funding institution, the Canadian Institute of Health Research (CIHR), to exemplify how one might look at our current state of social science to illuminate our present and future history. This provides a prospective account of how some social science research is currently being shaped, formed, and produced through the process of applying for funding.

Applying for funding

In Canada, all social science research was directed to the Social Science and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) for funding before 2009. After this, any social science research related to health was to be directed to the Canadian Institute of Health Research (CIHR) and was no longer eligible for funding through SSHRC. CIHR was established in 2000 and replaced two federal research agencies, the National Health Research and Development Program and the Medical Research Council (Bisby, 2001). It was developed as a model to emphasize excellence and promote interdisciplinary work, partnerships, priority setting and solutions-focused research, and multidisciplinary and collaborative approaches to health research across biomedical, clinical, health systems and services, and the social, cultural, and environmental factors that affect the health of populations (Bisby, 2001; CIHR, 2010). This shift effected positive changes for many social scientists that work with more traditional, “scientifically accepted” research methods. However, for other social scientists, this shift created a negative funding opportunity given that many social scientists work with a wide range of research methods to produce knowledge, that they perceive as not compatible with CIHR. Consequently, social scientists find themselves in a paradox between the need for funding and CIHR’s implicit research expectations for ‘traditional science’.

Using ‘Traditional Science’

In 2010, I attended a grants-crafting workshop designed to assist social scientists in making sense of the funding application process for the ‘Canadian Institutes

Continued on page 7

1 The ethnographic material presented in this paper comes from interviews conducted with social science graduate students in 2009-2010 for my Master’s research. The objective of these interviews was to get the social science graduate students to “walk me through” their processes of making an application to CIHR. To accommodate this, the interviews focused on drafts of application itself, specifically the graduate student’s Project Summary, the one page document in the application specifying the details of the research project.
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worked with sociologists from the colonizing countries (e.g. Busia 1951) and analyzed the circulation of ideas and people between colonies and metropoles (e.g. Banton 1954).

Sociology and Empire in Greater France

Durkheim and Mauss defined anthropology as a subfield of sociology, but that did not prevent anthropology from growing more rapidly than sociology during the interwar years in France. This was largely due to the Institute of Ethnology, founded by Mauss and Lucien Lévy-Bruhl, whose mandate was to study and advise the colonies. Many of the leading figures who moved into sociology after 1945 came from anthropology. This pattern can be seen in the revitalized *Année sociologique*, which included a regular section edited by Maurice Leenhardt, a specialist in New Caledonia, and later by Pierre Métails, a student of Mauss and Leenhardt who was also a specialist in New Caledonia. The editor in chief of *Année sociologique* between 1961 and 1974 was Roger Bastide, who had taken over the sociology chair at the University of São Paulo from Claude Lévi-Strauss and conducted ethnographic studies of Afro-Brazilian religion.

French sociologists were intensely interested in colonialism from the end of the 19th century until the 1960s, reaching a crescendo during the Algerian War of Independence. This imperial orientation went well beyond the use of data gathered in colonial settings by Durkheim and Mauss. The other leading contenders for leadership of French sociology at the end of the 19th century – René Worms, Frédéric Le Play, and Gabriel Tarde – wrote about colonialism and empire. Many of Mauss’ students conducted fieldwork in overseas colonies, including Leenhardt, René Maunier, Paul Mus, and Maxime Rodinson. The Durkheimian tradition extended into the research institutes in the colonies, which meant that sociology was as much of a *Leitdisziplen* there as anthropology. The French Scientific Mission in Morocco, founded in 1904, sponsored research in the Durkheimian sociological vein and was transformed into a “Sociological Section” of the colonial government in 1919 (Schmitz 1998: 109-110). The sociological tradition in Morocco continued through the 20th century and after independence (Adam 1972). Sociological research centers also existed in colonial Algeria and Tunisia. Sociology had a strong presence in West Africa due to the French Institute of Black Africa (*IFAN*). Sociologists Paul Mercier and Georges Balandier directed *IFAN* research centers after 1945. The largest employer of French colonial sociologists was the Organization for Colonial Scientific Research (ORSC, later renamed ORSTOM), created during WWII, which financed a network of research centers that spanned the French empire. The scholars employed as sociologists by ORSTOM include Balandier, Leenhardt, Mercier, Georges Condominas, and Marc Augé. The fact that most of these names are best known as anthropologists rather than sociologists nowadays underscores the fuzziness of the boundaries between the fields in this period as well as sociology’s loss of status compared to anthropology.

Sociology and Empire in Greater Britain, 1940s-1960s

Sociology had been less established in the intellectual, scientific, and university fields in
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Britain. The field’s institutional weakness was reflected in the fact that leading social anthropologists claimed to be doing sociology. A lectureship in “African sociology” at Oxford was held by E. E. Evans-Pritchard from 1935-1940 and by anthropologist R.G. Lienhardt from 1954 to 1972. Anthropologists Audrey Richards and Arthur Radcliffe-Brown used the words anthroplogy and sociology interchangeably. Sociology had also been more clearly distinguished from anthropology in Britain than in France. On the one hand sociology was defined as a generalizing social science, as against anthropology’s “ideographic” approach; on the other hand sociology was the science of the civilized Self while anthropology was the science of the primitive Other. In any case, social anthropology long overshadowed sociology in prestige and in numbers of PhD’s. Even in 1972, people with doctorates in social anthropology constituted the largest bloc of sociology professors or heads of sociology departments in the UK (Platt 2003: 33-35).

British sociology took off after 1945. Historians usually situate this boom in the context of the expansion of the welfare state and higher education, but the colonial context was also important. Unlike France, colonial social science had been completely dominated by anthropology until the 1940s. Sociology in the British African colonies and postcolonies grew directly out of a shift of emphasis within the Colonial Office from a focus on anthropology and studies of isolated tribes and tribal customs to an approach that was widely understood as “sociological,” which openly addressed urbanization, industrialization, detribalization, and cultural mixing. Sociology was also defined by the use of surveys and quantitative data. Especially during the wartime years and the Attlee Labour Government, the Colonial Office seemed to lean toward sociologists and the language of sociology in many of its research schemes. Government Sociologists, rather than Government Anthropologists, were hired to carry out research in colonies like Tanganyika. It was widely believed that educated Africans saw anthropology as being tainted by colonial racism, while sociology promised to analyze Africans using the same conceptual tools applied to European society.

The emerging sociological discipline was entangled with colonialism in various ways. The Colonial Social Science Research Council or CSSRC (1944-1961) was the first research body in the UK with representatives of all the major social sciences (Richards 1949: 143) and the main source of government funding for social science research in the UK until the 1960s. The Rhodes-Livingstone Institute (RLI), created in 1937 in Northern Rhodesia, received funding from the CSSRC and was seen as the model for all other colonial research institutes that the CSSRC created after the war. The RLI, like the other colonial social research institutes, brought sociologists and anthropologists together in close collaboration. The RLI’s first director, Godfrey Wilson, described social anthropology and sociology as “two words for the same thing” (Brown 1973: 187, n. 51). Wilson’s successor, Max Gluckman, continued this interdisciplinary mixing at the RLI and in the department he created at Manchester. The newly created University College of the Gold Coast (Ghana) hired sociologists St. Clair Drake, Ilya Neustadt, and Norbert Elias as chairmen of the Sociology
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department, which also included anthropologists like David Brokensha and Jack Goody. Central themes in metropolitan British sociology like community studies and the study of race relations grew out of this colonial context, as did key methodologies such as the extended case method (Gluckman 1961) and network analysis (Mitchell 1969).
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of Health Research’ (CIHR), originally a natural science funding agency. The workshop focused on tips for applying to CIHR and strategies for making and submitting a strong application. It was very helpful and insightful and provided information that would guide social scientists in properly produce CIHR applications. The social scientists sat in a large auditorium and watched a PowerPoint presentation that conveyed information such as: *CIHR encourages team projects over individual projects, applied research projects, and the use of scientific language.* During the ‘question and answer period’ of the workshop, many social scientists raised similar concerns - the philosophies and traditions of their research did not seem to be appropriate for funding by CIHR. They were concerned with the practicality of creating an application that would ‘match’ CIHR’s goals and style while still allowing them to do the research they wanted to do. This paradox and other concerns raised by social scientists at the grants-crafting workshop were about their ability to submit applications that CIHR would view as valuable and relevant, but still maintain their social scientific specificities. The workshop’s speaker had a well-prepared suggestion to deal with this concern. She suggested that they compare it to going to a different country. In summary, she said, 

*Imagine I travelled to foreign country and refused to speak the native language of where I was. How could I ask for help, how could I ask for food, how could I say anything? If I wanted something, I would have to learn the language, I would have to follow their rules, I would have to accommodate them.*

This was her advice for the social scientists. Pretend you are in a different country. It would be absurd for you to not use the native language to communicate what you wanted. She proposed that social scientists do the same if they want to submit strong applications to CIHR. Use general scientific language. She seemed to shrug off the validity of their concerns and basically said, *just use our language; it’s not that bad.* In short, her presentation suggested that there is a proper way to design CIHR applications, and that obedience to CIHR’s ‘way’ was necessary for success. 

**The Composition of CIHR’s Peer-Review Committees**

CIHR’s peer-review committees present an important form of social organization that organizes the expected style and production of the application. In the lists below, I draw attention to the concept of a *peer* and who CIHR has included on their committees; CIHR assures its applicants that the PRCs are comprised of peers. The scientific composition of CIHR’s Peer-Review Committees (PRCs), and CIHR’s preference towards biomedical definitions and approaches to health demonstrate its ideological framework and its tendency to support research adhering to the hegemonic paradigm of experimental science.

To determine who comprises the PRCs, I obtained the 2009/2010 committees for ‘Aboriginal research’ and for ‘population health’. Many members of the Aboriginal health PRCs do work in Aboriginal research of some sort. For example, Laura Arbour, UBC, a member of the Aboriginal health PRC, works for the department of medical genetics. She works in Aboriginal health research and her expertise is in “Clinical Genetics, Clinical Medicine, Ethics, Genetic Disorders among Aboriginal populations, Medicine, Northern Aboriginal Health Issues as they pertain to
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genetics, Population Health” (FNEHIN, 2011). While her membership on this Aboriginal health research peer-review committee is appropriate, as she is an Aboriginal health researcher, it is likely that her background and epistemological training is significantly different from a social science applicant’s training and research style. Technically, she is a peer to social scientists who do Aboriginal-health research; in that they both do Aboriginal-health research; however, this ‘peer’ status does not likely extend to the many of the research approaches characterizing the social sciences.

Here are, to repeat, the “peers” that CIHR has included on its 2009 committees:

**Fall 2009 – Aboriginal Health Research PRC**

- Arbour, Laura: Department of Medical Genetics
- Clearsky, Lorne: Clinical Assistant Professor Department of Medicine/ Community Health Sciences
- Dion-Stout, Madeleine: School of Nursing
- Gregory, David: Faculty of Health Sciences Bsc, MA Nursing, PhD Nursing & Medical Anthropology
- Reimer-Kirkham, Sheryl: Department of Nursing
- Tait, Caroline: Department of Women's and Gender Studies
- Toth, Ellen: Division of Endocrinology, Department of Medicine
- Varcoe, Colleen: School of Nursing

**Fall 2009 - Public, Community, and Population health PRC**

- Alter, David: Department of Medicine
- Pourbohloul, Babak: Division of Mathematical Modeling – PhD in theoretical physics
- Ross, Nancy: Department of Geography
- Yasui, Ykata: Canada Research Chair (Tier II) in Biostatistics and Epidemiologic Methods
- Anand, Sonia: Department of Medicine
- Bird, Chloe: Senior Social Scientist
- Colman, Ian: School of Public Health: Focus on epidemiology of common mental illnesses in the general population
- Dendukuri, Nandini: Department of Medicine at McGill University. Assistant Professor in the Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics
- Godwin, Marshall: Faculty of Medicine
- Punthakee, Zubin: Department of Medicine and Department of Pediatrics - Division of Endocrinology and Metabolism
- Wood, Evan: Clinical Associate Professor of Medicine

The concerns raised in my interviews with social science graduate students suggest that while CIHR’s methodological and ideological preferences may be enabling and inclusive for many social scientists’ research, they are also constraining and exclusive for social scientists who use a wide range of qualitative methods to produce knowledge. Many health based

---

2 For more information of CIHR’s PRCs, or to map the peer-review process from start to finish, please visit [http://www.cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/37790.html](http://www.cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/37790.html)
social science research projects can fit within CIHR’s eligibility criteria, scientific mandate, and application form; problematically however, others cannot fit and accommodate these methodological preferences. This is highly problematic, especially since the federal granting agencies state “the use of social science or humanities theories, methodologies and hypotheses is, in and of itself, not sufficient to make the proposal eligible at SSHRC” (GOVCANADA, 2010). These stipulations make it unclear where researchers whose projects do not fit the “typical” CIHR medical-model criteria can, or should go for funding. This situation places many social scientists in a confusing situation and consequently, many to try to fit their work within a normal science paradigm.

**Making the Application**

Despite some differences in the application process, my research informants expressed similar sentiments with developing an application. A common expression across informants was with their struggle to fit their social science research projects into CIHR’s “box”, as they would describe it. They struggled to keep and/or include their discipline’s theoretical perspective; they struggled to convey their chosen methodologies while using traditional scientific language; they struggled to present a research project that could be respectful to their research participants while accommodating the model of scientific research established as paradigmatic by CIHR’s criteria; they struggled to convey their project’s initial goals, significance, and uniqueness without using their disciplines language or theories; they experienced feelings of academic inadequacy, a lack of autonomy, felt ethically conflicted, and were often angry. Here are a few excerpts from my interviews that explicate the application process:

Joyce: It seems too rigid, this whole process. There is little flexibility, very little room for individual agency as a researcher and different types of knowledge and methods. I would have proposed something entirely different, like life histories, or monthly diary interviews, like very engaging with participants, and I didn’t. I felt like a lot of my background is very devalued in this process. Had I applied to SSHRC, I would have applied different and highlighted different things…

Leah: [I was told to take out the feminist theory and praxis in my work], that it was not part of CIHR. Don’t use it. I was pretty taken aback by that but I realize… like, feminism is still not accepted in academic circles. It’s just, it’s like one of those things that like… I wanted to get the funding so I played the game. But it’s also unfortunate that if I had chosen to keep [the feminist theory and praxis] in, that I don’t know how that would have affected their decision or not, I mean…

Cora: I think especially because, maybe some day, hopefully my next step is working for [an] Aboriginal consulting firm or some other organization that I’ve made connections with. One of my huge concerns is that if I were to do that study [proposed to CIHR] and put my name is on that, I would not be well received in the Aboriginal community. Like I can’t publish something like that. I would just be another one
of those researchers who wrote about Aboriginal people. I would not be proud to have my name on that work. I would not.

Through the process of writing social science applications for CIHR, social science graduate students became very aware of the disconnect between their research projects/ideas and CIHR’s expectations and programms. Whether or not their perception of CIHR’s expectations or their understanding of what ‘traditional science’ is was accurate, these ideologies and discourse were taken up to guide the making of their social science research.

Conclusion

While this research focused only on a specific Canadian case, I anticipate that social scientists across a wide range of disciplines and nations are faced with similar difficulties. My research supports current literature, which states that the competition for external funding has transformed, and is still transforming the nature of the university, the student, and the knowledge produced. However, the findings of my research take these claims one step further to show how this happens, what changes are actually occurring, and what research styles and traditions are being left behind. My findings go beyond a description of the “fairness and reliability of peer-review” and show the actual consequences of an unequal system by capturing how, why, and what decisions are involved in the making of ‘traditional science’. By focusing on the role of the researcher as participating in and (re)creating the discourses in CIHR, we not only get a description of making normal science, but we also get an understanding of the types of philosophies and assumptions built into science, and a clear picture of the assumptions and philosophies left out.

Consequently, the research funded by CIHR will take forward these assumptions and leave behind certain ways of knowing about the world (i.e. Aboriginal epistemologies), certain populations (i.e. Low income women’s existences), and problematically, may lead to the mismanagement of the health outcomes for certain, if not many, groups in the our population due to the neglect and exclusion of alternative epistemologies both by CIHR and the social scientists developing the applications.

To capture the significance of thinking of our future history today, consider another passage from C.W.Mills,

What is at issue seems plain: if social science is not autonomous, it cannot be a publically responsible enterprise. As the means of research become larger and more expensive, they tend to be “expropriated”; accordingly, only as social scientists, in some collective way, exercise full control over these means of research can social science in this style be truly autonomous. In so far as the individual social scientist is dependent in his work upon bureaucracies, he tends to lose his individual autonomy; in so far as social science consists of bureaucratic work, it tends to lose its social and political autonomy (1959, p. 106-107).
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Katelin Albert, University of Toronto. Full paper in development for publication. Comments welcome: katelin.albert@utoronto.ca
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advanced very quickly in the last few decades, as part of the fast development of cognitive science. One of its insights is that memory is not so much about the past as about the present. In order to handle the ongoing business of life, you need memory. You would be totally disoriented and lost without knowledge and experience of the past.

Another insight is that remembering does not mean calling something up that happened in the past, dusting it off, and presenting it to the mind. Instead, each time we remember, a new set of links have to be forged in our minds. A memory is a new mental construction of which the past is just part.

If both of these insights are transferred to the area of the history of sociology, we get the following. The main role of the history of sociology, for the average sociologist, is to handle his or her current research and teaching. Without the history of sociology you cannot choose a topic to explore, a theory to work with, a method to get the data and handle it, and so on. And each time we call upon our memory, we transform it.

Before getting into the details of what happens when the average sociological researcher makes use of the history of sociology in this way, let me stop for the moment and point something out. This is that by looking at the history of sociology from this perspective, we go from seeing the history of sociology as something that is primarily of interest to the professional historian of sociology, to something that is of interest to all sociologists.

One can put it even stronger. Looking at the history of sociology as the working memory of sociology would not only be of some interest to the average sociologist, it would be in his or her absolute self-interest to know much about it, since without it...
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he or she would be lost. No research could be done
and no teaching could be carried out.

If this line of argument is true, one should be
able to see a whole new set of tasks open up for the
modern historian of sociology. While it is no doubt
the case that a brief article of this type is not the
place for outlining and discussing these new tasks,
let me nonetheless take one example.

In this new type of history of sociology we
would, for example, be interested in exploring the
idea that most sociologists encounter in their early
education what we might call containers or
transmitters or recreations of earlier insights. We
are usually not taught the original texts but a later
version of some sociological method or theory, say
in the form of a textbook or a current article that
presents what we should know. This later version
typically transmits the original insight plus what has
happened later. And it does so in its very own way,
similar perhaps to the way that the mind looks for,
and calls up, one of its memories.

I want to end this small article on the
theme that this view of the history of sociology as
the working memory of sociology is one that
makes it of deep relevance for every sociologist,
not just for those (like myself) who has an interest
in what happened to sociology in the course of its
history. And even if it is true that the tasks that
come with this perspective are far from clear; and
even if it might be a gamble at this stage to press
ahead along these lines, it is also clear that this
perspective would in one stroke move the history
of sociology from the concern of some
sociologists to the concern of all sociologists.

- Richard Swedberg
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Conference Papers

Paul Lazarsfeld's Politics: (Dis)Engagement, Irony, and the Cigar.


Terry Nichols Clark, University of Chicago
Comments welcome: tnclark@uchicago.edu

Abstract
What were PF Lazarsfeld's politics? He has been classified as a tool of capitalists and his work dismissed for this reason. We should confront the issues directly as they are complex but essential to overcome barriers for many who do not know the details. PFL was highly adaptable, ironic, and flexible. He joked about his marginal man status, and played it masterfully. This paper explores the complexities of the links between PFL and politics in general, and the multiple specific answers that he offered in many of his publications. Consider his
analyses of engaging Austrian youths into socialism, to American voters like women buying red shoes, to the elitist theory of democracy, to the lack of impact of McCarthy on academe, to the policy implications of social science. The range and diversity of political analyses illustrate his adaptability, his innovativeness, his effort to find a new perspective and challenge established views, and his lack of total commitment to any single view, in his positive as well as his normative work. With Habermas, some of these ideas even became part of the new Frankfort sociology.

Download the paper by pasting this address in your browser, and clicking Download in upper right corner:

Edward Tiryakian gave the keynote address at the international conference on Durkheim's 'The Elementary Forms: 100 years of a classic,' Federal University of Porto Alegre, Brazil, October 15-18, His topic was: "The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life: Past, Present and Future".

**Book Spotlights**


The book covers all three phases of the oeuvre of Talcott Parsons and emphasizes the close relationship between the work of Parsons and Max Weber, and it also places Parsons in the debates with C. Wright Mills, the Frankfurt School, and utilitarianism (Rational Choice Theory), when its last chapter (100 pages) looks at what makes the Parsons Project important for sociology today (the three themes are research on inequality, the approach of Jeffrey Alexander, and also the Globalization theme, with an addendum on the financial crisis and what the Parsonian approach helps understand there).

Kalberg, Stephen. 2012. *Max Weber's comparative-historical sociology today: Major themes, mode of causal analysis, and applications.* Ashgate. $29.95

Bringing together the author’s major scholarly work on Weber over the last 30 years, offering a rich examination of the major themes in his sociology alongside a reconstruction of his mode of analysis and application of his approach, this book will appeal to scholars around the world with interests in social theory, German and American societies, cultural sociology, political sociology, the sociology of knowledge, comparative-historical sociology and the sociology of civilizations.


*Continued on next page*
expansion of the caste system in India; The rise and expansion of monotheism in ancient Israel. Part IV: Utilizing Weber I: the Importance of Deep Culture: Ascetic Protestantism, its legacies, and American uniqueness: the political culture of the United States; The cultural foundations of modern citizenship. Part V: Utilizing Weber II: Multi-Causal and Contextual-Conjectural Analysis: The origin and expansion of Kulturpessimismus: the relationship between public and private spheres in early 20th-century Germany; Culture and the location of work in contemporary Western Germany: a Weberian configurational and comparative analysis. Part VI: Conclusion: Bringing Weber Back In: Appendices; Bibliography; Index.

News & Announcements

Uta Gerhardt has moved to Berlin recently after nearly two decades at the University of Heidelberg. New postal address: Professor Uta Gerhardt, Ansbacher Strasse 65, 10777 Berlin, Germany. Her email address which is lodged with the University of Heidelberg, will stay the same.

Awards

Jennifer Platt has received these awards:
- The British Sociological Association's first Distinguished Service to British Sociology Award, April 2012.
- A Sarton medal of the University of Ghent Faculty of Political and Social Sciences for the academic year 2012-13, for research in the history and philosophy of social science; she will give the lecture in Ghent in March 2013.

At the Interim Coference in Dublin this summer, Christian Dayé received the Young Scholar Prize of the ISA’s Research Committee on the History of Sociology for a paper entitled, “Methods of Cold War Social Science: The Development of Political Gaming and Delphi as Means of Investigating Futures.”

Call for Papers

Reenvisioning the History of Sociology (and Much More)

A Call for Papers and Publication Opportunity for Doctoral Students and Early Career Sociologists

The history of sociology is seen by many as an antiquated domain. However, there is ample evidence that innovations in sociological theory and methodology have repeatedly come through extended engagement with historical works in the sociological tradition. Talcott Parsons, Harriet Martineau, Lewis Coser, Pierre Bourdieu, Margaret Archer, and Paul Lazarsfeld all testify to the benefits to be gained, for theory and methodology, in engaging with sociology’s past. Furthermore, the “history of sociology” can be seen more broadly as the “sociology of sociology.” If we take this perspective, what once may have appeared to be the preserve of historians and classicists becomes a locus of research for all sociologists.

In order to highlight the relevance of sociology’s past to its present and future, and to bring the history of sociology out of its marginal position, perhaps what we need are new approaches...
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to the history of sociology. The goal of this Symposium is to engage graduate students and early career sociologists in an effort to re-envision the history of sociology.

We invite paper submissions for a Symposium to be held in conjunction with the American Sociological Association’s 2013 Annual Meeting in New York City. This Symposium will be organized by the History of Sociology section, and held on the first day of the ASA (August 10, 2013). Following the successful model of the Junior Theorists Symposium, senior discussants will be invited to comment on a panel of papers, and to reflect on the broader theme of the Symposium.

The highest-quality paper submissions will be considered for publication in The American Sociologist. Professor Larry Nichols, as editor of The American Sociologist, has generously offered to dedicate an issue of his journal to publishing Symposium papers. Depending on paper length, space is available to publish up to seven papers. Decisions about which papers should be published will be made on the basis of paper quality and thematic coherence.

Paper specifications: All papers relating to the history of sociology are welcome, although papers engaging directly with the theme of the Symposium (“Reenvisioning the History of Sociology”) will be given highest priority. Papers focusing on the relevance of history of sociology to contemporary challenges in sociological theory and methodology will receive special attention. Papers must be under 30 pages in length, and must include (1) a title, (2) the author’s name, title, and contact information, (3) an abstract, and (4) a complete bibliography.

Please send submissions to the organizers: Michael Bare, University of Chicago (mbare@uchicago.edu) and Laura R. Ford, Cornell University (lrf23@cornell.edu). The deadline for submission is March 1. We will extend up to 12 invitations to present by May 1. Symposium participants will then have until July 1 to edit and revise their papers, prior to submitting the papers to the senior discussants.

Call for Papers: 45th Annual Meeting of Cheiron: The International Society for the History of Behavioral and Social Sciences.

Papers, posters, symposia/panels, or workshops are invited for the 45th annual meeting of Cheiron: The International Society for the History of Behavioral and Social Sciences. The conference will be held at the University of Dallas, located in Irving, Texas from Thursday, June 20 to Sunday June 23, 2013.

Submissions may deal with any aspect of the history of the human, behavioral, and social sciences or related historiographical and methodological issues. All submissions should conform to the guidelines listed below.

All submissions must be received by January 15, 2013. Please email your proposals to both lst...@collin.edu and bl...@collin.edu

Guidelines

All papers, posters, and proposed symposia/panels should focus on new and original work, i.e. the main part of the work should not have been published or presented previously at other conferences. To facilitate the peer review and planning process, please provide a separate sheet

Continued on next page
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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.

The Section

Section’s Mission Statement

...
Awards

Section prizes, 2012

Congratulations to this year’s winners! Thanks to all those who served on the three award selection subcommittees.

Lifetime Achievement Award

Professor Jennifer Platt, Emeritus Professor of Sociology, University of Sussex

Distinguished Scholarly Publication Award

Professor Lawrence A. Scaff, Department of Political Science, Wayne State University: For book entitled, *Max Weber in America*

Graduate Student Paper Award

Daniel R. Huebner, Ph.D. candidate, Department of Sociology, University of Chicago for his paper entitled “William Jerusalem’s Sociology of Knowledge in the Dialogue of Ideas”.

Section Officers 2012-2013

Chair

Richard Swedberg
Cornell University

Chair Elect

Alan Sica
Penn State University

Past Chair

George Ritzer
University of Maryland

Secretary-Treasurer

Erik Schneiderhan
University of Toronto

Council

Neil McLaughlin, McMaster University (’13)
Vera Zolberg, New School for Social Research (’13)

Marcel Fournier, Universite de Montreal (’14)
Jeffrey Olick, University of Virginia (’14)

Neil Gross, University of British Columbia (’15)
Norbert Wiley, Emiritus, University of Illinois (’15)

Student Representatives

Marcus Hunter, Northwestern University (’13)
Michael Bare, University of Chicago (’13)
Laura Ford, Cornell University (’14)

Congratulations to those elected, and thanks to all those who showed their commitment to the Section by their preparedness to stand.
**Section Committees 2012-2013**

**Distinguished Scholarly Publication Selection Committee**

Martin Bulmer, Surrey (Chair)
Peter Kivisto, Augustana College
Valarie Haines, Calgary

**Lifetime Achievement Selection Committee**

Larry Scaff (Chair)
Julia Adams, Yale
Kevin Anderson, UCSB

**Graduate Student Prize Selection Committee**

James Burk, Texas A&M (Chair)
Patricia Herzog, Rice University
Lisa McCormick, Haverford College
Ruth Braunstein (Grad Student Member)
Amanda Maull (Grad Student Member)

*Please Send Us Your Nominations for Next Year’s Prizewinners!*

**Lifetime Achievement Award**

*Larry Scaff, chair, email - lscaff@wayne.edu*

**Distinguished Scholarly Publication Award**

*Martin Bulmer, chair, email - m.bulmer@surrey.ac.uk*

**Graduate Student Paper Award**

*James Burk, chair, email – jsburk@tamu.edu*

Please send your 2013 nominations to the chair of each committee by March 15, 2013. See our website for more information on each award.

www.historyof­sociology.org