

TIMELINES

Newsletter of the ASA History of Sociology Section

July 2013, No. 21

INSIDE

ESSAYS

Message from the Chair 1
Wilner Figures 3

EVENTS AT ASA

HoS Events at ASA 4-5

New Symposium 6
Doctoral Students &
Early Career Sociologists

NEWS

Report: Award Panel 12
Recent publications 14
Book Spotlight 15
Announcement 16
Section Awards 19
Awards and Honors 19

Newsletter Editors

Erik Schneiderhan
e.schneiderhan@utoronto.ca

Katelin Albert
katelin.albert@mail.utoronto.ca

Message from the Chair, Richard Swedberg History of Sociology as a Working Memory (Part 2)

In the last issue of this newsletter I suggested that one way of looking at the history of sociology is to see it as the working memory of sociology. In this brief follow-up article I want to continue with this argument and spell out some of its implications.

The history of sociology, I argue, has two main functions. One is to produce the history of sociology in a narrow sense, a bit like the task of historians is to carefully write and analyze the history of the past. This is a task that typically only experts in the history of sociology will engage in.

The second task, however, is one that historians of sociology share with all other sociologists; and it can be captured by the metaphor of the working memory of sociology. This task can be described as *being aware of the knowledge of the past that is necessary to carry out a sociological*

study of good quality.

My suggestion is that members of HOS may want to devote attention to both of these tasks. While having access to a high quality history of sociology is important and valuable to all sociologists (*Task 1*), it may not engage their direct interest and more than, say, historians of sociology are directly concerned with what is going on in one and every subfield of sociology. What immediately concerns all sociologists, however, is the kind of knowledge of the past that they need to have in order to carry out their own research in a competent manner (*Task 2*). In short, when historians of sociology engage in the second task, they are working on issues that are immediate and direct interest to all sociologists. Or to phrase it differently: the more historians of sociology engage in Task 2, the more their work will be

CONTINUED ON PAGE 2

Section Officers

Chair

Richard Swedberg
Cornell University

Chair-Elect

Alan Sica
Pennsylvania State University

Past Chair

George Ritzer
University of Maryland

Secretary Treasurer

Erik Schneiderhan
University of Toronto ('14)

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
University of Illinois -- Urbana ('15)

Student Representatives

Michael Bare
University of Chicago ('13)

Laura Ford
Cornell University ('14)

Swedberg, continued

sought out by the average sociologist.

What Does Working Memory Mean?

What exactly is meant by the term “working memory”? The term dates from the 1960s and is primarily used in cognitive psychology and neuroscience. In cognitive psychology it is often seen as including short-term memory and in quite a few cases long-term memory as well. Cognitive psychologists are also interested in such issues as the general capacity of the working memory and its development (and decline) during the life-span of the individual. Neuroscientists have tried to locate the exact places of the working memory in the brain. They have also done work on what neurotransmitters are involved and related issues.

In thinking about the working memory of sociologists one can get many ideas from cognitive science and neuroscience. But one can also get ideas from other sources, and I do not think that one should build the history of sociology on the foundation of these two sciences.

There exist many other meta-

phors that can be used to approach our topic than the mind as a computer, processing information. We may, for example, draw some inspiration for an understanding of the working memory of sociology from the notion of a working library. A working library consists of the books we actively use for our research. It differs, say, from the library of a general reader or someone who collects first editions.

One can also view the working memory as something that is necessary to carry out any work, be it as a carpenter or a computer scientist. Work is the ontological condition of human beings, according to Marx; and this means that the working memory is part of the ontological condition of human beings. We are born with a capacity to develop a working memory; it is part of what it means to be human. Science and Technology Studies (STS) has also taught us to not only look at social relations but also at objects, from our bodies to non-body objects. The working memory of sociology may

CONTINUED ON PAGE 16

Wilner Figures

Jennifer Platt, *University of Sussex*

Over the years, a considerable number of studies have been done which count the proportion of papers in major journals that are quantitative in character, and this has commonly been treated as a basis for characterising whole national sociologies in the period covered. Some of these studies have dealt only with the present situation in one country at the time when they were undertaken, others have observed trends or made national comparisons. Whatever the original authors' intentions and interests, their data has quite frequently been used by subsequent writers as part of the historical picture. When several authors have offered material on the same period or journals, close attention is needed to any methodological differences between them; for instance, not everyone has used exactly the same set of categories. Working on a paper in this area, I came across a problem that seems worth drawing to the attention of members of the HoS constituency. It is in a paper well known at least to those old enough to remember the much regretted journal *History of Sociology*: Patricia Wilner, 'The main drift of sociology between 1936 and 1984', *History of Sociology* 5: 1-20, 1985. A quick google shows that this has been cited in several contexts.

It is an interesting paper, not concerned only with the qualitative versus quantitative pattern, and addressing issues in somewhat original ways. However, there are unexplained differences between the figures for quantification in the ASR, the only journal she used for her data,

between Table 2 (with detailed figures for different forms of qualitative and quantitative articles, and for non-empirical others using 'general theorizing' of various kinds) and Table 4 (which gives qualitative and quantitative totals, and looks like the obvious place from which to draw the conclusions). Looking at these more closely, it emerges that what she appears to have done is to distribute the articles her Table 2 classified as 'general theorizing' between the 'quantitative' and 'qualitative' totals used in Table 4. One can only speculate what her rationale was, or indeed whether this was intentional or some kind of practical error. But if she had not done this, the proportions quantitative and qualitative would have shown weaker trends since, as some other authors have pointed out, much of the variation over longer periods has been in proportions of non-empirical articles. Her figures need, therefore, to be used with care.

History of Sociology Activities at ASA—New York

Section on Comparative-Historical Sociology Paper Session.

Sponsor: Section on Comparative-Historical Sociology, Historical Sociology, and the History of Sociology

Time: Tue Aug 13 2013, 12:30 to 2:10pm

Title Displayed in Event Calendar: Section on Comparative-Historical

Sociology Paper Session. Historical Sociology and the History of Sociology

Session Organizer: George Steinmetz (University of Michigan)

Presider: George Steinmetz (University of Michigan)

Emancipation and the Sociological Tradition: The African American Contribution

*Gurminder K. Bhambra (University of Warwick)

General Equilibrium Theory Traveling Behind the Iron Curtain

*Olessia I. Kirtchik (Higher School of Economics), Ivan Boldyrev (Higher School of Economics -Moscow and Humboldt University)

The Impact Factor Fetishism

*Christian Fleck (University of Graz)

Universities, Law, Jurisprudence, and Sociology: A History

*Eric Lybeck (University of Cambridge)

Regular Session. History of Sociology/Social Thought

Time: Tue Aug 13 2013, 2:30 to 4:10pm

Title Displayed in Event Calendar: Regular Session. History of Sociology/Social Thought

Session Organizer: Sharon Hays (University of Southern California)

Presider: Jeff Weintraub (University of Pennsylvania)

Capitalism and the Jews in the Social Thought of Marx and Engels

*Chad Alan Goldberg (University of Wisconsin-Madison)

Is there anything new to say about Émile Durkheim?

*Marcel Fournier (Universite de Montreal)

Re-Examining the Rise of Functionalism: Key Events in Social Anthropology, Physiology and Sociology, 1922-1952

*Lawrence T. Nichols (West Virginia University)

Discussant: Jeff Weintraub (University of Pennsylvania)

Open Topic on the History of Sociology (one-hour)

Time: Mon Aug 12 2013, 2:30 to 3:30pm

Section on the History of Sociology Paper Session (one-hour). Open Topic on the History of Sociology

Session Organizer: Eleanor Townsley (Mount Holyoke College)

Presider: Eleanor Townsley (Mount Holyoke College)

Leave your ethic, feminism, and theory at the door: Contemporarily making social science

*Katelin E. Albert (University of Toronto)

Park's Notion of Collective Behavior: A Radical Interactionist's Critique

*Lonnie Athens (Seton Hall University)

Sociology in Iran: Instrumentalism, Pragmatism, Resilience

*Zohreh Bayatrizi (University of Alberta)

The Oracle's Personnel: Experts and Objectivity in the Early History of the Delphi Method

*Christian Daye (University of Graz)

Discussant: Eleanor Townsley (Mount Holyoke College)

THIS SESSION IS FOLLOWED BY THE HOS BUSINESS MEETING — SAME ROOM, 3:30-4:30

Section Business Meeting 3:30 to 4:30pm

Monday, August 12

BUSINESS MEETING IS IN THE SAME ROOM AS THE OPEN SESSION, ABOVE.

Open Topic on the History of Sociology: Past, Present and Future of Sociology

Time: Mon Aug 12 2013, 4:30 to 6:10pm

Title Displayed in Event Calendar: Section on the History of Sociology Paper Session. Open Topic on the History of Sociology: Past, Present and Future of Sociology

Session Organizer: Marco Santoro (University of Bologna)

Presider: Marco Santoro (University of Bologna)

Democracy at War: Tocqueville and the Invention of American Exceptionalism, 1941-1955

*Stefan Bargheer (University of California-Los Angeles)

From Aging to the Life Course: An Unfinished Dialectic

*James J. Dowd (University of Georgia)

New Assessments: Durkheim, Adorno and the persistence of the social

*Bjørn Schiermer (University of Copenhagen)

Signaling: Missing in Sociological Accounts of Interaction

*Anthony Paik (University of Iowa)

History of Sociology/Theory Section Joint Reception, Sheraton Time Square Hotel

Saturday, August 10, 6:30-7:30

Reenvisioning the History of Sociology in New York

Important HoS Sponsored Event!

Announcing our Exciting New Program for New York

Reenvisioning the History of Sociology:

A Symposium for Junior Historians of Sociology

Saturday, August 10, 2013

The New School for Social Research, New York, NY

Wolff Conference Room (D1103)

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

Co-Organizers: Michael Bare & Laura R. Ford

We are very pleased to announce the program for our History of Sociology Symposium, to be held in conjunction with the American Sociological Association's Annual Meeting in New York City. In the November issue of *Timelines*, we issued a Call for Papers, seeking contributions to a Symposium discussion about the role of sociology's history, in relation to its present and future. In response to our call, we received dozens of excellent paper submissions from graduate students and early career sociologists. Our submitters hailed from Latin America, Europe, and Asia, as well as North America. We have now finalized what promises to be a very exciting and dynamic program.

The Symposium will be held on August 10, 2013 in the Wolff Conference Room at The New School for Social Research, which is located near Union Square (65 Fifth Avenue, SE Corner of 14th & Fifth). We are particularly grateful to Jeffrey Goldfarb and Vera Zolberg, as well as the New School administration, for all their help in obtaining space at the New School. Given the quality of our paper submissions, we have planned a full-day symposium, with breaks for coffee and lunch. The detailed program, together with paper abstracts, is set forth below.

Please join us at the New School for what we hope will be an engaging and thought-provoking discussion! For further information about the Symposium, or for detailed directions, please contact Michael Bare (mbare@u.chicago.edu) or Laura Ford (lrf23@cornell.edu).

Final Program

8:30 – 9:00 a.m. – Coffee and Bagels

9:00 a.m. – Welcome from the Co-Organizers: Michael Bare (Chicago) & Laura Ford (Cornell)

9:05 – 10:35 a.m. – **Panel 1: Recognizing Social Theorists, Revisiting the Sociological Canon**

Orit Avishai (Fordham) & Courtney Irby (Loyola Chicago), *The Missing Feminist Revolution in*

*New Symposium, continued...**the Sociology of Religion*

Gina Bellofatto (Boston University), *Christian Sociology in Transition: The Institute of Social and Religious Research*

David Woods (NYU-Poly), *Reclaiming the Pragmatic Roots of C. Wright Mills' Sociological Imagination*

Panel Theme: a panel focusing on ways that the history of sociology helps us to reconceptualize sociology's canon, and to see a place in the canon for previously-marginalized groups, figures, and perspectives

Discussant: Jeffrey Goldfarb

10:35 – 10:45 a.m. – Break

10:45 – 12:15 p.m. – **Panel 2: Reconceptualizing the Social World**

Marcus Hunter (Yale), *A Pillar of American Sociology: Heterogeneity and W.E.B. DuBois' The Philadelphia Negro*

Alvaro Santana-Acuña (Harvard), *Outside Structures: Smithian Sentiments and Tardian Monads*

Jonathan VanAntwerpen (Social Science Research Council), *Empiricism, Interactionism, and Epistemological Authority: Examining Blumer's Early Sociological Practice*

Panel Theme: a panel focusing on ways that the

history of sociology helps us to theorize the social world anew

Discussant: Martin Bulmer

12:15 – 1:30 p.m. – Lunch

1:30 – 3:00 p.m. – **Panel 3: Reframing the Sociological Field**

John Boy (CUNY), *The Axial Age and the Problems of the 20th Century: Du Bois, Jaspers, and University History*

Joan Donovan (UCSD), *The Patient Effect: Social Order, Control, and Justice in American Medical Sociology*

Benjamin Merriman (University of Chicago), *Three Conceptions of Spatial Locality in Chicago School Sociology*

Panel Theme: a panel focusing on ways that the history of sociology helps us to see new possibilities for the discipline of sociology

Discussant: Jeffrey Olick

3:00 – 3:15 p.m. – Break

3:15 – 4:30 p.m. – **Reflective Panel & Discussion**

Paper Abstracts

Panel 1: Recognizing Social Theorists, Revisiting the Sociological Canon

Orit Avishai (Fordham) & Courtney Irby (Loyola Chica-

New Symposium, continued...

go), *The Missing Gender Revolution in the Sociology of Religion*

Despite the vast inroads that gender and feminist scholarship has made in reshaping academic disciplines, feminist sociologists argue that there is a missing feminist revolution in sociology. They claim that while analyses of gender are no longer parenthetical to the discipline, feminist theory has yet to enter the sociological canon or revolutionize its conceptual and analytical frameworks.

Although the missing feminist revolution argument resonates with gender and feminist scholars working in a range of sub-disciplines it has not been studied systematically within a particular subfield. This paper fills this gap, focusing on the sociology of religion. We examine the missing feminist revolution by drawing on three sources of data. We analyze articles at the intersection of gender and religion published since the 1980s in the journal *Sociology of Religion*, which is published by the Association for the Sociology of Religion, and find strong support for the “missing feminist revolution” claim. Contextualizing our analysis in the reflections of women sociologists of religion on the place of gender and feminist scholarship within the discipline, and several influential state-of-the-field articles published by prominent sociologists of religion in the past twenty years, we argue that in the sociology of religion gender scholarship has been parochialized and marginalized. We end the paper with suggestions for sociologists of

religion and consider the implications of this empirical study on broader claims of evolution of the field.

Gina Bellofatto (Boston University), *Christian Sociology in Transition: The Institute of Social and Religious Research*

Histories of American sociology generally acknowledge, to varying degrees, Christian involvement in the development of the field. Much of this attention, however, underemphasizes two highly influential movements in early-twentieth-century Christian thought, the social gospel movement (1870s–1920s) and the rise of the global ecumenical movement (beginning in 1910). One under-researched, yet particularly revealing example of the impact of these movements is the Institute of Social and Religious Research (“the Institute”; 1921–1934), founded in 1921 under the leadership of global Christian leader John R. Mott and funded by John D. Rockefeller, Jr. The Institute was comprised of Christian social scientific researchers who promoted interdenominational cooperation by engaging in scientific inquiry regarding the structure, current status, and functions of religious institutions and life in the United States. The Institute strived to maintain a high level of academic rigor while also retaining a religious motivation that included service to others, a classic struggle in the early history of American sociology.

The publications produced by the Institute were groundbreaking in their applications of social scientific methods to the study of religion in the United

New Symposium, continued...

States, most notable of which included Robert S. Lynd and Helen Merrell Lynd's highly generative and controversial *Middletown* study. In an overview of the largely unexplored tenure of the Institute, this paper brings together important trends in the early twentieth century to provide a unique perspective on the historical and theological contexts for the development of American sociology as an academic discipline.

David Woods (NYU-Poly), *Reclaiming the Pragmatic Roots of C. Wright Mills' Sociological Imagination*

In this essay, Woods argues that C. Wright Mills' "early writings and training as a public intellectual were within a pragmatist framework of democratic political economy, reflecting the influence of Dewey and Mead. In turn, Mills' radical pragmatism, as influenced by Dewey and Mead, was instrumental in the early development of the contentious participatory democracy of the Port Huron Statement and the Students for Democratic Society (SDS)."

Panel 2: Reconceptualizing the Social World

Marcus Hunter (Yale), *A Pillar of American Sociology: Heterogeneity and W.E.B. DuBois' The Philadelphia Negro*

In this paper, I locate the notion of heterogeneity within W.E.B. Du Bois's classic *The Philadelphia Negro* to demonstrate both the historical roots of the concept and also Du Bois's use of the concept as key to his production of new sociological knowledge. As

will be shown, Du Bois explicitly and implicitly disrupts the notion of a monolithic Black population by emphasizing intraracial variation; thus Du Bois's *The Philadelphia Negro* amplifies the role of heterogeneity as a tool for uncovering variation that produces incisive sociological theorization and analysis.

Alvaro Santana-Acuña (Harvard), *Outside Structures: Smithian Sentiments and Tardian Monads*

This paper engages with two historical works that occupy a peripheral position in the sociological tradition: *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* (1759) by Adam Smith and *Monadologie et sociologie* (1893) by Gabriel Tarde. In these works, the authors did not allude to structures to explain social phenomena. Rather, they relied on non-structuralist metaphors: sentiments in Smith's case and monads in Tarde's case. This paper reflects upon the idea of a sociological canon by analyzing how these non-structuralist metaphors can challenge the canonical (namely, structuralist) understanding of the social. In both works, the authors provide an "external metaphor" that could be perceived not as religious in nature, but rather as a secular one. It was this new secular space that progressively emerged as the modern notion of *society*. Smithian sentiments and Tardian monads functioned ultimately as external metaphors that placed the source of individual action outside the self. Although both, sentiments and monads, served as sources of the social, neither Smith nor Tarde located causality in structural forces, but rather in human interdependence

New Symposium, continued...

and interaction. This paper concludes that engaging with works outside the structuralist tradition can provide researchers with a distinctive arena for sociological innovation.

Jonathan VanAntwerpen (Social Science Research Council), *Empiricism, Interactionism, and Epistemological Authority: Examining Blumer's Early Sociological Practice*

This paper reconsiders Herbert Blumer's early texts on the movies, comparing the rhetoric and practice of sociological authority employed in these texts with Blumer's later theorizing. Drawing on previous work on the history of American sociology, I position Blumer's academic trajectory and intellectual project in a sociological field that was both dominated by perspectives other than Blumer's own and increasingly influenced by his interactionist program. An unrelenting critic of the discipline's methodological predilections and theoretical grandiosity, Blumer was once called "the gravedigger of American sociology." Yet his early writings on the movies might be subjected to the same form of critique he leveled at others.

Blumer's familiar reflections on sociological interpretation and authority, I argue, amounted to an implicit repudiation of his relatively less familiar early sociological practice. A consideration of the disconnect between Blumer's early practice and later theorizing highlights the limited and problematic mode of sociological authority practiced in Blumer's early work. As his research on the movies was transformed from a private and technocratic articulation to a popular mis-

appropriation, I conclude, the potential for a more critical public sociology was bypassed.

Panel 3: Reframing the Sociological Field

John Boy (CUNY), *The Axial Age and the Problems of the 20th Century: Du Bois, Jaspers, and University History*

The axial age debate has put big questions of social and cultural change back on the agenda of sociology. This paper takes this development as an occasion to reflect on how social thought works with (and against) nineteenth-century intellectual traditions in its efforts to understand history on a macro scale. Jaspers, who initially formulated the axial age thesis in *The Origin and Goal of History*, revised the Hegelian account of world history by broadening the scope of the narrative to encompass all civilizations participating in the events of the first millennium BCE that saw the rise of major philosophical and religious traditions. However, his account, like the earlier philosophical accounts he seeks to improve upon, privileges cognitive developments over material practices and social interactions, and as such offers little to those seeking to make sense of how cultural patterns interact with others and spread. Here another social theorist engaging with Hegel, W. E. B. Du Bois, provides a helpful contrast. His account of the development of double-consciousness in "Of Our Spiritual Strivings," the opening chapter of *The Souls of Black Folk*, helps us to understand experiences of encounter and the lasting historical effects they may have. Du Bois re-

New Symposium, continued...

minds us of the importance of unpacking abstractions and understanding processes in terms of social interactions.

Joan Donovan (UCSD), *The Patient Effect: Social Order, Control, and Justice in American Medical Sociology*

This historical paper on the field of American medical sociology explores its institutional founding through in-depth attention to early writings by Durkheim, Parsons, and Goffman to show how the historical context of its emergence shaped the kinds of questions posed in contemporary medical sociology. I illustrate how the broad concerns of sociological theory have come to focus and define the core set of questions posed by medical sociologists and how the reverberating effects of American culture, politics, and economics are part and parcel of this knowledge production. Here, I do not re-tell the story of medical sociology as a cohesive paradigm, but rather demonstrate why certain questions dominated the specialty at different points in history and how this links up with the current focus on structural inequality, health disparities, lay knowledge, and health social movements. This sociology of medical sociology concludes that for health based social movements, taking on the sick role is not like Parsons (1951) suggested, a way to get out of regular duties, but rather disease categories help form a collective identity, which consequently allows the group to act together towards social justice.

Benjamin Merriman (Chicago), *Three Conceptions of Spatial Locality in Chicago School Sociology*

The introduction of new spatial methods has heightened long-standing interest in the local organization of urban life. Though many of these methods derive from geography and other disciplines, the theoretical inheritance of the Chicago School remains at the core of urban sociology. Classic works of Chicago sociology, however, develop several different conceptions of spatial locality. This article identifies three major notions of locality, respectively defined by ecology, institutions, and subjective perceptions. Each of these conceptions corresponds to the ecological, organizational, and social psychological preoccupations of the Chicago School. These accounts of locality are not theoretically consistent, and make reference to partially distinct empirical phenomena. A brief survey of contemporary neighborhood research demonstrates that it relies upon these same accounts, though current research often gives priority to the measurement of effects rather than the description of processes. The nature of local space is undertheorized today, and there has been little formal debate about the descriptive goals of neighborhood research. Revisiting work from the Chicago School may serve to clarify beliefs about the nature of neighborhoods, and may also serve as the basis for well-defined theoretical positions about the purpose of neighborhood research.

Report: History of Sociology's Award Panel

Distinguished Scholarly Publication Award 2013

The HoS Selection Panel awards the 2013 Distinguished Publication Award of the History of Sociology Section of the ASA to **Lawrence T Nichols of the University of West Virginia** for his article

"Sorokin as a Lifelong Russian Intellectual: the Enactment of a Historically Rooted Sensibility", *THE AMERICAN SOCIOLOGIST* 43, December 2012, pp.374-405.

The panel also commends, but does not award the prize to, Grégoire Mallard of Northwestern University for his article "THE GIFT Revisited: Marcel Mauss on War, Debt and the Politics of Reparations", *SOCIOLOGICAL THEORY* 29, 4, 2011, pp.225-247, which is proxime accessit.

The Panel received six nominations for this award, all scholarly works of merit demonstrating different strengths. They are gratified to have had such a strong field to consider, and all entries deserved serious consideration for the prize. Three nominations were for books, three nominations were for articles in journals. Of the six, three were self-nominations, but all works considered were supported by at least one ASA member, who is identified here. Of the six authors, in terms of origin four are American, one Israeli and one French. All however hold an earned doctorate awarded by a US graduate school. Of the six, five are currently pursuing their career in the United States, and one in Israel.

The six works considered are summarised in the attached Excel spreadsheet:.

The panel consider that the winning entry by Lawrence T Nichols displays a refined analysis of what Pitrim A Sorokin brought to American sociology from his Russian background. Involved in Kerensky's government before his emigration, Sorokin has always been an enigmatic figure in sociology, achieving great fame yet not being understood well by his contemporaries or by sociologists today. Nichols does a very nice job in contextualising much of what Sorokin did as a sociologist, making sense of Sorokin's Russian sensibilities, which carried him far for a time but which ultimately doomed him to his not-so-deserved obscurity today.

The second article by Grégoire Mallard, 'THE GIFT Revisited', shows the origins of the doctrine of "reparative justice" in the French late nineteenth century academic milieu, and the role that that doctrine played in the thinking of Mauss and other legal scholars known as 'solidarists'. Grégoire Mallard demonstrates for the first time the relationship between THE GIFT and the international questions which obsessed Mauss and many of his contemporaries: the issue of whether Germans should pay some of the debts that the Allies contracted during and after the war toward their own citizens and toward other nations; and if so, how and when the Germans should pay these debts.

The remaining works all have various strengths. The article by Chad Alan Goldberg analyses the interplay be-

Report, continued

tween important elements in Durkheim's sociological thought and wider currents of social thought and ideology, in particular the diverse tendencies in 19th century French anti-semitism.

The empirical monograph by Julie Zimmerman and Otto Larson throws important light on US government support for rural sociology, and the fostering of studies of the role of women in rural America in the New Deal programme. This is the third and final historical volume on which Zimmerman and Larson have worked on behalf of the Rural Sociological Society, and responds in part to an initiative taken by Charles Camic when he was president of the Section in 2008.

Uri Ram's study of Israeli nationalism offers a combined analysis of Israeli political culture and of Israeli social sciences, especially in sociology and history. Its subject matter is two fold: first the role played by mainstream sociology and history in the nation-building process. And second, the role played by critical and alternative new approaches that evolved in those disciplines since the late 1970s.

John Levi Martin's book *THE EXPLANATION OF SOCIAL ACTION* has already received the publication prize of the ASA Theory Section in 2012. It is a work of considerable distinction which impressed the panel by its acute theoretical grasp and capacity to write humorously about abstruse issues in philosophy of social explanation. It is essentially a work in the philosophy of social science. The panel was not however in agreement about its suitability for the prize. Two members thought that it was

doubtful if it was centrally a work in the history of sociology, and observed that there were relatively few references to work in the history of sociology in the extensive bibliography. The third member took the opposing view that it was as a reconstruction of the history of theories of the explanation of social action in sociology that engaged with sociologists of the past to both challenge the received view and propose an alternative to it. It bridged sociological theory and history of sociology in a way that made major contributions to both. In this view it also fits with the theme of the Symposium ("Re-envisioning the History of Sociology (and Much More!)") for graduate students and early career sociologists organized by the History of Sociology section for the 2013 ASA meeting in New York. We all agree that it is a scholarly work of distinction.

Finally, we wish to suggest that the committee of the Section on the History of Sociology consider making some modification to this award in future years. In the course of reaching a decision for 2013, we experienced considerable difficulty in comparing articles and books, both of which were nominated. As one member of the panel put it, it was a bit like comparing apples and pears. We suggest that in future the History of Sociology section could make two awards, one for a distinguished scholarly article in the two previous years, and one for a distinguished scholarly book in the two previous years. The ASA Community and Urban Section, for example, has two prizes, the Park prize for the best book and the Jane Addams prize for the best article.

Report, continued

Last year the Section awarded its prize to a book, Lawrence A Scaff's *MAX WEBER IN AMERICA*. This year the prize winner is an article. Both are legitimate forms of scholarly output, but it is awkward to compare book and article. To make two awards, which could be done by the same selection committee, would avoid invidious choices and broaden the reach of the History of Sociology Section publication awards. We also suggest that book publishers be permitted in future to nominate works for

consideration for the book award, subject to support from an HoS section member or members other than the author.

Martin Bulmer, University of Surrey, Guildford, UK
[chair of the panel]

Valerie A Haines, University of Calgary, Alberta, Canada

Peter Kivisto, Augustana College, Rock Island, Illinois

NEWS

Recent Publications

Bayatrizi, Zohreh. 'Between Palace and Prison: Towards a reflexive history of academic sociology in Iran.' *International Sociology* 28: 467-83 (July 2013).

Abstract: The Institute for Social Studies and Research, founded in 1958, provided a framework for research and teaching modern social sciences, especially sociology, in Iran. The political climate of post-WWII Iran, that delivered neither the full benefits of freedom nor the true powers of censorship, fostered both resilience and pragmatism among the founders and leading figures in the Institute. The outcome was a brand of applied sociology that strived to provide scientific guidance for the state's modernization project while trying to maintain independence and critical distance. The resulting tensions are both unique to Iran and, at the same time, indicative of larger

global trends. Online version can be found at <http://iss.sagepub.com/content/28/4/467>

DOI: 10.1177/0268580913494913

Derman, Joshua. 2012. *Max Weber in Politics and Social Thought: From Charisma to Canonization*. Cambridge, UP.

Gill, Timothy M. 2013. "'Why Mills, Not Gouldner?' Differential History and Selective Commemoration in Sociology," *The American Sociologist* 44(1): 96-115

Abstract: Despite the close resemblances evident in their major works, their critical stance and their politics, C. Wright Mills and Alvin Gouldner have received strikingly different responses from their sociological peers, and they now occupy very different places in the collective memory of the discipline. This intriguing discrepancy provides the basis here for a comparative case study that examines both ongoing commemorative practices and historical evidence. This paper shows how the sociological community has frequently and approvingly commemorated Mills through introductory textbooks, as well as reading lists for doctoral comprehensive examinations,

News, continued

awards in Mills' honor and biographies of Mills, while doing much less to preserve and promote the memory of Gouldner and his contributions to the field. In an effort to attain a better understanding of such differences, I compare the prescriptions that each advocated for the discipline, especially as these are expressed in Mills' *Sociological Imagination* and Gouldner's *Coming Crisis of Western Sociology*. The analysis emphasizes how Mills explicitly sought to move beyond sociology, in a narrow academic sense, and called for well-honed empirical endeavors with relevance for a variety of publics, whereas Gouldner proceeded largely as an academic theorist who demanded sociological-theoretical reform. Unlike Mills, he did not breach the gap between academia and the general public. These findings illustrate an apparent paradox, namely, that American sociology in the twenty-first century may reserve its most esteemed positions for internal critics who advocate movement beyond its contemporary confines.

Go, Julian (ed.) 2013. *Postcolonial Sociology. Special Volume of Political Power and Social Theory* (volume 23). Emerald Publishing Ltd.

_____. 2013. "Fanon's Postcolonial Cosmopolitanism." *European Journal of Social Theory* 16(2): 208-225

_____. 2013. "Decolonizing Bourdieu: Colonial and Postcolonial Theory in Pierre Bourdieu's Early Work." *Sociological Theory* 31(1): 49-74.

Fleck, Christian (ed.) 2012. *Max Webers Protestantismus -These. Kritik und Antikritik*, special issue of *Österreichischen Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaften* vol. 23 (2012), issue 3.

Kracauer, Siegfried. 2012. *Studien zu Massenmedien und Propaganda*, ed by Christian Fleck and Bernd Stieg-

ler, with the assistance of Joachim Heck and Maren Neumann (=Siegfried Kracauer Werke Band 2.2), Berlin: Suhrkamp.

Platt, Jennifer., Charles Crothers, and Mervyn Horgan. Winter 2013. 'Producing Ethnographies: Workplace Ethnographies in History.' *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*.

Psathas, George. "Goffman and Schutz on Multiple Realities," in Michael Staudigl and George Berguno (eds.) *Schutzian Phenomenology and Hermeneutic Traditions*, Springer (forthcoming, 2013).

_____. "Helmut Wagner's Contributions to Social Science," in Lester Embree and James Dodd (eds.) *The Golden Age for Phenomenology at the New School for Social Research*, Springer, (forthcoming).

_____. "Interpreting Film: The Case of Casablanca," in Michael Barber and Jochen Dreher (eds.) *The Interrelation of Phenomenology, Social Sciences, and the Arts*, (forthcoming, 2013).

Rodgers, Diane M. 2013. "Insects, Instincts and Boundary Work in Early Social Psychology." *History of the Human Sciences* 26 (1): 68-89.

Steinmetz, George. 2013. "A Child of the Empire: British Sociology and Colonialism, 1940s-1960s." *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, Winter, no. 1.

Turner, Stephen. 2013. "The Young Shils." *Tradition and Discovery: The Polanyi Society Periodical* 39(3), 49-51.

Book Spotlight

Steinmetz, George, (ed.) *Sociology and Empire. The Imperial Entanglements of a Discipline*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2013. ISBN: 978-0-8223-5279-2 (paperback) and 978-0-8223-5258-7 (cloth).

The volume includes these essays:

Ch 1: Major Contributions to Sociological Theory and research on Empire, 1830s–Present - *George*

Book Spotlight, continued

Steinmetz

PART ONE: National Sociological Fields and the Study of Empire

Ch 2: Russian Sociology in Imperial Context - *Alexander Semyonov, Marina Mogilner, and Ilya Gerasimov*

Ch 3: Sociology's Imperial Unconscious: The Emergence of American Sociology in the Context of Empire - *Julian Go*

Ch 4: Empire for the Poor: Colonial Dreams and the Quest for an Italian Sociology, 1870s–1950s - *Marco Santoro*

Ch 5: German Sociology and Empire: From Internal Colonization to Overseas Colonization and Back Again - *Andrew Zimmerman*

Ch 6: The Durkheimian School and Colonialism: Exploring the Constitutive Paradox - *Fuyuki Kurasawa*

PART TWO: Current Sociological Theories of Empire

Ch 7: The Recent Intensification of American Economic and Military Imperialism: Are They Connected? - *Michael Mann*

Ch 8: The Empire's New Laws: Terrorism and the New Security Empire after 9/11 - *Kim Lane Scheppele*

Ch 9: Empires and Nations: Convergence or Divergence? - *Krishan Kumar*

Ch 10: The New Surgical Imperialism: China, Africa, and Oil - *Albert J. Bergesen*

PART THREE: Historical Studies of Colonialism and Empire

Ch 11: Nation and Empire in the French Context - *Emmanuelle Saada*

Ch 12: Empire and Developmentalism in Colonial India - *Chandan Gowda*

Ch 13: Building the Cities of Empire: Urban Planning in the Colonial Cities of Italy's Fascist Empire - *Besnik Pula*

Ch 14: Japanese Colonial Structure in Korea in Comparative Perspective - *Ou-Byung Chae*

Ch 15: Native Policy and Colonial State Formation in Pondicherry (India) and Vietnam: Recasting Ethnic Relations, 1870s–1920s - *Anne Raffin*

Ch 16: The Constitution of State/Space and the Limits of "Autonomy" in South Africa and Palestine/Israel - *Andy Clarno*

Ch 17: Resistance and the Contradictory Rationalities of State Formation in British Malaya and the American Philippines - *Daniel P. S. Goh*

Conclusion: Understanding Empire -- *Raewyn Connell*

Announcements

In the Max Weber field, as it were, in March there was a publication honoring Wilhelm Hennis: Wilhelm Hennis" Politische Wissenschaft: Fragestellungen und Diagnosen, ed. Andreas Anter. Tuebingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013. Given Hennis's reputation in the disputes over Weber, two of the essays of interest might be to HoS Section Members: 1- Tribe, Kieth "Hennis in the English-Speaking World", pp. 293-305

2- Scaff, Lawrence "Wilhelm Hennis, Max Weber, and the Charisma of Political Thinking", pp. 307-25.

Announcements, continued

Sage has published a new *Encyclopedia of Philosophy and the Social Sciences* (2013). Members of the History of Sociology Section will find a number of useful entries. Peter J. Burke is the author of "Identity, Social" (Pp. 454-457), and Michael G. Flaherty is the author of "Time, Social Theories of" (Pp. 1005-1007). In addition, Robert Dingwall is the author of "Symbolic Interactionism" (Pp. 974-975), and Stephen Turner, who is also on the editorial board, is the author of "Tacit Knowledge" (Pp 985-986).

NEW JOURNAL—Call for Papers

Serendipities -- Journal for the Sociology and History of the Social Sciences

Serendipities is a new interdisciplinary journal published as an open access, peer reviewed, online only periodical. It is devoted to sociological and historical studies of the social sciences in their broadest meaning.

While its title pays homage to Robert K. Merton and his insistence that the development of any scholarly activity is influenced by unanticipated and anomalous instances, the journal does not expect contributors to follow a narrowly defined program. Rather it seeks to encourage the use of a variety of concepts, methodologies and theories to study the trajectories of the social sciences. The pertinent time span ranges from the pre-history of the several disciplines, through to the period of their formation and their consolidation (or their decline). Papers are welcome from any theoretical or methodological perspective that covers any of these periods. Case studies or investigations of longer lasting developments, papers

focusing on a single scholar or on groups, schools, and research trends are equally appreciated by the journal so long as they conclude with more or less generalizing insights. Purely descriptive studies are not disallowed, but the emphasis of the journal is on the presentation of findings in a way that makes them applicable to other cases, periods, disciplines, and fields. Papers that translate concepts and insights from research fields (sociology of science, criminology, stratification etc.), social studies of sciences or philosophy and history of sciences into the sociology and history of the social sciences are also relevant to *Serendipities'* remit.

The social sciences emerged in different scientific cultures under different descriptions. That granted, we delineate the social sciences as an intellectual domain that today comprises sociology, political science, economics, management, anthropology, social psychology, geography, and all the offspring of these older fields, for instance, social policy, social work, demography, criminology, area studies, peace and conflict research etc. Contributions from or about the humanities are appreciated too, provided their significance for the social sciences is clearly documented.

Some of the topics that the editors hope to see covered in *Serendipities* are the development of methodologies and research techniques, the institutionalization processes of disciplines and research directions, the "traveling of ideas" from one scholarly culture to another, the role of funding agencies, and the relation among the social sciences, the state, and social movements. Finally, the interaction of social science with publics and

New Journal—Call for Papers, continued

different kind of clients is a matter of great interest to the journal. From a methodological point of view, we particularly invite submissions that engage with the still underdeveloped field of sociological semantics, prosopography, and advanced quantitative and qualitative approaches to analyze the personnel of the social sciences.

Serendipities attempts to cover not only a broad variety of disciplines but also an array of scientific cultures. This means that we welcome submissions from all corners of the world without regard to the disciplinary affiliations of their authors. We will accept traditional research articles, but also unconventional papers. Given the fact that *Serendipities* will appear as an online journal we will not impose word-count limits; nevertheless, we ask authors to write as concisely as possible.

We accept submissions in English, French, German, and Spanish for reviewing but will ask those authors whose articles are accepted to provide an English version for publication. Stylistic and orthographic copy-editing will be provided.

Serendipities publishes three kinds of texts: *Articles* will appear whenever one is ready. The *book review* section will cover new publications from and in any language, and function both as a forum for critical evaluation of new books and as a platform for those who are not able to read them in their original. A third part will be an *archive* section where items from the past are made visible to the scientific community, e.g. letters, unpublished manuscripts, administrative documents etc., together with short commentaries on the significance of the documents.

Serendipities will start in 2014. For old-fashioned lovers of book-like printed journal issues we will offer an annually print-on-demand version of the journal at cost price.

Editors:

Peter Baehr (Lingnan University, Hong Kong),
 Fernanda Beigel (Universidad Nacional de Cuyo, Mendoza, Argentina),
 Christian Fleck (University of Graz, Austria),
 Andreas Hess (University College Dublin, Ireland),
 Laurent Jeanpierre (Université Paris 8, Vincennes-Saint-Denis, France)
 George Steinmetz (University of Michigan, USA)

Associate and Book review editors:

Matteo Bortolini (University of Padua, Italy)
 Marcia Consolim (Universidade Federal de São Paulo, Brazil)
 Christian Dayé (University of Graz, Austria)
 Daniel Huebner (University of Chicago, USA)
 Kristoffer Kropp (University of Copenhagen, Denmark)
 Albert Tzeng (Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, Singapore)

International Advisory Board:

Richard Bellamy (University College London, United Kingdom)
 Mark Bevir (University of California, Berkeley, USA)
 Peter Breiner (State University of New York, USA)
 Peter Burke (University of Cambridge, Emmanuel College, United Kingdom)

New Journal—Call for Papers, continued

Hamilton Cravens (Iowa State University, USA)	ny)
Paul H. Erickson (Wesleyan University, USA)	Sergio Miceli (Universidade de São Paulo, Brasil)
Jean-Louis Fabiani (Central European University, Budapest)	Philip Mirowski, (University of Notre Dame, USA)
Lian Greenfeld (Boston University, USA)	Helga Nowotny (President European Research Council, Austria)
Johan Heilbron (Erasmus University, Rotterdam and Centre de sociologie européenne, Paris)	William Outhwaite (Newcastle University, United Kingdom)
Dirk Kaesler (University of Marburg, Germany)	Margaret Schabas (University of British Columbia, Canada)
Michèle Lamont (Harvard University, USA)	Cherry Schrecker (University of Nancy, France)
Wolf Lepenies (Wissenschaftskolleg zu Berlin, Germany)	

History of Sociology Awards

Graduate Student Prize:

B. Robert Owens (University of Chicago), "The Concept of Laboratory in Early American Sociology".

Distinguished Scholarly Publication Award

Lawrence T. Nichols (University of West Virginia) for his article "Sorokin as a Lifelong Russian Intellectual: The Enactment of a Historically Rooted Sensibility", *The American Sociologist* 43, December 2012, pp.374-405.

Lifetime Achievement Award

Donald N. Levine (University of Chicago)

Awards and Honors

Gross, Matthias. "'Objective Culture' and the Development of Nonknowledge: Georg Simmel and the Reverse Side of Knowing" has been awarded the 2013 Sage Prize for Innovation and Excellence of the British Sociological Association and is now available freely online at the Sage website: <http://cus.sagepub.com/content/6/4/422.full.pdf+html>.

At its annual meetings, November 1-3, 2012, the Society for Phenomenology and the Human Sciences (SPHS) honored Professor **George Psathas** with a special session and the publication of a festschrift, *Interaction and Everyday Life: Phenomenological and Ethnomethodological Essays in Honor of George Psathas*, edited by Hishasi Nasu and Frances Chaput Waksler. The book includes contributions by nineteen national and international scholars from the U.S., Germany, S. Korea, France, Japan and Canada. It was published by Lexington Books, a subsidiary of Rowan and Littlefield, in 2012.

Swedberg, continued from page 2

be similar in the sense that it has a social dimension but also involves objects (people to be interviewed, documents to be analyzed, books to be read, and so on).

Possible Topics

If you make the assumption that every sociologist has to mobilize, use and develop his or her knowledge of the past, in doing any kind of concrete research, what consequences does this have for the history of sociology?

What new tasks does this view of things possibly entail?

Below I will try to outline a few of these tasks; and I hope they will be understood in the spirit of being early suggestions and in no way definitive or exhaustive or otherwise complete. A first task would be to establish exactly what from the past is being transmitted, when it comes to the knowledge of the past that the sociologist actually uses in his or her research. A selection process is clearly involved; so exactly what is being transmitted? Take, for example, the idea of status that is currently being revived in sociology. Which ideas of the past are being used? Those of Maine, Weber, Everett C. Hughes? If not, why not?

Related to this task, but also a distinct task of its own, is the following. What has been forgotten of the past but deserves to be revived and incorporated in the working body of current sociology? There is an obvious normative dimension to this task, but there is also the argument that (say) the recent research on status is much less sophisticated than it *could* have been – that is, if more of the useful ideas of past research had been taken into account.

A third task would be to research exactly how knowledge is being transmitted, distorted and improved. Note in this context that while people may say that they know theory X and Y, in reality they use theory Z. What impact do undergraduate and graduate courses have on our working knowledge in sociology (and how do you document and measure this)? What about the research we do versus what we just read about – what different kind of impact do they have on our working memory? And what about the role of awards, the role of power, gender?

There is finally a fourth task that is more complex in some ways than the other three. It has to do with the importance of what may be called tacit working knowledge. While it may be important to incorporate some specific item into the way we do research, this may only be possible if we also have quite a bit of other, less easy to specify knowledge of the past.

Last Words

Is the notion of the working memory of sociology an important one, worth preserving and elaborating further? In my view, this is much too early to say; and a discussion would be helpful to reach an answer. It may very well turn out that there exist better ways of conceptualizing the tasks of the history of sociology.

What I would insist on, however, is the notion that there exist certain parts of the history of sociology that mainly concern the historian of sociology, and other parts that concern all sociologists, and without which they would be unable to carry out their everyday re-

Swedberg, continued

search. In my view historians of sociology may well have focused a bit too much on the former; and as a result the link between the history of sociology and the rest of sociology has become weaker than it could and should be. If this argument is correct, historians of sociology may in the near future want to redress this imbalance between their two tasks.