

TIMELINES

Newsletter of the ASA History of Sociology Section

Dec 2013, No. 22

INSIDE

ESSAYS

Parsons - Voegelin 1
LeQuire and Silver

Collective Memory 6
Bare and Ford

SECTION INFORMATION 2

NEWS

Recent publications 8
Announcement 8
Section Awards 9
Nomination Committees 10

Newsletter Editors

Erik Schneiderhan
e.schneiderhan@utoronto.ca

Katelin Albert
katelin.albert@mail.utoronto.ca

The Parsons–Voegelin Correspondence: Notes on an Unexpected and Instructive Intellectual Encounter

Brickey LeQuire, Samford University (pblequir@samford.edu)

Daniel Silver, University of Toronto (dsilver@utsc.toronto.ca)

On January 20, 1940, Eric Voegelin wrote a letter to Talcott Parsons, thus opening an unexpected but highly instructive dialogue between two of the twentieth century's most penetrating social thinkers. Their twenty-five extant letters were preceded by earlier personal contacts and extended numerous face-to-face conversations, which began during the autumn of 1938, when Voegelin (who had just fled Austria in the wake of the *Anschluss*) held a temporary post at Harvard, and took place not only in professional contexts, but also in the more intimate settings of the Parsons summer retreat and family home. On more than one occasion, Parsons served as a professional reference for Voegelin as the latter sought to establish an academic career in the United States. By 1944, however, Voegelin had secured a tenured professorship at Louisiana State University, and the written conversation had apparently stalled; by the mid-1960s, the intellectual friendship – as one of Parsons' doc-

toral students later reported – seemed to be a distant memory.

Nevertheless, their letters, which are housed in the Harvard University Archives and the Hoover Institution Archives, stand as testament to a rare meeting of profoundly different minds. Published now for the first time in English, the complete correspondence contains much material to interest a wide academic audience. We hope that members of the ASA History of Sociology Section, in particular, will appreciate the depth and breadth of the dialogue. Our edition of the letters, including extensive notes, appears in the latest edition of the *European Journal of Sociology* (<http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0003975613000192>), along with a co-authored essay in which we interpret the exchange in its historical and interpersonal context, and assess its present-day implications (<http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0003975613000143>).

Here we offer only a brief overview,

Section Officers

Chair

Alan Sica
Pennsylvania State University

Chair-Elect

Neil L. Gross
University of British Columbia

Past Chair

Richard Swedberg
Cornell University

Secretary Treasurer

Erik Schneiderhan
University of Toronto ('14)

Section Council

Marcel Fournier
Universite de Montreal ('14)

Jeffrey Olick

University of Virginia ('14)

Norbert F. Wiley

University of Illinois -- Urbana ('15)

Mustafa Emirbayer

University of Wisconsin at Madison ('16)

Peter Kivisto

Augustana College ('16)

Student Representatives

Laura Ford
Cornell University ('14)

Amanda E. Maull

Pennsylvania State University ('15)

SECTION WEBSITE:

<http://www.historyofsociology.org/>

LeQuire and Silver, continued

discussing what initially attracted us to the exchange, the circumstances and concerns that brought the two scholars together, and stressing above all the remarkable degree of mutual intelligibility they were able to attain. We conclude with some speculations about why their friendship and scholarly partnership were not longer-lived.

As we discuss at greater length in our article, this was a fleeting but profound intellectual encounter between two very different men and minds. Though separated by disciplinary and cultural lines, they were drawn together by a set of common interests, which included questions about the origins of totalitarianism and modern anti-Semitism, the legacy of Max Weber, the patterns of secularization set in motion by the Protestant Reformation, and the proper methodology of the social sciences. Not only did they agree on the questions, but to a remarkable extent they actually agreed on the answers, at least in general terms, even as Parsons was in the midst of an unpleasant exercise in mutual misunderstanding with one of Voegelin's closest friends, the philosopher Alfred Schütz (1899-1959). The letters are thus not only a thoughtful and wide-ranging conversation on a set of central topics in

twentieth-century social science, but also an object lesson in the potentials and challenges of cross-cultural and cross-disciplinary dialogue.

Our interest in this exchange was initially sparked by its serendipitous quality. The sheer existence of the letters came as a surprise to us: who would have thought that the dean of official, establishment American sociology would be engaged in serious dialogue with the author of speculative philosophical treatises on the mysteries of human participation in divine Being, barely recognizable as the work of a professional social scientist? Who would have thought that Voegelin, a severe critic of secular social science as veiled "gnosticism (a quasi-religious attempt to deify man and create heaven on earth) would be found in genuine and open conversation with one of its greatest twentieth-century exponents? What could they have had to talk about, how could they have hoped to learn anything from one another?

These were questions we were primed to pursue. LeQuire had written a dissertation on Voegelin, critically explicating the theological dimensions of his political philosophy as it developed during the 1950s. Silver had taught a course on Par-

LeQuire and Silver, continued

sons at Chicago and published an essay constructively extending Parsonian ideas about action theory. We were also surprised to find that the original letters had not yet been published in their entirety. They had appeared in Italian translation, and most of Voegelin's letters are available in his *Collected Works*. But for us a major part of their fascination comes from the back-and-forth of the conversation, as we observe each thinker starting, dropping, and circling around to lines of argument, broaching sensitive personal as well as professional topics, probing areas of disagreement, and, most importantly, looking to learn from one another about topics of shared concern. Given the stature of the correspondents, leaving the complete correspondence unpublished seemed strange indeed – but this, too, is perhaps symptomatic of the difficulties in finding editors, authors, and readers willing and ready to follow Parsons and Voegelin across lines of sociology, political theory, history, religion, philosophy, and beyond.

Parsons' 1941 controversy with Schütz concerned basic questions in the theory of action. Despite a seemingly shared set of concerns with issues revolving around the role of subjectivity in sociological theories, one of the most noteworthy features of the dialogue between Parsons and Schütz is that it hardly qualifies as such – the two persistently talked past one another, despite both parties' manifest desire to find a common footing. In his letters to Voegelin, which commenced shortly after the denouement of the Schütz exchange, Parsons expressed regret for this failed communication. He also indicated that he did not quite understand its sources. Parsons had, at least in his own self-understanding, made an honest effort to understand where Schütz was coming from. This was clearly a request for Voegelin to “mediate” between Parsons and Schütz.

Voegelin obliged. But instead of tracing the source of

the dialogue's failure to some lack of personal effort to understand one another, or even to some fundamental ideational conflict, Voegelin suggests that the immersion of Schütz and Parsons in highly different intellectual cultures and academic milieus generated divergent notions of sociological practice. In these different contexts, he argued, the same words had deeply different implications. A case in point is Schütz's claim that Parsons' social theory is “naïve” – a point to which Parsons understandably took great offense. What Schütz meant by this charge, Voegelin explains, was not that Parsons was a childish naïf, but that his stance did not amount to a transcendental “critique” in the Kantian sense of the term. Parsons sought a direct “theory of society” rather than a theory of the perceptual and cognitive apparatus by which knowledge of society is conditioned. Thus, despite the fact that Schütz and Parsons shared certain technical vocabulary, such as “action” and “meaning,” because Schütz sought a “critical” social theory in his debates with Hans Kelsen and other leading figures of Austrian social science, they ended up talking past one another, much to their mutual frustration. In essence, Voegelin offered a sociological account of intellectual (mis)communication that situated the semantics of theoretical sentences within the practical context of their deployment. To understand a theory is to understand how its conceptual repertoire is used.

One indication of the power of this pragmatist approach to the sociology of knowledge is that it can help participants in (difficult) intellectual exchanges to understand themselves better. Indeed, Parsons immediately credits Voegelin's astute account, and proceeds to eagerly add new layers to it. “Possibly one of my troubles in my discussion with Schütz lies in the fact that by cultural heritage I am a Calvinist. I do not want to be a philosopher... By the same token I don't think [Schütz] wants to be a

LeQuire and Silver, continued

scientist as I understand the term until he has settled all the underlying philosophical difficulties.” The two used the same words, but they were doing different things with them. Knowing this helped Parsons to reflexively comprehend his own theoretical statements by way of the ethical-practical situation in which they acquired their meaning. Contextual reconstruction is not only a tool for research into intellectual history; it can also stimulate self-awareness of the presuppositions of one’s own scholarly tradition.

Such reflexivity, however, is not a sufficient condition for successful cross-cultural or cross-disciplinary communication. By the time Parsons understood the sources of his misunderstanding with Schütz, he had lost interest in repairing the relationship. Paradoxically, it seems that Parsons’ singular *openness* to German-language social theory may have been partly to blame. He had earned his doctorate at the University of Heidelberg, and had almost singlehandedly made Max Weber a household name in the English-speaking academy. Yet as an American champion (to Americans) of one current in European sociology, he seems to have been initially unaware of the range of alternatives to it. The time and difficulty it had taken him to recognize the substance of Schütz’s actual concerns were perhaps a source of intellectual and personal embarrassment, suggesting that his grasp of the European tradition he was attempting to mediate and transcend was less secure than he had presumed. In any event, the failed exchange with Schütz prevented the formation of a personal and intellectual relationship that might have motivated curiosity about larger philosophical questions that had failed to excite Parsons’ real interest when he first encountered them as a student in Germany.

Set against the grinding of intellectual gears between

Parsons and Schütz, the fruitfulness of the dialogue between Parsons and Voegelin becomes all the more striking. What stands out here is how little the two shared by way of terminology, yet how much they shared by way of substance. Voegelin, simply put, was not in the business of constructing an empirically-grounded theory of social action; Parsons, for his part, was not aspiring to elucidate the basic structure of human consciousness. And yet their different professional projects led them to share a deep interest in similar substantive issues, which notably included the causes and legacies of the Protestant Reformation and the religious roots of contemporary anti-Semitism. Without a shared theoretical vocabulary to which either was professionally committed, their discussions of these topics are marked by a rare degree of focus on the matters at hand. A shared language set in different practices can be a source of confusion; a shared object can be a source of communication across different backgrounds. Even their extensive discussion of methodological issues was not carried on in the abstract, but had the tangible goal of resolving a particular, personal misunderstanding (between Parsons and Schütz).

Of course Parsons and Voegelin did have some common intellectual touchstones. But the most important was not a set of ideas or propositions to which they both assented but rather an intellectual model according to which they organized their behavior: Max Weber. Parsons and Voegelin each followed in Weber’s intellectual footsteps by insisting on the role of values in human agency, and by emphasizing the role of “secularized” religious belief in shaping modern society. While they interpreted Weber’s work differently, both regarded it highly, though neither accepted it uncritically. Decisive for both was how they first encountered Weber. Too young to have studied with Weber in person, they were educated in a

LeQuire and Silver, continued

world where his charisma lived on. Both had studied (at different times) with Alfred Weber, Max's brother, and Parsons in his Heidelberg days was invited to "sociological teas" hosted by Marianne Weber, Max's widow, with whom Voegelin prided himself on having once corresponded. Especially with these personal connections, they were as young scholars awed by Weber's ghost. They continued to emulate his greatness and his commitment to scholarship as a calling throughout their careers.

Yet if Weber provided not so much a shared conceptual framework, but rather served as an intellectual exemplar, this charismatic figure proved to be a tenuous basis for a long-lasting dialogue. For as the exchange unfolds it becomes clear that working in the wake of Weber implied very different types of intellectual practice for Parsons and Voegelin. For Voegelin, Weber's writings are *essentially* fragmentary, "he never placed himself in the center of systematic thought in order to organize the materials from such a center" (9/24/1941). For Parsons, in pointed contrast, Weber's fragments haltingly pointed the way toward a unifying analytical scheme for the social sciences.

The divide that opened up between Parsons and Voegelin over the practical meaning of Weber's legacy would only deepen in later years. It may have been a key factor in their growing personal and intellectual distance. In 1952, Voegelin published *The New Science of Politics*, his first book in English. Its introduction examines the current state of social-scientific methodology, and centers around a nuanced portrait of Weber's foundational contribution. Tellingly, his former correspondent Talcott Parsons is not cited. Somewhat strangely, though, in the final chapters of this work, which are targeted at political and academic ide-

ologies of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, Voegelin draws a withering portrait of the radical English Puritan of the sixteenth century as the typical "gnostic" intellectual (rather than, as one might have expected, Nietzsche or Heidegger). Without direct evidence, we nevertheless suspect that this is a veiled barb at Parsons the cultural Calvinist, or at least toward the approach to social science he represented.

Whether or not Voegelin registered his disagreements with Parsons in this veiled fashion, the Parsons-Voegelin exchange constitutes an episode in the history of the social sciences that teaches us about the challenges of cross-disciplinary and cross-cultural dialogue, then and now. To the extent that such dialogue, like Weber's charismatic leader, occurs at the limit edge of established intellectual norms, generating renewed attention to "the things themselves" and new opportunities to work without the net of shared disciplinary conventions, it also, again like Weber's charismatic mode of authority, is hard to sustain in durable institutions. If such moments occur, however, they provide opportunities for disciplinary and personal renewal, not so much through translating one theoretical language into another, but through, at least for a time, relaxing their strictures and allowing the matter itself to predominate. The publication of the Parsons-Voegelin correspondence makes available one such moment for a wider audience.

*History of Sociology as Sociology's Collective Working Memory*¹

Michael Bare, University of Chicago

Laura R. Ford, Cornell University

On August 10, 2013, the History of Sociology Section and The New School for Social Research hosted a Symposium for Junior Scholars. Ambitiously inviting participants to “re-envision” the history of sociology, we sought to inaugurate an institutional forum that would follow in the path of the Junior Theorists Symposium, generating excitement and energy around the history of sociology. In what follows, we will offer an overview of the Symposium, building on the originating vision of Richard Swedberg, the excellent papers and presentations by Symposium participants, and the thought-provoking comments provided by the discussants: Jeffrey Goldfarb (The New School for Social Research), Martin Bulmer (University of Surrey), and Jeffrey Olick (University of Virginia).

History of Sociology as Sociology's Working, Collective Memory: The basic conclusion of the Symposium was that, both as a description of current scholarly practice and as a normative prescription for future activity, the History of Sociology Section provides an institutional home for collective memory studies, much more than professional historiography. Of course, the Section is very fortunate to have within its membership scholars like Martin Bulmer, whose book on the *Chicago School of Sociology* (1984) masterfully balances the demands of careful historiography with sociological generalization. However, as Goldfarb and Olick both emphasized in their discussion, most practitioners of the history of sociology are not aiming at professional historiography, but are rather seeking a reformation in contemporary understandings of the sociological enterprise. *We are, in many cases, engaging in an activity of sociological theorizing, one that takes the form of a dialogue with personalities*

and institutions from the past.

This view of the history of sociology as a kind of sociological theorizing, or at least as a contribution to sociological theorizing, was very much in keeping with the vision that Richard Swedberg laid out in his 2012 opening speech as Chair of the History of Sociology Section. In that speech, and in his essays subsequently published in *Timelines* (the newsletter of the History of Sociology Section), Swedberg articulated a vision of the history of sociology as sociology's “working memory.” This conception builds on contemporary cognitive science, pointing to the way that memory works in enabling human activity. Memories “work” in at least two important ways, from this perspective, to enable meaningful human activity. First, they are active, in the sense that they are constantly being remade in light of new experiences and new problems to be solved. Second, they actively organize perception and cognition. By analogy, then, the history of sociology contributes to contemporary sociological theorizing by remaking our sociological memory, focusing attention on particular social questions, and providing critical, conceptual resources for the creative, inferential activities involved in theorizing.

The history of sociology, as sociology's collective working memory, links contemporary theoretical concerns to characters, events, and institutions from sociology's past, while seeking to glean new insights from those characters, events, and institutions. Through this dialogue with the past, history of sociology contributes to theoretical coherence, progression, and creativity. The History of Sociology Section, from this perspective, is not a preserve of antiquarian research, but rather a vital source for

¹ This co-authored essay is an adaptation of a piece that was previously published in the ASA's Theory Section newsletter under Ford's name.

Bare and Ford, continued

contemporary sociology. The Section may also be seen as providing an institutionalized space for a “reflexive” sociology, which analyzes sociology’s past in order to understand its present, and the theoretical possibilities of its future.

Remaking Sociological Memory: Consistent with these perspectives, several of the papers presented at the Symposium pointed the way toward a remaking of sociological memory. Gina Bellofatto (Boston University) highlighted the involvement of Christian social movements in the early development of American sociology. In “Christian Sociology in Transition: The Institute of Social and Religious Research,” Bellofatto traced a little-known chapter in American sociology, a point at which Christian social gospel and ecumenical movements came together in an Institute funded by John D. Rockefeller, Jr.; this Institute sponsored the controversial *Middletown* study, and helped to establish early paradigms for empirical social scientific research in the U.S. David Woods (NYU-Poly) pointed to the pragmatist foundations of C. Wright Mills’ *Sociological Imagination*. In “Reclaiming the Pragmatic Roots of C. Wright Mills’ Sociological Imagination,” Woods argued that a recognition of Mills’ pragmatism helps us to understand his commitment to “deep democracy.” As Jeff Goldfarb put it, an awareness of the pragmatist foundation of Mills’ *Sociological Imagination* helps us to recover a vision of sociology as a dialogue with publics. Finally, Jonathan VanAntwerpen (Social Science Research Council) drew attention to Herbert Blumer’s early work on “sexual excitation” and Hollywood movies. In his paper, “Empericism, Interactionism, and Epistemological Authority: Examining Blumer’s Early Sociological Practice,” VanAntwerpen argued that Blumer’s early work on movies provides significant nuance in relation to the methodological skepticism that later characterized his symbolic interactionism,

and sheds important light on the open-minded approach that Blumer took toward building Berkeley’s sociology department.

Refocusing Sociological Attention: Another set of papers pointed to new ways in which sociology’s theoretical attention might be focused. Marcus Hunter (Yale) drew attention to W.E.B. DuBois’ theorization of heterogeneity. In “A Pillar of American Sociology: Heterogeneity and W.E.B. DuBois’ *The Philadelphia Negro*,” Hunter drew attention to the fruitful ways in which DuBois theorized heterogeneities of class, politics, and religion in Philadelphia’s Black population, and called for new attention to the concept of heterogeneity in contemporary sociologies of urban growth and change. Amplifying Hunter, John Boy (CUNY) pointed to the value of DuBois’ concrete and interactionist approach to macro-historical, cultural questions, as seen in *The Souls of Black Folk* (1903). In “The Axial Age and the Problems of the Twentieth Century: DuBois, Jaspers, and Universal History,” Boy demonstrates the helpfulness of DuBois’ approach to Hegelian “problems of universal history,” which are returning to sociology as scholars debate theories about the “Axial Age” of religious and philosophical foundations. Finally, Álvaro Santana-Acuña (Harvard) drew attention to the value of non-structuralist metaphors for theorizing society, as seen in Adam Smith’s *Theory of Moral Sentiments* (1759) and Gabriel Tarde’s *Monadologie et sociologie* (1893). In “Outside Structures: Smithian Sentiments and Tardian Monads,” Santana-Acuña argued that Smith and Tarde point the way toward theoretical innovations locating social causality in human interdependence and interaction, rather than in social structures.

Critical and Conceptual Resources for Theorizing Anew: A third set of papers drew on the history of sociology to point out ways in which sociological theorizing can and

Bare and Ford, continued

should be reformed. Orit Avishai (Fordham) and Courtney Irby (Loyola Chicago) pointed to “The Missing Feminist Revolution in the Sociology of Religion.” Avishai and Irby document the marginalization of feminist and gender-based perspectives in the development of the sociology of religion, concluding that such perspectives are needed in order to deepen the conceptual and analytical frameworks being deployed. Similarly, Joan Donovan (UCSD) pointed to the entrenchment of an institutionalist framework in medical sociology, which focuses attention primarily on structural inequalities and health disparities. In “The Patient Effect: Social Order, Control, and Justice in American Medical Sociology,” Donovan argues that

theories of health-related social movements can be further developed by focusing on the role that disease categories play in mobilizing collective identities and activities. Finally, Benjamin Merriman (University of Chicago) traced the development of three different conceptions of spatial locality (ecological, institutional, and perceptual) underlying the Chicago School’s approach to urban sociology. In “Three Conceptions of Spatial Locality in Chicago School Sociology,” Merriman argues that these conceptions point to partially-independent processes, which should be theorized more explicitly so that they might be more carefully integrated or distinguished.

NEWS

Recent Publications

de Leon, Cedric. Party and Society: Reconstructing a Sociology of Democratic Party Politics. Cambridge, UK: Polity. 2014 Online version can be found at <http://www.polity.co.uk/book.asp?ref=9780745653686>

Norbert, Wiley. "Chomsky's Anomaly: Inner Speech." forthcoming, *International Journal for Dialogical Science (IJDS)*.

Platt, Jennifer. ‘The Sociological Imagination, “On intellectual craftsmanship”, and Mills’ influence on research methods’, in ed. J. Scott and A. Nilsen, C. Wright Mills and the Sociological Imagination, London: Edward Elgar, 2013.

Platt, Jennifer. 'What have we done, and what remains to be done, in the history of sociology?', *Sartonian* 26: 115-140, 2013.

Tiryakian, Edward A, ed. Sociological Theory, Values and Sociocultural Change. Essays in Honor of Pitirim A. Sorokin, with a new Introduction. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers. 2013.

Turner, Stephen. American Sociology: From Pre-Disciplinary to Post-Normal. Basinstoke: Palgrave. 2013.

Turner, Stephen. The Young Shils. *Tradition and Discovery*. 39(3): 43-51. 2013.

Announcements

CONFERENCE — Call for Papers

From the Past to the Present and towards Possible Futures: The Collected Works of Norbert Elias

College Court, University of Leicester, 20–22 June 2014

“One cannot ignore the fact that every present society has grown out of earlier societies and points beyond itself to a diversity of possible futures.”

“Today we have basically lost the ability to think of a

News, continued

future. Most people do not want to go beyond their present – they do not like to see themselves as a link in the chain of generations” - Norbert Elias, 1987

In 2014 the eighteenth and final volume of the Collected Works of Norbert Elias in English will be published by University College Dublin Press. (For details of the volumes, see www.ucdpress.ie.)

The mammoth undertaking, in association with the Norbert Elias Foundation, Amsterdam, and under the stewardship of Professor Stephen Mennell, has taken a decade to bring to fruition. It brings together the entire corpus of Elias's works, featuring many writings previously unpublished or not hitherto translated into English, faithfully representing his core ideas, which have been widely discussed not just among sociologists, but also among historians, anthropologists, criminologists, International Relations specialists and in the human sciences generally.

The conference marking the completion of the whole project will appropriately be held at the University of Leicester, where Elias lived and taught from 1954 to 1977.

The conference will be organised around some of Elias's key works: *On the Process of Civilisation*; *What is Sociology?*; *The Established and the Outsiders*; *Quest for Ex-*

citement; and *Essays I: On the Sociology of Knowledge and the Sciences*.

Besides parallel sessions on these theme, there will be postgraduate workshops and keynote presentations.

Craig Calhoun, Director of the London School of Economics, has agreed to give the opening address.

Abstracts of no more than **500 words** for the conference should be submitted to the conference organisers, John Goodwin (john.goodwin@le.ac.uk) and Jason Hughes (jason.hughes@le.ac.uk) not later **than 31 December, 2013**.

Abstracts must:

- Specifically address one or more of the conference themes (and specify preferred stream)
- Include details of institutional affiliation
- Be written in English, since all presentations will be in English

Registration for the conference will open **3 February 2014**. For further details, see the full version of this call for papers at:

www.norberteliasfoundation.com or

www.eliasconference.com

History of Sociology Awards — 2013

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)

Section Nominations

Nomination time is fast approaching!

To nominate please follow the appropriate instructions and contact the relevant committee members.

GRADUATE STUDENT PRIZE COMMITTEE

This award recognizes excellence in graduate student research in the field of history of sociology. Students who were actively enrolled (full- or part-time) in a graduate sociology program as of December 15, 2013 may submit one scholarly paper for consideration for this award. The submission may be an unpublished manuscript, an article submitted or accepted for publication, or a single chapter of a thesis or dissertation, and should address a theoretical or empirical problem central to the history of sociology. Members of the current award committee are ineligible for the award. The paper, along with a cover letter, must be submitted **by email** to all the members of the committee no later than March 15, 2014. Nominees will be notified of the committee's decision at the beginning of May 2014.

The members of the committee this year are:

Peter Baehr, Lingnan (chair), peterbaehr20@gmail.com
 Marcus Hunter, Yale, marcus.hunter@yale.edu
 Mikaila Arthur, Rhode Island College, marthur@ric.edu
 Robert Owens (Chicago), student member, browens@uchicago.edu
 Eleni Arzoglou (Harvard), student member, arzoglou@fas.harvard.edu

LIFETIME ACHIEVEMENT SELECTION COMMITTEE

This award recognizes sociologists who have made outstanding contributions to the history of sociology throughout their career, or who have made groundbreaking innovations or produced significant bodies of scholarly work in the history of sociology. Nominees must be sociologists. Letters of nomination should highlight the nominee's outstanding innovation(s), career, and contributions to the history of sociology. Self-nominations are welcome if accompanied by a letter of support from another member of ASA. Members of the current Lifetime Achievement Award Committee are ineligible for the award. To nominate an individual, send a nomination

letter, the nominee's cv, and samples of the nominee's work **by email** to all three members of the award committee (see below). Nominations must arrive no later than March 15, 2014. Nominees will be notified of the committee's decision at the beginning of May 2014.

The members of the committee this year are:

Charles Camic, Northwestern (chair),
c-camic@northwestern.edu
 Vera Zolberg, New School, zolbergv@newschool.edu
 Kristin Luker, Berkeley, kristinluker@gmail.com

DISTINGUISHED SCHOLARLY PUBLICATION SELECTION COMMITTEE

This award honors sociologists who have made significant contributions to the history of sociology by writing books or articles on the 'cutting edge' of sociological inquiry. Only monographs, articles, or edited works published in 2012 or 2013 are eligible. The author(s) or editor(s) must be sociologists. All texts submitted for consideration should be accompanied by a letter of nomination highlighting the text's significant contribution to the history of sociology. Self-nominations are welcome if accompanied by a letter of support from another member of ASA. Members of the current Distinguished Scholarly Publication Award committee are not eligible for this award. Nominations of articles should be sent **by email** to all members of the awards committee. Books should be sent by regular mail to all committee members. Nominations must be received no later than March 15, 2014. Nominees will be notified of the committee's decision at the beginning of May 2014.

The members of the committee this year are:

Silvia Pedraza (chair), Department of Sociology, University of Michigan, 500 S. State St, 3001 LSA Building, Ann Arbor MI 48109-1382, spedraza@umich.edu

Nico Stehr, Zeppelin Universität gemeinnuetzige GmbH, Am Seemooser Horn 20, D-88045 Friedrichshafen, Lake Constance, Germany, nico.stehr@t-online.de

Julie Zimmerman, Department of Community and Leadership Development, 500 Garrigus, University of Kentucky, Lexington KY 40546-0215, jzimm@uky.edu