

# TIMELINES

Newsletter of the ASA History of Sociology Section

June 2016, No. 25

## INSIDE

### ESSAYS

Message from the Chair	1
Framing American Sociology	7
The Scholar Denied	8
The Case for Scholarly Reparations	10
Neglected Figures	16

### EVENTS

HoS Events at ASA	5
-------------------	---

### NEWS

2015 Award Winners	3
2016 ASA Election Results	3
2015 Award Remarks	4
Recent Publications	18

#### Newsletter Editors

Mathieu H. Desan  
mdesan@umich.edu

Laura Ford  
lford@bard.edu

Brandon Sepulvado  
bsepulva@nd.edu

Taylor P. Winfield  
taylorpw@princeton.edu

## *Message from the Chair*

Martin Bulmer, University of Surrey, UK

I am pleased to be sending you the 2016 issue of Timelines, the bulletin of the ASA History of Sociology section. Copies of past bulletins may be consulted via the ASA web site at the following link:

<http://www.asanet.org/sectionhistory/newsletters.cfm>

My warm thanks to the editorial team who have produced the present issue that you now have before you. Their hard work is much appreciated.

The first few months of my year were occupied by producing what one might call an apologia pro vita sua for our section, by which I mean I was asked to provide a justification for an ASA Committee of why our section is so small and what scope there is for expanding its membership. I was much helped in this by advice which I received from the chairs of the section for the last decade, and I think I can best open this issue by an abbreviated version of the letter which I sent to the ASA in reply to this request. I have heard nothing since, so I am hopeful that our response was received and welcomed.

### **Rationale of the ASA History of Sociology Section**

1. This is the mission statement of the History of Sociology section.

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.

2. The history of sociology is the memory of sociology - when it comes to theory, methods and the

*CONTINUED ON PAGE 2*

## Section Officers

### Chair

Martin Bulmer  
*University of Surrey, UK*

### Chair-Elect

Peter Kivisto  
*Augustana College*

### Past Chair

Neil Gross  
*Colby College*

### Secretary Treasurer

Christian Dayé  
*Alpen-Adria-University Klagenfurt, Austria*

### Council

Mustafa Emirbayer  
*University of Wisconsin, Madison*

Erik Schneiderhan  
*University of Toronto*

Eleanor Townsley  
*Mount Holyoke College*

Chad Alan Goldberg  
*University of Wisconsin, Madison*

John W. Mohr  
*University of California, Santa Barbara*

### Student Representatives

Brandon Sepulvado  
*University of Notre Dame*

Mathieu H. Desan  
*University of Michigan*

## *Bulmer, continued*

people who have spent their lives as sociologists. This is the rationale for the section, and it serves the ASA not just as a small and remarkably stable section of high quality, but as a window onto issues of wider significance. While there are relatively few specialists on the history of sociology, the history of the discipline is important for the whole of the ASA. In the past ten years, the chairs of the section have been Ed Tiryakian [Duke], Eleanor Townsley [Holyoke], Craig Calhoun [NYU and LSE], Gary Alan Fine [Northwestern], Richard Swedberg [Cornell], Charles Camic [Northwestern], Jennifer Platt [Sussex,UK], Alan Sica [Penn State], George Ritzer [Maryland] and Neil Gross [UBC]. HOS is vital to the collective identity of the discipline.

Every discipline needs to remember its past, to honor its present condition, and to point directions for the future. As a field, we often rediscover important figures from the history of the discipline and rereading and reconsidering the writings of these theorists encourage us to rediscover those topics that we have lost. The most dramatic recent case has been the magnum opus of Aldon D. Morris, *The Scholar Denied: W. E. B. Du Bois and the Birth of Modern Sociology* [University of California Press, 2015] which was the subject of a panel at the Chicago meetings in 2015 and will also be featured in the 2016 meetings. Morris insists that we consider the writings of W.E.B. Du Bois not merely as a token, but as an intellectual progenitor in several substantive areas. A similar point could be made about the work of past section chair Mary Jo Deegan over a decade ago in drawing attention to the significance of Jane Addams for the history of sociology. Every field needs to be aware of its past and needs to continue to rethink that past.

Our most important contribution to the ASA is that the section provides a forum for those professionally involved in doing research on the history of the discipline, to share research findings and perspectives on the past in order to better understand the way in which our scholarship and our discipline have developed. The history of sociology is also fundamental to how we enter into the joint sociological endeavour today, and provides the discipline with its working memory. It is central to the discipline and crucial to the reflexivity that defines the sociological imagination....

The section has also made important contributions to the preservation of the discipline's archival holdings. Led by former section chairs Charles Camic and Alan Sica, an action group persuaded the ASA in 2014 that it should not destroy over 600 boxes of journal-related printed materials sent to ASA journals between 1990 and 2010. The association could not afford

*CONTINUED ON PAGE 3*

to store these materials permanently, so an alternative means of preserving them had to be found in the interest of future historical research. ASA administrative staff secured an NSF grant that will guarantee the digitization of the historically important materials within the preserved boxes of records. Without vigorous Section participation, this achievement would never have occurred.

3. Why do we consistently stay on the smaller side in terms of members?

The section has had around 200 members for many years; this membership is stable and strong. Our influence on the discipline is wider than our numbers might suggest... History of sociology is not a subject which is

taught in graduate school, unlike the state of affairs in Psychology, and few positions are advertised in the field. History of sociology at the margins overlaps with sociological theory and with comparative and historical sociology, both of which have large and flourishing sections within ASA. We co-exist comfortably in this mixed economy of sub-fields and sections, while continuing to insist that history of sociology is a viable sub-discipline, with international links to the ISA section and to journals in the field, organised around a committed band of scholars.

## 2015 History of Sociology Award Winners



**Lifetime Achievement Award**  
Hans Joas, University of Chicago

**Award Committee Members:**

- ◆ Grégoire Mallard (chair), Graduate Institute for International and Development Studies, Geneva, Switzerland
- ◆ Donald N. Levine, University of Chicago
- ◆ Edward A. Tiryakian, Duke University

**Distinguished Publication Award**  
Not Awarded

**Award Committee Members:**

- ◆ Jennifer Platt (chair), University of Sussex, UK
- ◆ Christian Fleck, University of Graz, Austria
- ◆ Marcus A. Hunter, UCLA



**Graduate Student Prize**  
Álvaro Santana-Acuña, Harvard University

**Award Committee Members:**

- ◆ Lawrence T. Nichols (chair), West Virginia University
- ◆ Anthony J. Blasi, University of Texas at San Antonio
- ◆ Kim de Laat, University of Toronto
- ◆ Cedric de Leon, Providence College
- ◆ Laura Ford, Baldy Center for Law & Social Policy, SUNY Buffalo Law School

## Section Officer Election Results

<i>Chair of the Section in 2017-2018:</i>	David Swartz, Boston University [to succeed Peter Kivisto, current Chair-elect]
<i>Two members of the Section Council for 2016-2019:</i>	George Steinmetz, University of Michigan J.I. (Hans) Bakker, University of Guelph, Canada
<i>Student representative for 2016-2018:</i>	Christine Bucior, Pennsylvania State University

## Elegy and Eulogy: *Remarks by Edward Tiryakian*

*The following remarks were made at the History of Sociology section Business Meeting, American Sociological Association, in Chicago on August 22, 2015 by Edward Tiryakian, past chair of the section, in memory of Donald Levine and in honor of Hans Joas, recipient of the section's Lifetime Achievement Award for 2015.*

*[Professor Joas was unable to be present in person].*

I have been charged to make appropriate remarks to our section on the History of Sociology about two remarkable persons, who have long connections to the University of Chicago, each deserving a more extensive tribute than the time allotted me.

I. I begin with an **elegy**, the loss of **Donald Nathan Levine**, past Chair of the ASA Theory Section, and recipient of our section's 2013 Distinguished Scholarly Career Award, who left us on April 4<sup>th</sup> 2015. Don embraced the University of Chicago, from his B.A. in 1950, his Ph.D. in 1957, and continuing thereafter, including a 5-year very successful stretch as an esteemed Dean of the College. Don was a firm believer in the sociological tradition (he was editor in succession to Morris Janowitz of the *Heritage of Sociology* series) and in students finding sociological worth outside narrow confines. His commitment to sociological theory is exemplified in his acclaimed work, *Visions of the Sociological Tradition* (Chicago 1995). Don Levine was a champion of Georg Simmel and did much to make mainstream American sociology aware of Simmel's unique microsociology.

But Don had two other long-term commitments. He was a noted authority in **Ethiopian Studies**, publishing extensively on the modernization of Ethiopian society and civilization (*Greater Ethiopia* revised edition 2000), and

was awarded a doctor *honoris causa* from Addis Ababa University in 2004. And, even more surprising, he was a devotee of **aikido**, a Japanese Martial Art, where he was a 4<sup>th</sup> degree black belt, and since the late 1980s Don served as head instructor of the University of Chicago Aikido Club. Truly, Don Levine was a multidimensional person, sensitive to conflicts and to creative ways of neutralizing them.

II. I now switch from elegy to a **eulogy**, in bringing out this year's winner of the section's award for a Life-Long Contribution, **Hans Joas**.

Let me indicate some interesting linkages between Levine and Joas. First, in 2004 Charles Camic and Hans Joas presented Don Levine with a *festschrift*, *The Dialogical Turn. Essays in Honor of Donald M. Levine*. Second, last fall Martin Bulmer, chair-elect of our History of Sociology Section, invited me, Don Levine and Grégoire Mallard (of the Graduate Institute at Geneva, Switzerland as chair) to be a three-member committee for the 2015 Lifetime Achievement Award in the history of sociology. So Don was very involved in this year's award, and I have his e-mail dated March 21, 2015 strongly supporting Joas, and mentioning a favorable book review he had written about him, as well as Joas' bringing to the attention of top students at Chicago neglected major figures such as Max Scheler and Ernst Troeltsch. And now let me say why Hans Joas stands out as recipient of this year's recognition.

Born in Munich in 1948, Hans Joas has a dual appointment, as Ernst Troeltsch Professor for the Sociology of Religion, Faculty of Theology, Humboldt University of Berlin and Professor of Sociology and Social Thought and member of the Committee on Social Thought, here at the University of Chicago. I will not detail various academic appointments he has held, both in Europe and

*CONTINUED ON PAGE 6*

# History of Sociology at ASA 2016—Seattle

Sunday, August 21, 2016

## Regular ASA Session on History of Sociology/Social Thought

8:30-10:10 am

Presider: Charles Camic, Northwestern University

Capitalism and the Jews in the German Sociological Tradition

Chad Alan Goldberg, University of Wisconsin-Madison

Rereading Durkheim in Light of Jewish Law: How a Rabbinic Thought-Model Shapes his Scholarship

Taylor Paige Winfield, Princeton University

Structure after 79½ Years: The Disembodied Anatomy of a Charter

Michael E. Bare, University of Chicago

The Career of Historical Social Science: Evidence from Book Reviews, 1900-2008

Nicholas Hoover Wilson, Stony Brook University

Jensen Sass, University of Canberra

Risk and Reputation: How Professional Classification Signals Drive the Diffusion of New Methods

Erin Leahey, University of Arizona

Sharon Koppman, University of California, Irvine

## Council Meeting

12:30 pm

Main Subject: Relations between the History of Sociology Section and other ASA Sections.

## Business Meeting

1:30-2:10 pm

Business Meeting in public for members of the Section. The start of the Business Meeting will be the presentation to past chair Edward A. Tiryakian, of Duke University, of a festschrift by one of the editors, Professor Roland Robertson, of the University of Pittsburgh. The collection is published by Anthem Press.

## Section Paper Session: *Neglected Figures in the History of Sociology*

2:30-4:10pm

Organiser and Presider: Martin Bulmer, University of Surrey, UK

An American Burke? Accounting for Daniel Patrick Moynihan's 'Obscurity' in the Sociological Tradition

Clayton Alexander Fordahl, SUNY Stony Brook

The Neglected Marginal Man Thesis and "Marginality": Robert Park and Everett Stonequist

J. I. Hans Bakker, University of Guelph

Types of Social Secrecy under Totalitarianism and the Intellectual Style of Soviet Sociology

Mikhail Sokolov, European University at St Petersburg

What Makes a Neglected Figure and When Should We Care? The Example of Max Ralis

Andrea Ploder, University of Graz, Austria

"Black Matriarchy" in Bahia, Brazil, 1938-1939: The Analogous Perspectives of Ruth Landes and E.F. Frazier

Abby Suzanne Gondek, Florida International University

## Note on Section Reception from Section Chair

There will be no section reception at the ASA this year, as the cost consumes more than half of the section budget, which we can ill afford. Members may consider going to the reception of the Sociological Theory section or the Comparative and Historical Sociology section.

- Martin Bulmer

## *Tiryakian, continued from Page 4*

in the United States since obtaining in 1981 his “habilitation” – the highest qualification after the Ph.D. a scholar can obtain in Europe. He has been enormously productive—witness a 42 page list of publications in German, English, French and other languages in sociological theory, sociology of religion, history of sociology, and social philosophy—and there is no sign of a let-up. Along the way, he has received many awards, including honorary degrees.

As a budding sociologist in post-war Germany, Joas sought a theoretical orientation combining intellectual rigor with democratic commitment. Unlike many others, he found what he sought in American pragmatism, particularly in the works of George Herbert Mead, around whom he published one of his first books, and is presently completing the definitive edition of Mead’s *Mind, Self, and Society*. Over the years he has taken pragmatism into innovative ventures, such as *The Creativity of Action* (1996) and *The Genesis of Values* (2000). If pragmatism has a certain forward-looking sense of optimism, which is reflected in Joas, he also has written on a darker side of modernity, on themes of war, slavery and torture. In recent decades, Joas has taken to Durkheim in exploring deeper themes of religion and the sacred as “la vie sérieuse”. He has developed a penetrating critique in the sociology of religion whose standard bearer was to accept secularization as a one-way inevitable path of modernization. In several recent writings, Joas has cogently shown that **sacralization** of the person is another viable option with deep historical ties. And Joas has used a comparative-historical analysis to examine the genealogy of the sacredness of the person in the post-war acceptance of human rights.

In developing further his theoretical coverage of the evolution of modernity, anterior to the Enlightenment period, Hans Joas found a congenial colleague in the late Robert Bellah, with the two drawing on social philosophy and anthropology around the key notion of Karl Jaspers’ “axial age” in a challenging evolutionary paradigm of the human condition (see their edited volume *The Axial Age and Its Consequences*, 2012, and Joas “A Conversation with Robert Bellah,” *The Hedgehog Review*, 14:2, 2012).

In Europe Joas frequently enters the public sphere, engaging in debates with Habermas, both filling a role on serious ethical and moral matters which has not been institutionalized in American sociology. As a special recognition of his stature, very recently – just last month—the most prized award given by the Max Planck Society and the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation was jointly awarded to Hans Joas and Bryan Turner for the focus theme, “Religion and Modernity – Secularization, Social and Religious Plurality”. Criss-crossing the Atlantic, Joas has greatly enriched the sociological tradition bringing out layers of leaven in American pragmatism that tended to gather dust, and bringing to America layers of European social thought that get little attention in the empirical quantitative emphasis. Truly, the History of Sociology section has made an outstanding selection in Hans Joas, innovative sociologist and social thinker.

—Edward A. Tiryakian

Emeritus Professor of Sociology  
Duke University  
[Durkhn@soc.duke.edu](mailto:Durkhn@soc.duke.edu)

# How Should the History of American Sociology be Framed?

Martin Bulmer, *University of Surrey,*  
*UK*

When did sociology originate in the USA, and how closely intertwined was it with the study of race and ethnicity? A major new work on the subject by Aldon Morris of Northwestern University, *The Scholar Denied: W. E. B. Du Bois and the Birth of Modern Sociology* was published by University of California Press in 2015. This work raises critical questions about the location of the study of race and ethnicity in the discipline of sociology, and the place of scholars of color in the discipline in America in the first decade of the twentieth century.

The history of American sociology places great emphasis on the role of sociology at the University of Chicago and the role of Robert Park and W. I. Thomas in fostering the study of race and ethnicity in that department. Thus did sociology carve out for itself a place in the academic firmament, distinct from the developing disciplines of economics and political science. I myself indeed devoted some years to the study of this episode in the rise of empirical sociology (Bulmer 1984). Morris challenges this emphasis by arguing that Du Bois, the first black scholar to gain a PhD at Harvard University, who had spent two years studying social science at the University of Berlin, was a progenitor of sociology at Atlanta University, where he held an appointment well before Robert Park came to Chicago, and that Du Bois established a program of black sociological research which deserves to be called the Atlanta School of Sociology.

The book was subject of a symposium at last year's

ASA meetings in Chicago, the papers from which have now been published in the *Berkeley Journal of Sociology* at <http://berkeleyjournal.org/topics/w-e-b-du-bois/>. One of these papers, by Julian Go of Boston University, indeed argues that Morris's radical recasting of the historical timeline is provoking reaction among current graduate students who are taught the conventional history of sociology in graduate school, and find this difficult to square with the revisionist interpretation which Morris is putting forward. This paper seems so important that it is reproduced here in full following this introduction [with permission] in order to broaden the discussion.

It is notable that Morris has already provoked significant reviews in the journals. In *Du Bois Review*, the Harvard house journal, Lawrence D. Bobo claims that Morris "authoritatively rewrites the conventional script of the origin of American sociology."<sup>1</sup> Three reviews appear in the *EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY*, by Christopher Muller of Columbia, Nikki Jones of Berkeley and Jason L Ferguson of Berkeley.<sup>2</sup> Muller starts: "This is an extraordinary and an extraordinarily important book". Jones claims that "so much of what we call sociology today was born in the late nineteenth century in the 7<sup>th</sup> Ward of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania", the setting of Du Bois's pioneering work *The Philadelphia Negro* of 1898. Ferguson wants us to focus on the relationship between the scientific Du Bois whom Morris extols, the political Du Bois and the aesthetic Du Bois, drawing attention to the importance of the latter. A third symposium appears in *Ethnic and Racial Studies Review*, which I edit, with contributions by Charles Camic, a former chair of this section, Marcus Hunter of UCLA, myself, Hynek Jerabek of Charles University in Prague

*CONTINUED ON PAGE 19*

# The Scholar Denied: W. E. B. Du Bois and the Birth of Modern Sociology

Aldon D. Morris, *Northwestern University*

All scientific fields have origin stories. These stories inform outsiders, and generations of scientists, about their histories and who the great innovators were that developed the groundbreaking ideas giving rise to their scientific fields. Such accounts identify the institutional base from which the field emerged and the social attributes of the scholars who invented the enterprise. Through their retelling, these stories come to be the unquestioned wisdom pertaining to the foundations and trajectories of the field. Origin stories empower particular scholars and institutions while relegating others to the sidelines.

Moreover, power and economic resources play important roles in determining which scholars and institutions are recognized as path breaking producers of knowledge.

For a century, the accepted wisdom has been that modern scientific sociology was founded at the University of Chicago by an all-White male faculty. This scientific sociology, it is claimed, became institutionalized as it arose in and traveled to other elite White institutions including Columbia and the University of Pennsylvania. Among the illustrious founders were Albion Small, W. I. Thomas, Franklin Giddings, Robert Park, and Ernest Burgess. These founders who developed the first sociology departments were White males housed in elite universities. What was distinctive about them, the origin story maintains, is they rescued sociology from a speculative field more akin to social philosophy than an empirical science. These pioneers are said to have emphasized empirical research, replacing armchair theorizing

(based on abstract deductive reasoning) with data and fieldwork. These White males embraced scientific identities and the scientific methods like their counterparts in the natural sciences. The work crowned as the empirical breakthrough was Thomas and Florian Znaniecki's *The Polish Peasant*, published in 1918-1920. In the hegemonic narrative, modern scientific sociology followed, utilizing surveys, interviews, fieldwork and quantitative and qualitative data to document and interpret the human condition.

Yet, origin stories of science can be misleading and woefully inadequate. In my new book, *The Scholar Denied: W. E. B. Du Bois and the Birth of Modern Sociology*, I argue that the accepted origin story of sociology is wrong. Indeed, there is an intriguing, well-kept secret, regarding the founding of scientific sociology in America. The first school of American scientific sociology was founded by a Black professor located in a small, economically poor, largely racially segregated Black university. At the dawn of the twentieth century - from 1898 to 1910 - the Black sociologist and activist, W. E. B. Du Bois, developed the first scientific school of sociology at a Historic Black school, Atlanta University. The researchers of Du Bois' Atlanta School consisted of Black professional sociologists, undergraduate and graduate students, and community leaders. Most of these researchers worked voluntarily or for modest wages; sufficient funds were not available to them because White supremacy did not tolerate dangerous ideas and outspoken Black scholars challenging the status quo. Out of necessity, researchers in Du Bois' School accepted as wages a "liberation capital," a compensation consisting

*CONTINUED ON PAGE 9*



of a belief that scientific sociology would produce knowledge enabling African Americans to overthrow Jim Crow oppression. As a result, these professional and amateur researchers conducted empirical work and theoretical analyses that gave rise to a scientific School embedded in an oppressed community and born on the periphery of elite academies.

The empirical methodologies first employed by the Du Bois Atlanta School of Sociology are widely used in the field today. In the conventional account, the Chicago School receives credit for pioneering empirical methodologies. It is claimed that Chicago sociologists were first to utilize the city (Chicago) as a major sociological laboratory where they pioneered empirical sociology. To the contrary, *The Scholar Denied*, demonstrates that the Atlanta School first used cities (Atlanta and elsewhere) as social laboratories where empirical methods were employed to study the human condition. Thus, the roots of American scientific sociology are to be found in Du Bois' Atlanta School and not the Chicago School under Robert Park.

The founding White sociologists of the late and early twentieth centuries developed a racist sociology that agreed with the dominant White American view that Blacks were inferior. This scientific racism was based on speculations, conjecture, and racial biases. By contrast, Du Bois and his School initiated empirical sociological research to prove that the Black race was not inferior. Du Bois' School pioneered quantitative and qualitative methods where fieldwork was conducted and where researchers often took up residence in communities, interviewing, observing, and surveying thousands of people to unravel the causes of racial domination. This empirically-based sociology predated by two decades the empirical sociology of the Chicago School. Explaining how his School sought scientific knowledge,

Du Bois declared "we study what others discuss." As a result of conducting numerous sociological studies, Du Bois' Atlanta School invented a new scientific sociology of African Americans and race inequality that was both rigorous and emancipatory. Du Bois was surely among the first to develop structural analyses of race inequality, emphasizing that race was a social construct while White sociologists peddled biological explanations of race inequality. Therefore, Du Bois emerged from his early scientific studies as the first number crunching, surveying, interviewing, participant observing and field working sociologist in America.

Yet, scholars of sociology continue to ignore Du Bois' pioneering Atlanta School of Sociology, out of ignorance, given that his contributions have been so marginalized, and scholars of the mainstream have never been required to study and absorb them. Moreover, those scholars aware of Du Bois' sociological contributions have tended to undercut their importance by viewing them as contributions to "Black empirical sociology." When Du Bois explicates structural and cultural dimensions of the Black community, he is incorrectly perceived as merely producing Black sociology. Thus, this approach allocates Du Bois' insights to a narrow ghetto, implying that it is only applicable to the sociology of Black people, rather than to general theory and methodology.

It is long past time for Du Bois' sociology to be placed in the sociological canon alongside those of Karl Marx and Emile Durkheim. Thus, *The Scholar Denied* aims to do nothing less than to shift our understandings of the founding of scientific sociology over a century ago. The book insists on redefining this slice of intellectual history. In so doing, *The Scholar Denied* aims to challenge existing paradigms, disrupt dominant narratives, and illuminate new sociological truths.

# The Case for Scholarly Reparations: Race, the history of sociology, and the marginalized man – lessons from Aldon Morris' book *The Scholar Denied*

Julian Go, Boston University

Reproduced with the permission of the author and the publishers from Julian Go, "The Case for Scholarly Reparations," *Berkeley Journal of Sociology*, (2016), accessed April 24, 2016, <http://berkeleyjournal.org/2016/01/the-case-for-scholarly-reparations/>

*The Scholar Denied: W.E.B. Du Bois and the Birth of Modern Sociology*

by Aldon Morris

University of California Press, 320 pages, August 2015

If Aldon Morris in *The Scholar Denied* is right, then everything I learned as a sociology PhD student at the University of Chicago is wrong. Or at least everything that I learned about the history of sociology. At Chicago, my cohort and I were inculcated with the ideology and ideals of Chicago School. We were taught that American sociology originated with the Chicago School. We were taught that sociology as a scientific enterprise, rather than a philosophical one, began with Albion Small and his successors; that *The Polish Peasant* by W.I. Thomas and Florian Znaniecki was the first great piece of American sociological research; and that the systematic study of race relations and urban sociology originated with Robert E. Park and his students. We were taught that we should not only read the Chicago school but also venerate it, model our work after it, and pass its wisdom on through the generations. But *The Scholar Denied* shows that the Chicago school was not the founding school of sociology in the United States. Neither Small, Park, Thomas and Znaniecki nor their students originated scientific sociology. The real credit goes to W.E.B. Du Bois, whom leading representatives of the Chicago School like Robert E. Park marginalized – perhaps wittingly. Moreover, and perhaps more contentiously, *The Scholar Denied* suggests that Park plagiarized Du Bois, and that venerated sociologists like Max Weber were perhaps more influenced by Du Bois rather than the other way around.

The implications are far-reaching. If the Chicago school is not the originator of sociology, then why spend so much time reading, thinking about, or debating it? If Morris is right,

graduate students should instead focus upon the real innovators and founders: Du Bois and his "Atlanta School" of sociology. It only struck me after reading this book that Du Bois had barely if ever appeared on any my graduate school syllabi. Yet, this is not a question of *adding* more thinkers to the sociology canon. If Morris is right, there is an argument to made that Du Bois and the Atlanta School should *replace* the Chicago School, not just be added alongside it. For, with *The Scholar Denied*, Du Bois can no longer be seen as the "first black sociologist", the originator of "African-American sociology," or the one who pioneered the study of African-American communities. He must instead be seen as the first scientific sociologist who is the rightful progenitor of American sociology itself.

And it works the other way around. With Morris' book, the Chicago school – and indeed early mainstream American sociology in general – can be exposed for what it was: a parochial if not provincial body of thought that reflected little else than the worldview and groping aspirations of a handful of middling white men whose interests were tethered to the interests of the American empire: men who had to suppress those others from whom insights they drew in order to be.

Admittedly, this exaggerates the arguments made in Morris' landmark book. It is perhaps the most extreme conclusion one might draw. But what makes *The Scholar Denied* so important is that it renders this conclusion possible and plausible at all. Thankfully, *The Scholar Denied* helps those of us who are willing to go there, get there.

## From the Margins

Let us return to the first issue on the table: the Chicago School. There is at least one good reason for why Chicago heralds itself as the founding school of American sociology. It is not mere self-congratulation. Nor is it the fact that Chicago founded *The American Journal of Sociology*. The reason why Chicago heralds itself as the founding school is because everyone else does too. "[T]he history of sociology in America," declared Lewis A. Coser in 1978, "can largely be written as the history of the Department of Sociology at the University of Chicago."<sup>[1]</sup> It is "hard not to see Chicago," declares Ken

CONTINUED ON PAGE 11

Plummer more recently, “as the *fons et origio* of modern sociology.<sup>[2]</sup> Sociology’s “first great institutional base was at the University of Chicago,” Calhoun announces.<sup>[3]</sup> And, presumably, it was the first great *intellectual* base: the leading sociologists at Chicago transformed sociology into an empirical science, finally turning “sociology from social philosophy toward empirical research.”<sup>[4]</sup>

Morris is alive to the fact that this is the “hegemonic narrative” about the origins of sociology, and his masterful book does not so much puncture holes in it as overthrow it entirely. “There is an intriguing, well-kept secret regarding the founding of scientific sociology in America,” reads the opening paragraph of *The Scholar Denied*. “The first school of scientific sociology in the United States was founded by a black professor located in a historically black university in the South.”<sup>[5]</sup> The origins of scientific sociology, in other words, do not lie in the Chicago School but in W.E.B. Du Bois and his Atlanta School. In the early twentieth century, “the black sociologist, scholar and activist W.E.B. Du Bois developed the first scientific school of sociology at Atlanta University. [...] Du Bois was the first social scientist to establish a sociological laboratory where systematic empirical research was conducted.”<sup>[6]</sup>

Du Bois and his school innovated on several fronts. The first has to do with the “scientific” aspect of sociology or, rather, the empirical aspect. According to the hegemonic narrative, it was the Chicago School that innovated: the sociologists of Chicago were the first to go into communities, observe, collect data, and then systematically analyze it. “The city of Chicago served as a social laboratory where empirical research conducted on the major social processes unfolding in one of the world’s great modern cities.”<sup>[7]</sup> As Andrew Abbott avers, one overarching characteristic of the Chicago School was that “it always has a certain empirical, even observational flavor, whether it is counting psychotics in neighborhoods, reading immigrants’ letters to the old country, or watching the languid luxuries of the taxi-dance hall.” The culmination was *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America* (1918). But Morris persuasively shows that *The Philadelphia Negro* by Du Bois, completed in 1897 and published in 1899 (nineteen years before the publication of *The Polish Peasant*), is the more deserving text. *The Philadelphia Negro* was motivated precisely by Du Bois’ interest in systematically studying African Americans. Whereas previous work “on the Negro question” had been “notoriously uncritical,” in Du Bois’ own words, and lacking “discrimination in the selection and weighing of evidence,” Du Bois insisted upon “scientific research” to study the issue, and *The Philadelphia Negro* was his early testament. Focusing upon the Seventh Ward of Philadelphia. Replete with historical and comparative analysis, the work resulted from “extensive interviews, with all families in the ward...surveys, archival data, and ethnographic

data from participant observation.”<sup>[8]</sup>

After moving to Atlanta University, Du Bois continued this innovative work. Though his resources paled in comparison to those of the wealthy Department of Sociology at Chicago, Du Bois put together a team of researchers to study African Americans in their communities and held conferences for researchers on black life in America. They carried out the sort of empirically driven work he had pioneered in *The Philadelphia Negro* but this time studying a variety of African-American communities, from rural communities to modern cities in the south and north. His teams included black scholars like Monroe Work, who had previously earned his AB and MA from the University of Chicago but who then joined Du Bois’s research team to conduct studies on race, politics, crime and the black church. His teams included graduate as well as undergraduate students, alumni of black colleges, and community leaders. Morris shows how an entire “hidden generation” of sociologists was connected with the school. Besides Work, there was Richard R. Wright, Jr. and George Edmund Haynes. These and others “who apprenticed with Du Bois constituted the first generation of black sociologists” and went on to make significant contributions to the field.<sup>[9]</sup>

The conferences held at Atlanta University were a vital part of the school. Held each spring, they brought together white, black, male and female scholars and attracted wide interest. Already by 1902, the “Atlanta Conference” was being heralded by some as an important graduate training institution for the “study of the social problems in the South by the most approved scientific methods” – as Frank Tolman wrote in his survey of sociology courses and departments.<sup>[10]</sup> For at least a decade, a period spanning the first years of the twentieth century, the Atlanta School worked ceaselessly, producing published work like *The Negro Artisan* (1902), among a variety of papers. Morris declares “no comparable research programs existed that produced empirical research on African Americans” in these years.<sup>[11]</sup> And the Atlanta Conference saw the participation of people like Charles William Eliot, the twenty-first president of Harvard University, as well as Jane Addams, Florence Kelley, Walter Wilcox, and Franz Boas – the famous anthropologist whose thinking on race purportedly helped upend biological determinism in social science.

Du Bois is often noted to be the first “black” sociologist, but Morris’ point here is that Du Bois more rightfully deserves to be among the first empirical sociologists, period.

Given his work on Philadelphia and his painstaking research at Atlanta, Du Bois stands as “the first number-crunching, surveying, interviewing, participant-observing and field-working sociologist in America,” even originating what we call today “triangulation.” Notable (white) journalists like Ray Stannard Baker

*CONTINUED ON PAGE 12*

## Go, continued

declared Du Bois in 1908 to be “today one of the able sociologists in this country”, who work from Atlanta was “work of sound scholarship” that “furnish the student with the best single source of accurate information regarding the Negro at present obtainable in the country.”<sup>[12]</sup> At this point Robert E. Park had not even started his position at the University of Chicago. And it would take another ten years before Thomas and Znaniecki’s *The Polish Peasant* would hit the bookshops.

The erasure is almost pernicious.<sup>[13]</sup>

### Unseen Influences

Still, just at this point of possible historical recovery, even the most sympathetic readers might raise questions. If everyone at the time, and everyone still, turns to the Chicago School for influence, and heralds the Chicago School as the real founding institution, does not that itself prove that Chicago deserves the title of originator? How can Morris claim that Du Bois is the rightful founder of scientific sociology if he was not influential as such?

On this point, anonymous posts on the internet forum “Sociology Job Rumors” are telling. The site is a repository for students to post information about the sociology job market, but it has morphed into a site that gives license to certain would-be sociologists with a little learning to say a lot. Recently on the site, someone mentioned *The Scholar Denied*, and many of the posted responses were incredulous. One declared that since Du Bois was not cited and was instead marginalized, he cannot be considered a founder: “a citation analysis would be necessary evidence to make an argument for the ‘founder’ of any scientific advance.” Another post added “I’m not sure how DuBois can be a founder while also being so marginalized.” “I’d venture that of the early 20th century black sociologists,” wrote another, “Cox, Frazier, and perhaps a few others were at least as influential on the field as Dubois, if not more so.”<sup>[14]</sup>

The remarkable thing about *The Scholar Denied* is that it shows us that, in fact, Du Bois was influential at the time. Morris mobilizes an array of impressive information revealing that Du Bois influenced a range of thinkers whose debt to Du Bois has been covered up. Standard histories of sociology, for example, overlook the black sociologists of the Atlanta School and instead point to Oliver Cox, Charles S. Johnson or E. Franklin Frazier from the 1920s and 1930s who were advised by Park at Chicago (the influence of these histories upon present-day students is seen in the website discussions noted above). But the impact of Du Bois upon these thinkers is clear. Frazier’s most important book was *The Negro Fami-*

*ly in the United States*, and in 1939, just after its publication, Frazier wrote to Du Bois to tell him that Du Bois’ “pioneer contributions to the study of the Negro family” was influential upon him, and that much of Frazier’s own work – and of his colleagues – is merely “building upon a tradition inaugurated by you in the Atlanta studies.”<sup>[15]</sup>

The list of others influenced by Du Bois is long. It extends to Gunnar Myrdal, whose book *An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy* (1944) influenced Supreme Court decisions and became a social science classic. Morris notes that Myrdal himself pointed to Du Bois’ *The Philadelphia Negro* as a model for the sort of work done in *An American Dilemma*. Even more significantly, Myrdal’s influential work cites Du Bois eighty-three times, but Park only nine.

According to Morris, Du Bois’ influence even extended to Park himself. Park’s 1928 article on “marginal man” in *The American Journal of Sociology* is the smoking gun. In that article, Park proposed that migration produces a hybrid type of social being, someone trapped in the “traditions of two distinct peoples.” Park credits Simmel’s concept of the stranger as inspirational. But according to Morris, who ably marshals evidence provided by Chad Goldberg and others, it was Du Bois’ concept of “double consciousness” that was determinant. Park just did not bother to cite it.<sup>[16]</sup>

Or, take another example: Max Weber. While many histories of sociology claim that Weber mentored Du Bois while Du Bois studied in Germany in the 1890s, they are just plain wrong. While known in Germany, Weber was not yet a famous sociologist in the US (and he would not be until after the Second World War) and was only four years older than Du Bois. While the two were in Germany, “they were both essentially graduate students.”<sup>[17]</sup> By the time Weber had travelled to the US in 1904, Du Bois had already published influential works (not only *The Philadelphia Negro* but also the widely popular *The Souls of Black Folk*), and in this sense it was Du Bois who was the known sociologist in the United States, not Weber. This probably explains why Weber wrote to Du Bois on a number of other occasions, extolling the virtues of Du Bois’ *The Souls of Black Folk*, urging it be translated to German, and inviting Du Bois to come to Germany. It is also probably why Weber asked Du Bois to write something on caste relations for Weber’s journal, *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik*. The invitation resulted in the 1906 publication of “Die Negerfrage in den Vereinigten Staaten” nestled between articles by Robert Michels and Georg Simmel, and its theorization of race in the US as a

CONTINUED ON PAGE 13

caste system shaped Weber's own thinking on caste stratification.

In short, the elevation of the Chicago School has served to marginalize Du Bois, even as Du Bois was profoundly influential for his time. Narrating this tension is one of the many virtues of Morris' book, and it marks the tragedy that *The Scholar Denied* writes for us – that we have erased the history of Du Bois' profound influence upon sociology from our most influential histories of sociology. We assume Weber taught Du Bois. We herald Frazier as the most influential black sociologist. We herald Robert E. Park as the innovator. So how did this marginalization and erasure happen?

### Heterodoxies of Race

It would be comforting to think that Du Bois was marginalized because of the narrow racism of the white establishment – the result of white racists who suppressed Du Bois out of their own deep prejudices against African-Americans. It would be comforting not because the story would be a happy one, but because the ending would be hopeful. Since we sociologists are no longer racists, we can rest peacefully knowing that we would not conduct such an injustice today. And we can excuse the early racists as being men of their time. Who was *not* racist in early 20th century America?

There is no doubt that naked racism played a role in the marginalization of Du Bois. In *The Scholar Denied*, Morris multiplies examples. How Gunnar Myrdal or Robert Park directly prevented Du Bois from receiving the right resources, assignments, and credit are riveting parts of the book. But the story Morris tells in *The Scholar Denied* is also subtler. It does not boil down to acts of racial discrimination by a few men. Morris instead reconstructs the field of sociology at the time, and, drawing upon Pierre Bourdieu's field theory, shows how Du Bois suffered from his particular position within the field as a black man operating in institutions without sufficient resources. It was a matter of the unequal distribution of capitals in the field of sociology at the time.<sup>[18]</sup>

Still, there is another explanatory current amidst the flow. It is not only that Du Bois was black and other sociologists were white, or that Du Bois suffered from lack of capital, it is also that he had dangerous ideas. To be sure, Du Bois innovated by his empirical orientation and methodology. But Du Bois also innovated substantively, birthing a sociology of race that aimed to wrestle discourse on race away from the Darwinistic, biological and frankly racist sociological episteme of the day. Participants and promoters of that episteme included most all other white sociologists, and Morris pulls no punches when pointing out how the Chicago School was at the center of sociologically racist thought. In riveting swaths of *The Scholar Denied*, we learn about Robert Park's racist sociol-

gy, for example, a sociology that "portrayed African Americans" as "handicapped by a double heritage of biological and cultural inferiority."<sup>[19]</sup> These views compelled Park to side with Booker T. Washington in suggesting that the best route for African-Americans was to become manual laborers rather than to try overcome their "savage" origins (in Park's own terminology). These views also compelled Park to conclude that blacks should stay away from cities, for there they would "only succumb to the vice, disease, crime, and other evils rampant in city life."<sup>[20]</sup> And Park's own famous theory on the cycle of race relations was underwritten by Darwinistic thought on the inferiority of non-whites. Park's thought was merely the "conceptual framework" that could explain and hence legitimate why the whites of Europe and the US were dominating the world through colonialism –and why race relations throughout the globe were so tumultuous.<sup>[21]</sup>

Du Bois would have none of this. For, unlike Park, Du Bois' thinking on race was rooted not only in his personal experience as an African-American but also in actual empirical research. Indeed, as Morris demonstrates, Park was the subjective, unscientific sociologist, not Du Bois. Morris points out how Park's study of the black church was based upon "assertions and the testimony of questionable informants", unlike Du Bois' truly scientific research.<sup>[22]</sup> And Park's other work, including his theory of the race relations cycle, relied upon little else than deduction, along with his own "impressions, opinions and beliefs." Worse still, it was based upon "intuition, impressions, opinions, and travelers' tales told by individuals with ideological axes to grind and power to protect."<sup>[23]</sup> Du Bois' work, using systematically and painstakingly collected data on communities about which Park had little inkling, instead showed the *social* production of racial inferiority rather than its biological or even cultural determination. In contrast to Park, therefore, Du Bois' sociological research led him to break completely from social Darwinism and claims "that biology and cosmically driven forms of interaction determined race dynamics and racially based social conditions."<sup>[24]</sup>

It is not only that Du Bois was black and other sociologists were white, or that Du Bois suffered from lack of capital, it is also that he had dangerous ideas.

In this sense, Du Bois prefigured or at least paralleled the thinking of Franz Boas, showing that racial and as well as gender inequalities "derived from exploitation, domination, and human agency exercised by both oppressors and the oppressed."<sup>[25]</sup> Boas is typically taken to be the major thinker who moved social science "beyond biological explanations of race to explanations highlighting culture as the determinant of racial outcomes."<sup>[26]</sup> But along with Boas (with whom Du Bois corresponded for decades), Du Bois also "advanced and supported with his

*CONTINUED ON PAGE 14*

## Go, continued

scholarship the idea that races were socially created categories and that, despite the scientific racism of the day, blacks were not racially inferior.”<sup>[27]</sup>

Morris thus raises the possibility that Du Bois should be credited with shifting the paradigm of thinking on race in the US. In any case, Morris is unequivocal on just how seminal and important Du Bois’ line of thinking is, at least compared to Park:

While Park clung to the heritage of nineteenth-century thinking who stressed natural racial hierarchies, and biological determinism, Du Bois foreshadowed the current social constructionist approach, which emphasizes race as a social construct and highlights the role of power in establishing and maintaining racial inequalities.<sup>[28]</sup>

The astonishing thing is that Du Bois came to his thinking on race at least a decade if not more before Robert E. Park was spouting his theory of the race relations cycle. Park’s thought was retrograde, even as the hegemonic narrative heralds Park’s thought on race as innovative.

We can now begin to see that the reason for why Du Bois was marginalized, and why his influence has been obscured, is not just his skin color. It is also that he was intellectual insurrectionary – intellectually heterodox – challenging the hegemony of scientific racism upon which white sociology had been mounted at the time. Heterodoxies rarely win over orthodoxy, but imagine how much more difficult it must have been given that the heterodoxy came from a black man in early twentieth century America? And how much more if the orthodoxy in question – scientific racism – had institutions with money behind it, while the heterodoxy had almost no resources? This is the story Morris tells: Du Bois was marginalized partly because Du Bois and his colleagues were right, and mainstream sociology was wrong, and yet mainstream sociology had all the power to define right and wrong in the first place.

Throughout *The Scholar Denied* we see more closely how this marginalization and erasure worked. Morris shows, for example, how the anti-scientific racism of Boas and Du Bois developed in tandem, and that they corresponded and held each other with mutual respect and admiration, but that Boas’ views were later accepted and Du Bois marginalized because Boas was better positioned as a white male at Columbia University. We see how Du Bois laboriously built his Atlanta School but how he faced countless difficulties stemming from limited funding and institutional help. And we see how he was repeatedly set aside due to claims that, as a black man,

his sociology was taken by the powers-that-be to be “biased” (while work by Myrdal, for example, was presumed to *not* be biased despite the fact that Myrdal was white).

One instance of this suppression of heterodoxy is especially worth noting. When Du Bois argued that his findings proved that black people were not inferior, the US Department of Labor refused to publish his work and even destroyed the manuscript report on the grounds that it “touched on political matters.”<sup>[29]</sup> All the while, when Park at Chicago or Giddings at Columbia proclaimed the inferiority of the “savage races”, their views were taken to be *not* political. They were taken to be objective, while the views of Du Bois were not. Institutional racism here took the form of claims to objectivity and science – and both functioned to suppress heterodox social theory.

### Sociology’s Parochiality

The story told by Morris is tragic. But, on the other hand, it should not be entirely surprising. After all, sociology, as it has come to us through the Chicago School, Columbia University and other major white institutions was founded as a project of and for power. It emerged in the nineteenth century as an intellectual formation meant to manage disorder from below: to stave off the threats to social order and coherence posed by recalcitrant workers, immigrants, women, and natives.<sup>[30]</sup> Let us not forget: the earliest use of the term “sociology” in the title of a book in the United States came from George Fitzhugh and Henry Hughes, who used it as part of their intellectual effort to vindicate the slave system in the American South.<sup>[31]</sup> And later in the nineteenth century, as sociological ideas conjoined with scientific racism, and as sociology began to be institutionalized at Chicago or Columbia, sociology’s task become one of giving intellectual coherence to the fact of ongoing imperial domination, offering a putatively scientific justification for Anglo-Saxon rule over those whom sociologist Franklin Giddings and others referred to as the “savage hordes” and “inferior races” of the world.<sup>[32]</sup>

Orthodox sociology as it first emerged was parochial to the core, in the sense that it represented a very particular worldview and standpoint. It embedded and embodied the mindset of white elites in the dominant imperial metropolises that, in those tumultuous decades of the early twentieth century, were extending their violent imperial hand around the world in the name of civilization – and to the tragic detriment of Du Bois’ distant African ancestors.<sup>[33]</sup>

No doubt, *all* social science is parochial. It comes from a

*CONTINUED ON PAGE 15*

place. It is shaped by the interests behind, around, and subverting it. Each theoretical construction embeds a specific standpoint. Did Du Bois and the Atlanta School have a distinct standpoint? Of course. Theirs was a standpoint that came not only from their personal experience but also through their empirical research into black communities. Theirs was a standpoint that summoned the question that Du Bois famously asked in *The Souls of Black Folk*: “how does it *feel* to be a problem?”<sup>[34]</sup> This is the standpoint that emerged from the field research of Du Bois and his teams. But white privileged departments of Sociology also had their distinct standpoint. And theirs was the standpoint of imperial power. Theirs was the standpoint that did not ask how it “felt” to be a problem but that thought in terms of “social problems” that had to be managed. And theirs was the standpoint that defined social problems as anything that disturbed, upset, or challenged the social order of the metropole and the global order of racial domination.

So yes, all social science is parochial. The difference is that some of these standpoints get valorized as universal and others get marginalized as particularistic. Some become heralded as objective and true, others get resisted as subjective or irrelevant. Orthodox sociology, such as that which emerged at Chicago, is parochial yet it masquerades as universal, and it has only been able to pull off this God trick because of the money and resources behind it – money and resources which the Atlanta School were not afforded.

Running through *The Scholar Denied*, however implicitly, is this very story of standpoints, power, and marginalization. And this is why the story of *The Scholar Denied* is much bigger than a professional insider’s debate about founders; bigger than something that only the History of Sociology Section of the ASA should bother with. It is also bigger than questions about who to include on our syllabi, or what stories we tell of the University of Chicago. It is a wake up call about our own disciplinary doxa. It is a call, in the spirit of the critical sociology of Pierre Bourdieu – whom Morris invokes – to be reflexive about those sociological standpoints that purport universality when are not universal; and can never be.<sup>[35]</sup> It is a call to be reflexive about social knowledge’s potential proximity to power and how such proximity exacts a high cost. In Chakrabarty’s terms, it is thus a call to “provincialize” those dominant standpoints, open up the breach, and integrate alternative standpoints that otherwise get occluded: not because of the political or ethical import of integrating those standpoints but also because, quite simply, those standpoints might offer us invaluable insights on the social world – just as did the work of Du Bois.

Amidst the discussion of *The Scholar Denied* on the website

“Sociology Job Rumors”, one respondent wrote that they will not bother reading the book because “it’s not relevant to the discipline today.” If this is representative of the minds of sociology PhD students in the US today, we are in a sad state indeed. For what this sort of presentist response misses is that the story of Du Bois, his influence, and his occlusion *is* relevant to the discipline today. It is crucial for the discipline today. For it speaks to a general social process in the academy that reenacts today what had happened to Du Bois back then (however in ways that we might not easily see). *The Scholar Denied* is a powerful and persuasive plea to pay attention to those voices that might still be unwittingly relegated to the margins on the grounds of their ostensible particularism or subjectivism. And it is a reminder that the cost of such marginalization is not simply an ethical one, it is an epistemic one. And it is one that sociology cannot afford.

*A collection of essays on the work, intellectual importance, and lasting legacy of W.E.B. Du Bois – adapted from a panel discussion at the 2015 conference of the American Sociological Association – can be found at <http://berkeleyjournal.org/topics/w-e-b-du-bois/>.*

*This essay has been updated to include references to the work of Dipesh Chakrabarty and Pierre Bourdieu.*

#### References and Footnotes

1. Lewis A. Coser, "American Trends," in *A History of Sociological Analysis*, ed. Tom Bottomore and Robert Nisbet (New York: Basic Books, 1978), po. 311.
2. "Kenneth Plummer, ed. *The Chicago School: Critical Assessments*, 7 vols., vol. I (New York: Routledge, 1997), p. 1.
3. Craig Calhoun, "Sociology in America: An Introduction," in *Sociology in America: A History*, ed. Craig Calhoun (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007), p. 1.
4. Calhoun, p. 27.
5. Aldon Morris, *The Scholar Denied: W.E.B. DuBois and the Birth of Modern Sociology* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2015), p. 1.
6. Morris, p. 2-3.
7. Morris, p. 2.
8. Morris, p. 47.
9. Morris, p. 62.
10. Tolman quoted in Morris, p.74.
11. Morris, p. 76.
12. Baker quoted in Morris, p. 95.
13. Morris is also quick to note how Jane Addams’ work and the Hull House can also be seen as establishing scientific sociology early on. <http://www.socjobrumors.com/topic/groundbreaking-book-argues-du-bois-is-primary-founder-of-modern-empirical-sociology/page/4>. Accessed November 1, 2015.
15. Quoted in Morris, p. 197.
16. Morris, pp. 145-6.
17. Morris, p. 150.
18. Morris, pp. 182-194.
19. Morris, p. 119.
20. Morris, p. 120.

CONTINUED ON PAGE 19

# Neglected Figures in the History of Sociology

Martin Bulmer, University of Surrey,  
UK

This short article is intended as an introduction to the session on neglected figures in the history of sociology at the 2016 Meetings in Seattle. The twenty-four figures identified below are a personal selection drawn from sociology and related fields such as anthropology, history, law, criminology, philosophy and psychology. Discussing the field in this way is a bit of a party game. Who is in and who is out? There are no right or wrong answers; each of you will have your own choices. Several members of the section have written on one or more neglected figures and some of their books or articles are mentioned below.

It is impossible to adequately cover the national and disciplinary varieties of sociology. Most of the persons mentioned are American, though a considerable number were born in Europe; a few are British by birth or adoption; the most common place of birth outside the English-speaking world is Vienna; Poland is also well represented; Germany, France and Scandinavia are poorly represented, and the Third World hardly at all.

The most contentious and conceptually difficult task is determining what constitutes “neglect.” The criteria one adduces for “neglect” are debatable. Is W. E. B. Du Bois “neglected”? Hardly in the present, though he certainly has been in the past. Currently, his precise place in the history of sociology is keenly debated, as Morris’s recent book demonstrates. Some figures are more prominent than others, ranging from several past presidents of the ASA to more marginal figures such as Benney and Steinmetz. There is a possible bias to those who have contributed to the development of empirical sociology, and there are few who are “pure” theorists. Yet several general sociologists who appear, such as McIver, Marshall, Rossi and Toennies, made lasting contributions to theory and conceptualisation.

The session in August at Seattle reflects the submissions that came in. I am sure that the papers will provoke debate.

- ◆ STANISLAS ANDRESKI [1919-2007] born Czeztow, Poland. Began career in the Polish army in late 1930’s, stripped off his officer’s insignia when captured by the Russians early in WW2 and as a result survived the Katyn massacre of the Polish officer corps. Came to England where he wrote a book on

*Military Organisation and Society*. Headed sociology at the University of Reading, UK, for 20 years, taught in Mexico and Poland in retirement.

- ◆ GEORGES BALANDIER [1920- ] born Aillevilliers-et-Lyaumont, France, French sociologist, ethnologist and anthropologist of Africa who was professor at Sorbonne and edited the journal *Cahiers Internationaux de Sociologie*.
- ◆ MARK BENNEY [1910-1973] born London, who began life as a burglar and ended teaching sociology in the College at the University of Chicago. See his two volumes of autobiography, *Low Company: Describing the Evolution of a Burglar* [London: Peter Davies, 1936] and *Almost a Gentleman* [London: Peter Davies, 1966]. Fascinating article about him by Ray Lee, “‘The Man who Committed a Hundred Burglaries’: Mark Benney’s Strange and Eventful Sociological Career”, *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, 51 (4) Fall 2015: 409-33.
- ◆ MARTIN BUBER [1878-1965]. Jewish philosopher born in Vienna, brought up and educated in Lvov and later Lviv, Ukraine. Early Zionism later transmuted into advocating a bi-national state of Jews and Arabs together in Israel, tolerating each other. Honorary professor at Frankfurt/Main, 1930-1933. In 1938 he emigrated to Jerusalem and began teaching anthropology and sociology at Hebrew University. See Uri Ram, *The Return of Martin Buber: National and Social Thought in Israel from Buber to the neo-Buberians* [TelAviv: Resling, 2015]
- ◆ W. E. B. DU BOIS [1868-1963] first black Ph D at Harvard, studied in Germany, academic career at Wilberforce and Atlanta, founder of NAACP and in 1910 moved to New York to found and edit its magazine, *The Crisis*. Died in Ghana as a Ghanaian citizen. Fine new biography by Aldon Morris, *The Scholar Denied* [University of California Press, 2015]
- ◆ MARIE JAHODA [1907-2001], born Vienna, co-author, with P. Lazarsfeld and H. Zeisl, of *Die Arbeitslosen von Marienthal* [1932], a classic study of unemployment, exiled under the Nazis, lived in the USA and the UK, Professor of Social Psychology at

CONTINUED ON PAGE 17



- the University of Sussex, described as the Grand Dame of European socialism in late 20th century.
- ◆ VIOLA KLEIN [1908-1973], born Vienna, exiled to UK under the Nazis, studied for second PhD under Karl Mannheim at LSE, author with Alva Myrdal of the pioneering study *Women's Two Roles*, taught at the University of Reading. See Stina Lyon, "Viola Klein: Forgotten Émigré Intellectual, Public Sociologist and Advocate of Women," *Sociology* 41 January 2007: 829-842.
  - ◆ ROBERT M MACIVER (1882-1970) born Stornoway, Isle of Lewis, Scotland, taught at the Universities of Aberdeen and Toronto before moving to Barnard College and then Columbia University in New York, where he was Lieber Professor of Political Science and Sociology, before ending his career as President and then Chancellor of the New School for Social Research. President of the ASA in 1940.
  - ◆ SIR HENRY MAINE [1822-1888], British comparative jurist and historian, author of *Ancient Law*, a foundational work of the sociology of law. See Alan Diamond [ed], *The Victorian Achievement of Sir Henry Maine* THE VICTORIAN ACHIEVEMENT OF SIR HENRY MAINE [2006]
  - ◆ HERMANN MANNHEIM [1889-1974] born Libau, Latvia, trained in the law and rose to be judge in the Kammergericht in Berlin (the highest court for the whole of Prussia) and professor at the University of Berlin. On coming to power of the Nazis, moved to UK in 1933 and became reader in criminology at the LSE, where he helped to establish the subject in the UK.
  - ◆ T. H. MARSHALL [1893-1981] born London, taught sociology and social policy at the London School of Economics and Political Science, later senior social science post at UNESCO, author of influential article on "Citizenship and social class", pioneer student of social stratification. See M. Bulmer and A M Rees (eds.) *Citizenship Today* [London: UCL Press,1996].
  - ◆ D. P. MOYNIHAN [1927-2003] born Tulsa, Oklahoma, sociologist and politician, associated with Tufts, LSE, Syracuse, Harvard, MIT, Wesleyan. Service in government as adviser and ambassador. Senator [Dem] for New York State, 1976-2000.
  - ◆ KARL POLANYI [1886-1964] born Vienna, Austro-Hungary. Comparative economic historian whose main claim to fame is *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time* (London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1944). Taught at Columbia, where he was influential teacher. Lived in Canada as his wife was banned from living in the USA due to her membership of the Communist Party.
  - ◆ KARL POPPER [1902-1994] born Vienna, Austro-Hungary. PhD at University of Vienna on question of method in cognitive psychology under Karl Buhler. Taught philosophy in Canterbury, New Zealand, 1937-1946, when he was appointed reader in logic and scientific method at London School of Economics and Political Science, promoted to professor in 1949, retired 1969. One of the greatest philosophers of science in the twentieth century.
  - ◆ DAVID RIESMAN [1909-2002] Born Philadelphia, Author of *The Lonely Crowd*, taught at Harvard. See Riesman, D. (1988). "On discovering and teaching sociology: A memoir." *Annual Review of Sociology*, 14, 1958, 1-24.
  - ◆ ALICE S. ROSSI [1922-2009] born New York City, taught at UMass, Amherst, leading sociologist of women and feminist, president of the ASA in 1983.
  - ◆ PITRIM A. SOROKIN [1889-1968] born Turiya village, Vologda Governate, Russian Empire. Founder of the Sociology Department at the University of St Petersburg, 1918. Secretary to Kerensky during the Russian Revolution. Exiled by the Soviet Government and emigrated to the USA in 1923. Taught first at University of Minnesota and then at Harvard until his retirement in 1959. He was president of the ASA in 1965. See Lawrence T. Nichols, "Sorokin as Lifelong Russian Intellectual: The Enactment of an Historically Rooted Sensibility," *The American Sociologist* 43, 4 (December 2012).
  - ◆ SEBALD RUDOLPH STEINMETZ [1862-1940], born Breda, Netherlands. Dutch Professor of Geography at University of Amsterdam who coined the term "sociography."
  - ◆ DOROTHY S. THOMAS [1899-1977] born Baltimore, Maryland. Author of *The Spoilage* and *The Salvage* (1946 and

*CONTINUED ON PAGE 18*

## *Bulmer, continued from page 17*

- 1952), two studies of the treatment of Japanese Americans during WW2 which were accepted by the Supreme Court in litigation about the issue. Demographer and population scientist. First woman president of the ASA in 1952.
- ◆ W. I. THOMAS [1863-1947] born Russell County, Virginia, studied psychology in Germany with Wundt, Lazarus and Steinthal, taught sociology at the University of Chicago 1895-1918, when he was dismissed. Author with F. Znaniecki of *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America* [1918-20]. Moved to New York, ASA president 1927.
  - ◆ FERDINAND TOENNIES [1855-1936], born in Oldenswort, North Frisia. Founder of the German Sociological Society and its president from 1909 to 1933, author of *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft*.
  - ◆ BEATRICE WEBB [1858-1943], born Gloucestershire, self-educated, assisted Charles Booth in his study of poverty in London, became an expert on cooperatives, wrote notable report on the Poor Law, with her husband Sidney Webb and George Bernard Shaw founded the London School of Economics and Political Science as a college of the University of London, wrote text with Sidney Webb on *Methods of Social Study* (1932).
  - ◆ W. F. WERTHEIM [1907-1998] born St Petersburg, Russia. Professor of Non-Western Sociology at the University of Amsterdam and specialist on the Dutch East Indies, on which he wrote *Indonesian Society in Transition* (The Hague: Van Hoeve, 1964). Also author of a major study of revolutions, *The Long March of Emancipation* [4<sup>th</sup> ed 1977].
  - ◆ MONROE WORK [1866-1945], born Iredell County, NC. First African-American to have an article published in the AJS, while a student at the University of Chicago. Joined staff of Tuskegee Institute in 1908, where he compiled the *Negro Year Book* and *A Bibliography of the Negro in Africa and America*.
  - ◆ FLORIAN ZNANIECKI [1882-1958] born Świątniki, Congress Poland, a state controlled by the Russian Empire. Philosopher and sociologist, he studied abroad at Geneva, Zurich and the Sorbonne, where he heard lectures by Durkheim and was influenced by Henri Bergson. Returned to obtain his Ph D in Cracow, and from 1914 on moved back and forth between Poland and the USA for the rest of his career, first to do research for *The Polish Peasant*. President of the ASA in 1954.

# NEWS

## *Recent Publications*

Articles, chapters and books on the history of sociology.

Elias, Sean and Joe R. Feagin. 2016. *Racial Theories in Social Science: A Systemic Racism Critique*. New York: Routledge.

Olen, Peter and Stephen Turner. 2015. "Durkheim, Sellars, and the Origins of Collective Intentionality." *British Journal for the History of Philosophy* 23(5): 954-975. DOI: 10.1080/09608788.2015.1039483

Platt, Jennifer. 2015. "Biographie in der Soziologiegeschichte." In Christian Dayé and Stephan Moebius (ed), *Soziologiegeschichte: Wege und Ziele*. Berlin: Suhrkamp, 149-191 [A copy in English can be provided on request]

Turner, Stephen. 2016. "History of Sociology." In *Oxford Bibliographies in Sociology*. Ed. Janeen Baxter. New York: Oxford University Press.

Turner, Stephen. 2016. "Rural Sociology: A Slightly Personal History." In Hans Bakker (ed.) *Rural Sociologists at Work: Candid Accounts of Theory, Methods and Practice*. London: Routledge, 9-33.

*CONTINUED ON PAGE 19*

## News, continued

Williams, Joyce E and Vicky M MacLean. 2015. *Settlement Sociology in the Progressive Years: Faith, Science, and Reform*. Boston: Brill. The Progressive Era roots of sociology as a public enterprise for reform are restored to the canon and given recognition by tracing key works of early sociological practitioners in the leading settlement houses of Chicago, New York and Boston.

## Other News

Jennifer Platt was Current Sociology 'Sociologist of the month', October 2015.

## Go, continued from page 15

21. Morris, p. 125.
22. Morris, p. 123.
23. Morris, p. 133.
24. Morris, p. 129.
25. Morris, pp. 129-30.
26. Morris, p. 218.
27. Morris, p. 218.
28. Morris, p. 130.
29. Quoted in Morris, p. 185.
30. Patricia Owens, *Economy of Force: Counterinsurgency and the Historical Rise of the Social* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015).
31. Calhoun, "Sociology in America: An Introduction," p. 5.
32. Franklin Henry Giddings, *Democracy and empire; with studies of their psychological, economic, and moral foundations* (New York: Macmillan & Co., 1900). For more on racial thought and empire in early sociology, see R.W. Connell, "Why is Classical Theory Classical?," *American Journal of Sociology* 102, no. 6 (1997), Julian Go, "Sociology's Imperial Unconscious: the Emergence of American Sociology in the Context of Empire," in *Sociology and Empire*, ed. George Steinmetz (Durham: Duke University Press, 2013), and Julian Go, "Beyond Metrocentricism: From empire to globalism in early US sociology," *Journal of Classical Sociology* 14, no. 2 (2013).
33. Connell, "Why is Classical Theory Classical?." On the racial origins of International Relations, and the marginalization of the "Howard School" of International relations that is not unlike the marginalization of the sociological Atlanta school, see the illuminating excavation by Robert Vitalis, *White World Order, Black Power Politics: The Birth of American International Relations* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2015).
34. W. E. B. DuBois, *The Souls of Black Folk* (Mineola: Dover Publications, 1994 [1903]).
35. Bourdieu, Pierre, and Loïc J. D. Wacquant, *An invitation to reflexive sociology* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992).

The *Berkeley Journal of Sociology* is run by a collective of graduate students from the UC Berkeley Department of Sociology. It seeks to contribute to the "history of the present" by publishing critical sociological perspectives on current social, economic, political, and environmental issues.

## Bulmer, continued from page 7

and Patricia Hill Collins of the University of Maryland at College Park, with a response by Aldon Morris.<sup>3</sup>

*The Scholar Denied* has already provoked much debate, and to encourage this, *Ethnic and Racial Studies Review* has invited contributions of up to 800 words on the subject to their issues of late 2016 and early 2017 to carry on the discussion. The history of sociology is alive and kicking!!

### References:

Bulmer, Martin. 1984. *The Chicago School of Sociology: Institutionalization, Diversity and the Rise of Sociological Research*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Go, Julian. 2016. "The case for Scholarly Reparations: Race, the history of sociology and the marginalized man — lessons from Aldon Morris's book *The Scholar Denied*", accessed April 24, 2016, <http://berkeleyjournal.org/2016/01/the-case-for-scholarly-reparations/>.

- 
1. "Bringing Du Bois Back In: American Sociology and the Morris Enunciation". Vol 12 (2), 2015, pp 461-67.
  2. Vol 56 (3) 2015, pp. 407-425.
  3. Vol 39 (8), June 2016.