

Swarthmore College

Works

History Faculty Works

History

3-1-1976

Review Of "Sociologists Of Chair: Radical Analysis Of Formative Years Of North-American Sociology, 1883-1922" By H. Schwendinger And J. R. Schwendinger

Robert C. Bannister
Swarthmore College

Follow this and additional works at: <https://works.swarthmore.edu/fac-history>



Part of the [History Commons](#)

[Let us know how access to these works benefits you](#)

Recommended Citation

Robert C. Bannister. (1976). "Review Of "Sociologists Of Chair: Radical Analysis Of Formative Years Of North-American Sociology, 1883-1922" By H. Schwendinger And J. R. Schwendinger". *Isis*. Volume 67, Issue 236. 145-146. DOI: 10.1086/351578
<https://works.swarthmore.edu/fac-history/213>

This work is brought to you for free and open access by . It has been accepted for inclusion in History Faculty Works by an authorized administrator of Works. For more information, please contact myworks@swarthmore.edu.



CHICAGO JOURNALS



History
of
Science
Society

Review

Author(s): Robert C. Bannister

Review by: Robert C. Bannister

Source: *Isis*, Vol. 67, No. 1 (Mar., 1976), pp. 145-146

Published by: [The University of Chicago Press](#) on behalf of [The History of Science Society](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/231167>

Accessed: 11-06-2015 16:53 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The University of Chicago Press and The History of Science Society are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Isis*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

tures atrocious printing errors, including garbled paragraphs and whole pages left blank. A book as useful, and as expensive, as this one deserved better treatment.

R. STEVEN TURNER

Department of History
University of New Brunswick
Fredericton, N.B. Canada

Herman and Julia R. Schwendinger. *The Sociologists of the Chair: A Radical Analysis of the Formative Years of North American Sociology 1883–1922.* xxvii + 609 pp., bibl., index. New York: Basic Books, 1974. \$19.50.

Recent interest in the history of sociology has not improved the stock of America's pioneer sociologists, although one might argue it was never very high. In the late 1920s neo-Positivists charged that the moralism, metaphysics, and reformism of the pre-war generation vitiated the "scientific" study of society. In *The Structure of Social Action* (1937) Talcott Parsons located the authentic sociological tradition in Europe, thus ignoring American antecedents of his "action theory." Later studies by the Chicago-based sociologists Louis Wirth, Edward Shils, and their followers, although not unsympathetic, examined why American sociology remained so long immune from European theory. More recent work in the "sociology of sociology" has stressed the mixed legacy of institutionalization and professionalization. And Alvin Gouldner's *The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology* (1970), scarcely a Parsonian tract, followed Parsons in ignoring the pre-war generation. There are exceptions, of course. On the left, for example, such critics as C. Wright Mills, Hans Gerth, and Ernest Becker appeared to find redeeming evidences of the "sociological imagination" among turn-of-the-century sociologists. But *The Sociologists of the Chair* bluntly reverses this trend. The result is a new low in the historical reputation of the "founding fathers."

In this first full-scale study of the period from Ward's *Dynamic Sociology* to Ogburn's *Social Change* (1922) the Schwendingers

argue that America's sociologists were prime theorists of the modern welfare-warfare state with its many ills—"imperialism, racism, sexism, economic exploitation, and political oppression." The theoretical matrix of sociology was liberalism, whose key assumptions sociologists continue to share: natural law, egoism (selfishness), and "panconflictism" (competition), all premised on a permanent scarcity of resources. In a long introductory section the authors described the transformation of liberalism from a "classical" to a "laissez faire" and finally "corporate" version. American sociologists were heir to two varieties of the latter: one bourgeois, stemming from French Positivism; the second aristocratic, represented by the German "socialists of the chair."

So instructed, they fashioned theories with very practical payoffs. Lester Ward led, providing a rationale for imperialism and corporatism. His "sociocrats" were but the "new mandarins"; his doctrine of social control a historically conditioned attempt "to reconstitute liberal hegemony in the face of a radical challenge." Industrial violence in the 1890s deepened concern over the "neo-Hobbesian" problem of social order. Edward A. Ross, building on Ward, broadened the concept of social control. Albion Small elaborated a "liberal syndicalism" wherein the older liberal view of conflict among atomistic individuals yielded to a vision of "the universal conflict of interests between groups." The "sexism" of sociologists since Comte culminated in the work of W. I. Thomas. Winnowing the last remnants of utopianism from earlier theory, the "urban technographers" of the Chicago school consolidated a new conservatism that ultimately justified elitist and repressive urban policies.

Unfortunately, no brief survey can capture the complexity of this argument nor convey the special exasperation produced in untangling it. In several respects the authors synthesize and expand the arguments of recent radical scholarship. Their view of the progressive era owes a good deal to Gabriel Kolko and James Weinstein, as do the not entirely relevant examples adduced to illustrate the relation of sociology and social fact. Their attack on "value free" social science and their insistence that

historians must study intellectual “strategies” as well as explicit argument echo much leftist criticism of academic sociology, including that of Gouldner, despite their charge that he wrongly anchors sociology in anti-liberal theory. In applying these insights, their treatment raises significant questions. Interpretative summaries of individual works are unfailingly provocative.

Yet as history, *The Sociologists of the Chair* has serious shortcomings. Even if one accepts the contention that all analytic categories, including those of academic history, embody ideological bias, the blanket application of such manifestly political slogans as “racist” and “sexist” obscures the development of the very ideas at issue. The concept of “social control,” extremely faddish among historians of reform lately, is also handled uncritically. Although promising a “radical analysis,” the authors often revert to mechanical and even conventional explanations, concerning the effect of the academic freedom cases of the 1890s, for example, or the conservatizing effects of World War I. Although American sociology has been distinctively an academic enterprise, little attention is given to the institutional and professional pressures fostering differentiation among the social sciences.

A greater difficulty concerns the protean definition of liberalism. Assuming fundamental continuity during almost three centuries of liberal theory, convinced that similarities can be established by examining “strategies” rather than conclusions, they dismiss anti-liberal borrowings as inconsequential and reduce to insignificance the often bitter controversies between such “liberals” as Spencer, Ward, and Durkheim. Since liberalism allegedly provided the “integrative” (meaning?) basis of sociology, they also discount “endless wrangling over the relative contribution of historical precursors.” Latitudinarianism also surfaces in a brief final section in which they attempt to demonstrate essential continuities between earlier American sociology and that of the post-1945 period. Social scientists are urged to “abandon liberalism if they are really interested in making a contribution, however small, to the common good.” Despite brief analyses of Marx on the division of labor and Engels on the subjugation of women, this study is clearer

as to the need for change than the direction it should take.

ROBERT C. BANNISTER

Department of History
Swarthmore College
Swarthmore, Pennsylvania 19081

White Watson. *The Strata of Derbyshire.* Facsimile reprint of the 1811 edition, with a new introduction by **Trevor D. Ford.** 18 + 76 pp., 3 figs., 3 pls. (2 folding), index, bibl. Little Haywood, Staffordshire: Moorland Reprints, 1973. £3.60.

When books were published in boards rather than in a final binding, as today in the English-speaking world, they had no dust jackets on which a summary of the work could be printed on the inside flap. Authors and publishers of an earlier time frequently included summaries as part of the title. Thus, a summary is part of the full title of White Watson's book: *A Delineation of the Strata of Derbyshire, Forming the Surface from Bolsover in the East to Buxton in the West, by a Plate, Designed from Tablet, Composed of the Specimens of Each Stratum Within the Above Line, with an Explanatory Account of the Same; Together with a Description of the Fossils Found in These Strata; and Also of the Nature and Quality of the Respective Soils.*

Watson (1760–1835) was a sculptor, marble worker, and dealer in minerals and fossils. He produced mosaic-like table tops and similar articles from the varied and beautiful minerals of the mining regions of the Derbyshire. He also made geological sections, which he called “tablets,” using the actual rocks; some of these still survive. The tablet described and reproduced in a large folding plate in 1811 is a reasonably accurate geological section and one of the first to appear in Britain. In present-day terms, this is a west-to-east structure section of the strata from near Buxton to Bolsover (near Chesterfield), and according to Trevor D. Ford, “compares favorably with more recent interpretations.” The strata are in a large, simple anticlinal fold in the west, and a series of small anticlines and synclines on the east. The strata are identified by symbols, and each is discussed in detail in the text—the composition, joint-