

# TIMELINES

Newsletter of the ASA History of Sociology January 2021, No. 31

## INSIDE ESSAYS

- Message from the Chair 1
- Fifty-Five Years: How the  
Holocaust made me into a  
Sociologist 3
- Reflections on ASA Lifetime  
Achievement Award 5
- The ASA Committee on  
Presidential Biographies  
– A First Report 7
- Call for ASA Online  
Presidential Biographies 9

## NEWS

- Recent Publications 10

## EVENTS

- New Voices Seminar 12

Newsletter Editor

Kieran Durkin

[kieran.durkin@york.ac.uk](mailto:kieran.durkin@york.ac.uk)

## Message from the Chair

*By Kevin B. Anderson, University of California-Santa Barbara*

**H**APPY NEW YEAR, such as it is, and welcome back to the Section on the History of Sociology.

We certainly live during times when an historical perspective can illuminate things. For example, many have said that the fascist coup attempt of January 6 – an attempt to disrupt the final recording of the electoral votes for president – was the first attack on the U.S. Capitol since it was burned by the British in 1814. But as historians quickly pointed out, in fact something similar to January 6, 2021 happened in early 1861. As the same process was taking place, to validate Abraham Lincoln’s election, a pro-slavery mob threatened the Capitol in a last-ditch effort to derail the election. However, the mob, which hurled “free state pimp” and other epithets at Lincoln, was blocked from approaching the Capitol by a large show force by the U.S. military. The mob nonetheless raged through the streets of Washington, while inside the Capitol, a few pro-slavery senators who tried to disrupt the proceedings were threatened with prosecution for “treason” by the commander of the military, General Winfield Scott, who had similarly threatened those planning to engage in the mob attack. While Lincoln had not yet even come out clearly for the abolition slavery, he was opposed to its extension into new states. This was enough to cause the pro-slavery mob to be organized, and, as we know, for secession and civil war to break out a few months later. (For details on the attempt to derail the electoral vote tally for Lincoln, see Ted Widmer, “The Capitol Takeover That Wasn’t,” *New York Times*, Jan. 8, 2021 <https://www.nytimes.com/2021/01/08/opinion/capitol-protest-1861-lincoln.html?fbclid=IwAR0P1kbQoZzEVdSJtcMd72icFcS5cx7v-zsVd-loiB34KyV2EsJXGjJFuh7A>.)

SECTION OFFICERS

**Chair**

Kevin B. Anderson  
*University of California-Santa Barbara*

**Chair Elect**

Paul Joose  
*University of Hong Kong*

**Past Chair**

Gillian Niebrugge-Brantley  
*George Washington University*

**Secretary/Treasurer**

Kristin Marsh  
*University of Mary Washington*

**Student Representatives**

Hannah Waight  
*Princeton University*

Kerby Goff

*Penn State University*

**Section Council**

Joyce E. Williams  
*Texas Woman's University*

Lauren Langman  
*Loyola University-Chicago*

Martin Bulmer  
*University of Surrey, UK*

Simonetta Falasca-Zamponi  
*University of California-Santa Barbara*

Anne Frances Eisenberg  
*SUNY-Geneseo*

Chad Alan Goldberg  
*University of Wisconsin-Madison*

One sociologist observing these events at the time, Karl Marx, kept in the next few months calling for General Scott to be named commander of the Union Army, regarding him as firmer and more aggressive than General George McClellan, who lost the early battles by adopting a non-confrontational stance toward the Confederate forces and who was despised by abolitionists.

It is not hard to see similarities between the white supremacist mob that invested the Capitol on January 6, 2021 and the one that attempted the same in early 1861, with the former actually sporting the Confederate flag while also trying to block the democratic process. This similarity is not comforting, as it suggests that those who see at least a small-scale civil war in the offing could be right.

What is equally interesting, though, is the national amnesia of U.S. culture and its representatives concerning the mob attack in early 1861. Just as the atrocities that destroyed Black Reconstruction are not usually highlighted as crimes against humanity, and even passed over or forgotten, so is the coup attempt of 1861 pushed under the rug, even now, in media accounts of a smooth democratic process all along. But January 6, 2021 -- and the Black Lives Matter mass protests this summer -- have been and will continue to force these forgotten pages of history to the forefront, erased due to what Du Bois once called "the American Blind-spot" in his epochal *Black Reconstruction*.

For similar reasons, the work of our Section over the years, in uncovering the hidden history of marginalized scholars and practitioners in the history of sociology has been -- and will continue to be -- extremely important for the entire profession of sociology and beyond. As Hegel famously wrote in the preface to the *Phenomenology of Spirit*, knowledge can move forward only by "looking the negativity in the face." I believe that we have worked in this direction. In so doing, Section members have written pathbreaking studies of Addams, Du Bois, Gilman, and other neglected or marginalized founders of our discipline. Others have published work casting long-recognized figures like Mauss, Marx, Mead, or Weber in new light. Finally, in terms of uncovering the real history of sociology, we have started the ASA presidential biographies project, launched by Stefan Bargheer with much input from Jill Brantley. It will provide short biographies of past presidents, warts and all.

Another endeavor of this academic year is the proposed name change for our section: from "History of Sociology" to "History of Sociology and Social Thought." In recent years, Section membership has hovered around the minimum of 200 members, which has led to some rethinking. Arguments in favor of the name change, which Section members will have a chance to vote on this spring, include these points. (1) Many of us already work on the history of social thought as well as the history

of sociology (if one looks at the papers presented at our sessions at ASA and other work our members are doing). (2) The ASA itself implicitly recognizes our proposed name change by continuing to list “History of Sociology/Social Thought” as an “area of sociological interest” that can be checked off when people join or renew their ASA membership, yet there is no ASA section for “History of Social Thought.” In 2019, 156 ASA members indicated “History of Social Thought” as one of their areas of interest. [In comparison, 850 indicated Theory, 661 Comparative Historical Sociology, 1294 Sex and Gender, and 177 Marxist Sociology.] (3) The term “social thought” will likely attract new people to the section. It is broader than “social theory,” let alone “sociological theory.” It will strengthen our hand in continuing the scholarly activity of working to discover and include people who were/are doing important and serious work in the ongoing challenge of


understanding society. (4) The very large ASA Theory Section [membership 769 as of fall 2019] has moved away from the history of social thought in recent years, giving us a niche to fill with this name change. For all the above reasons, I think such a name change would benefit us by describing more accurately what we are already doing, and by attracting people interested in social thought (and theory) who may not realize that’s what we are doing. If we can reach 300 members [we had 209 in fall 2020, had 215 as of fall 2019], then we would have 2 paper sessions at ASA meetings.

I look forward to working with all of you to foster the deepening and continuance of our important research, and to its constant rethinking in light of unfolding events and changes in how we view ourselves and the profession of sociology.

## Fifty-Five Years: How the Holocaust made me into a Sociologist

By Jack Nusan Porter, Associate, The Davis Center for Russian and Eurasian Studies, Harvard University

**M**Y, HOW TIME FLIES. One minute you’re a sal-low 18-year-old taking his first sociology course; and the next, you’re a semi-retired codger of 76.



People have asked me how and why I became a sociologist, and in these dark times (bad, but not as bad as the Nazi era that I and my parents went through), it’s important to emphasize the importance of sociology because, if you Google the word “sociology,” you

come up with some strange things, like: “sociology is useless for getting a job,” etc. So, we need better public relations. Hopefully, this essay will help.

My tale begins on December 2, 1944. I was born during World War II or as they call it in Russia, the “Great War of the Fatherland,” in a bombed-out hospital in Rovno (today called Rivnie in Ukraine), formerly part of Poland.

My father, Irving Porter (Srulik Puchtik originally), was a commander in a mostly-Jewish partisan *otryad* (fighting band) called the Kruk-Maks Group, led by a Polish Communist Yosef Sobiezek and a Ukrainian Communist named Nickolai Kanishchuk. This Soviet-trained group’s job was to blow up trains, food supplies, and police stations used by the German Army or the Nazi *Einatzgruppen* – a very dangerous job. My dad’s group personally killed 13 Nazis, and he was honored with the Partisan First Class Medal after the war.

My mom was a nurse and a cook, taking care of the wounded and feeding some 300 fighters and their families in the woods of Volynhia, Ukraine. She was the

sole survivor of her entire family. In all, I lost 25 members of my family: including two young sisters, age 4 and 2.

But we survived, and long story short, after a year in a DP camp in Austria, we came to America in 1946; spent a few weeks in New York; a few months in Chicago and, finally, settled in Milwaukee. I attended Sherman Elementary, Steuben Junior High, and Washington High School. (Why did they name so many schools after generals back then?)

I wanted to study in Israel, so at age 17, I went to Jerusalem and then lived on a socialist Kibbutz, Gesher Haziv, in the Western Galilee for a year. I wanted to go to Harvard. I had very-good grades in high school, but my parents had no money for Harvard, so I lived with my folks for four years and attended the University of Milwaukee-Milwaukee (UW-M).

It was a great urban school with wonderful teachers: Irwin Rinder, Donald Noel, Don Weast, and Lakshmi Bhara-waj. It was there I became a sociologist. My first class was with the dynamic Prof. Karl Flaming. One day, he asked us to write about our grandparents. I went to his office after class and sadly said:

“Prof. Flaming, I have no grandparents”

“That’s strange, you are only 19 or 20 years old; you should have at least one”

“I know. Everyone in your class has one, but I don’t; they all died in the war”

And then he said the six words that made me into a sociologist:

“Jack, maybe you should study that.”

And so, I did. I became a sociologist in order to understand why I had no grandparents and very few uncles, aunts, and cousins.

I became a sociologist in order to understand why I had no grandparents and very few uncles, aunts, and cousins.

The Holocaust made me into a sociologist.

At UW-M, I had teachers who were also refugees from Nazism; people like Hugo Engelmann and his “crazy” theories of society; I was also mentored by Prof. Werner Cahnmann, who was a towering figure in New York and helped preserve many Jewish cemeteries and monuments in Europe that had been vandalized and abandoned.

After UW-M, I was fortunate to have been accepted to Northwestern University. I didn’t have such a great grade point average overall (the usual college slump after high school), but I had a 3.9 average in sociology courses, plus I must have done very well on the sociology SATs.

It was a heady time, 1967-1971. One of my fellow students was Lee Weiner of the Chicago 7/Chicago 8 Conspiracy Trial.

Again, great teachers: Janet Abu-Lughod, Richard Schwartz, Bernie Beck, Charlie Moskos, and Scott Greer, but the one that mesmerized all of us with his quiet charisma was Howard S. (Howie) Becker, as he led us into

the field of participant observation and social deviance.

And that was the factor that led me to study the Holocaust and genocide. I wanted to understand “evil”, or at least the weird, the marginal, the stigmatized; in short, the deviant.

I applied deviance theory to Nazis, and I was one of the first – and maybe the only one – in my cohort generation to do so in sociology.

There is a great line in a movie called Homicide by David Mamet; in it, a Jewish cop played by Joe Mantegna collars a crazy guy who has just killed somebody, and this nut asks Mantegna’s character, Detective Gold, “Do you want to know the meaning of evil?”

And Gold retorts: “No, man; I don’t; otherwise, I’d be out of a job.”

Well, my job was to study the meaning of evil, and in my many books from *Genocide and Human Rights*, to *The Jew as Outsider*, to *Confronting History and Holocaust*, to *Sexual Politics in Nazi Germany*, to *The Genocidal Mind: Sociological and Sexual Perspectives*, to *Predicting Genocide and Terrorism*, I have tried to understand, predict, and help prevent evil.

Most people come to Holocaust or genocide studies via history, political science, or even literary analysis, but I was intrigued with deviance: thus, my writings dealt with “Holocaustal Suicides,” the sociology of the perpetrators, the mind of Hitler, Himmler, and Goebbels, the persecution of homosexuals and lesbians, the

deviant sexual nature of Nazi leaders, and most recently the sexual attacks (rape, abuse) against Jewish women, not only by Nazis but by Russians and others after the war. This is called *gendercide*.

For my 50 years of work in this field, I was nominated in 2016 for a Nobel Peace Prize by three prominent scholars and teachers: a historian, a sociologist, and a former State Department official.

But I have always remained a sociologist and I am proud to have become a sociologist. It helped me understand my life as a child-survivor of the Shoah and for that I am forever grateful.

### Bibliographical Sources

*If Only You Could Bottle it: Memoirs of a Radical Son*, Academic Studies Press (ASP), forthcoming in 2021. Order from ASP.


*The Radical Writings of Jack Nusan Porter*, Academic Studies Press, 2020.

*Courage, Resilience, and Faith: The Life and Legacy of My Parents: Srulik and Feige Porter*, by Bella Porter, 2012. Written by my late sister, it can be ordered through me.

"From Holocaust to Genocide Studies: A Personal Odyssey, an essay," 2020. Can be gotten from me by email.

*Happy Days Revisited: Growing Up Jewish in Ike's America (about growing up in Milwaukee, Wisconsin)*, The Spencer Press, 2010.

*Milwaukee Memories*, The Spencer Press, 2011



Jack Nusan Porter can be reached at [porter\\_jack@comcast.net](mailto:porter_jack@comcast.net). His life and work can be seen in an entry in Wikipedia and also in a profile in *The New Yorker*, “Talk of the Town” by Ben McGrath, April 19, 2012.

## Reflections on ASA Lifetime Achievement Award

By Marcel Fournier, University of Montreal

It is not so easy to write a “short piece” about the ASA History of Sociology Lifetime Achievement award I received recently. Two questions come to mind: 1) Do I have to speak about this award and how

prestigious it is? 2) Should I speak about my own career and how successful it has been?

Concerning the first question, I agree that, for a historian of sociology, no honor is more meaningful than this recognition for lifetime achievement. Few scholars

have ever received such awards: Norbert Wiley, Aldon Morris, Stephen Turner, Hans Joas, Steven Lukes, Donald N. Levine, Jennifer Platt, Charles Camic, Edward Tiryakian, Robert Alun Jones, Irving Louis Horowitz, Susan Hoecker-Drysdale, etc. We could undertake a critical analysis of this “selection” of authors: most of them are male, American, etc. Some of their works are more empirical, others more theoretical, some are about classical sociologists, others about contemporary sociologists, some are about sociology as a discipline and others about sociology as a profession. But we know that the books each of them has published are important and original. The quality of the works is the central criteria for peer evaluation, so I’m proud to be on this list.

In our field of research, which is not different from the other sociological specializations, there is a great diversity of theoretical and methodological perspectives, with many debates and conflicts, today more than ever before. One of the main theoretical-methodological oppositions is between the history of sociology (which focuses on historical contexts) and social thought (which focuses on the history of ideas). The section History of Sociology, founded in 1999, is one of the ASA’s small sections and must compete with the Theory section, which is older (founded in 1968) and has more active members. It was therefore decided to change the name of the section to include a reference to social thought. The new name of our section – History of Sociology and Social Thought – reflects the theoretical-methodological opposition mentioned above and I hope it will not be the source of dogmatic conflicts but of open discussions.

As for my career, when I was a student at the *École Pratique des Hautes Études* (now *Écoles des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales*), Pierre Bourdieu, who was my PhD supervisor, invited me to publish my first two academic papers in the *Revue française de sociologie*, the first about theory, “*Réflexions théoriques et méthodologiques à propos de l’ethnoscience*” (Fournier, 1971), and the second about the history of Quebec sociology, “*L’influence de la sociologie française au*

*Québec*” (Fournier, 1972). The topic of my PhD thesis was the “Institutionalization of social sciences in Quebec” (Fournier, 1973). In the 1980s, I became a member of the editorial board of *Études durkheimiennes. Bulletin d’information*, now *Durkheimian Studies/Études Durkheimiennes*. Philippe Besnard was the founder (1977) and the editor. There, I published one of my first papers on Durkheim, “*Durkheim, L’Année sociologique et l’art*” (Fournier, 1987). A few years later, I published my book on Marcel Mauss (Fournier, 1994) and (edited with Besnard) the letters from Durkheim to Mauss himself, his nephew (Durkheim, 1998). At that time, there was a debate about the nature of the history of sociology: is it about social thought and the adaptation of ideas to new social realities (Stjepan Mestrovic [1992] was during that period the “pet peeve” of the *Bulletin*), or about the discipline of sociology, its context, and its institutionalization? This opposition was between history and philosophy.

for a historian of sociology,  
no honor is more meaningful  
than this recognition for  
lifetime achievement.


The *Bulletin* was mainly on the side of history with a sociological perspective, and published archives (correspondences, manuscripts, etc.). My first interest was social theory and for many years, I taught “Contemporary theoretical debates in sociology”. Soon I made two decisions: 1) to concentrate my research efforts not on the history of Quebec sociology but on the French School of sociology (Durkheim, Mauss, etc.), and 2) not only to read the authors and teach their theories but also to do empirical research about their ways of life and work as well as the institutional, cultural, and political contexts of the discipline of sociology. I became a historian, deriving great pleasure from discovering archives and interviewing people. But I did so with a sociological perspective – Bourdieu’s theory of the field, etc. and also a reflexive bias about what writing the history of sociology means. A history of sociology should be, by definition, a historical sociology and defend to a large extent relativism, or the idea that every society has its own sociology: every sociology is ‘local’ and has ‘local’ roots. Nevertheless, it tends also to be comparative, to be part of an international network and (why not?) to have a universalistic dimension.

In the social sciences today, one of the great challenges is the critical postcolonial perspective with its ‘radical’ relativism. Many books are an uprooting (“*déboulonnage*”) of our Western, white, and male pioneers and founders. These critics claim that Durkheim, Marx, Weber, Parsons, and others were people of their time and of their countries, with their biases and prejudices (ex. Stroczkowski 2019). The question then is not only how but also *who* can write this ‘new’ critical history of sociology? I hope we will be able to avoid dogmatism and to maintain an openness towards universalism.

### Bibliographical Sources

- Émile Durkheim, 1998. *Lettres à Marcel Mauss*, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, Edition and presentation: Philippe Besnard and Marcel Fournier).
- Fournier, Marcel, 1971. « Réflexions théoriques et méthodologiques à propos de l’ethnoscience », *Revue française de sociologie*, pp. 459-482.
- Fournier, Marcel, 1972. « L’Influence de la sociologie française au Québec », *Revue française de sociologie*, pp. 665.
- Fournier, Marcel, 1987. « Durkheim, L’Année sociologique et l’art », *Études durkheimiennes*, pp.1-11.

- Fournier, Marcel, 1994. *Marcel Mauss*, Paris, Fayard.
- Mestrovic, Stjepan, 1992 *Durkheim and the Postmodern Culture*, New York, Aldine de Gruyter.
- Stroczkowski, Wiktor , 2019. *La science sociale comme vision du monde. Émile Durkheim et le miracle du salut*, Paris, Gallimard.



## The ASA Committee on Presidential Biographies – A First Report

By Stefan Bargheer, Aarhus Institute of Advanced Studies

**W**ho should count as a founder of sociology? While only few sociologists would fail to identify Marx, Weber, and Durkheim as founders, there is arguably only a handful of contemporaries who would be prepared to also name the scholars who established the discipline in the United States. The way we remember the history of our discipline pays a premium to the names of grand theorists. With theorists being eulogized as founders, the role played by institution builders often falls to the wayside. Many of the early presidents of the American Sociological Association – initially called American Sociological Society – belong into the latter category, regardless of the acclaim that their work had at the time and

regardless of the contribution that they made to the foundation of sociology as an academic discipline.

The biographies of the by now more than hundred presidents of the American Sociological Association are available on the website of the association, yet the record is rather uneven, if not to say incomplete. (<https://www.asanet.org/about/governance-and-leadership/council/presidents>) Compared to the ASA centennial publication *Sociology in American: A History* (Edited by Craig Calhoun, 2007), the presidential biographies on the ASA website reflect the breadth and sophistication of the available scholarship on the history of the discipline only incompletely. To address this

situation, the History of Sociology Section has created a Committee on ASA Presidential Biographies (CAPB) that organizes the revision of the biographical profiles.

Looking at the biographies that are currently available, one cannot fail to notice how much the discipline has transformed over time. Not only the leading theories, methods, and empirical topics of sociology have changed over time, but also the political circumstances under which sociologists produced their work. Among the previous generations of ASA presidents are sociologists who used their scholarship to promote human and civil rights and to defend democracy against fascism and communism, and later, against anti-communism, i.e., McCarthyism and the red scare. Yet there were also those who took a stand in favor of – not in opposition to – racial segregation, immigration restriction, prohibition of mixed marriages, and eugenic sterilization laws. While the former set of engagements rarely fails to be mentioned, the latter is frequently, albeit not always, overlooked. History, the history of the ASA and its leading officers included, can be a treasure trove of ideas and prove inspirational, yet it can also be an equally important reminder that some ideas – and those from whom they originate – are forgotten for good reasons.

The more dated and by today's standards more problematic views of former presidents are not exclusively a reflection of the society in which they were produced, but also of the fact that the ASA was initially everything but diverse. The early history of the association was dominated by American born white men. The first immigrant (i.e., scholar born and educated outside the United States) took office in 1940, the first African American in 1948, and the first woman in 1952. Up to this point in time, the topic of diversity was largely restricted to the question of regional representation. Since then, the constitution of the ASA and the rules and procedures for electing presidents have changed, and so has the status of the association within American sociology and its relation to sociologists in other countries. Given these transformations, it would be

farfetched to argue that the biographies of the presidents of the ASA provide a window into the history of American sociology at large. What they nevertheless provide a window into is the way the discipline remembers its past.

To some extent, no doubt, the current state of the online biographies owes to the fact that they were produced for very different purposes. As they stand, the biographies fall into at least four segments. One segment, beginning with Ward in 1906-1907 and running through the 1923 presidency, is a series of biographies written by Michael Murphy, a former ASA staff member and inaugurator of the project. In a second segment, spanning the time from 1924 to 1952, entries vary substantially in length and rely heavily on Howard Odum's *American Sociology* (1951) and a number of additional sources that range from biographical information taken from archive catalogues to obituaries. The reliance on the work of Odum is among the main

**Looking at the biographies  
that are currently available,  
one cannot fail to notice  
how much the discipline  
has transformed over time.**

reasons for the silence problematic content. His history of sociology is in large parts a hagiography of scholars who, like Odum himself, had previously served as presidents of the ASA. Points of view on race and related topics that by then were no longer deemed acceptable were simply left

unaddressed, most likely a reflection of the fact that many early twentieth century sociological works, including Odum's own publications from this time, smacked of racial stereotypes. A third version of the biographies begins in 1953 and offers a uniformly very brief treatment of each president, with many being only one or two sentences long. The fourth and current form consists of portraits written by contemporary colleagues – usually as election profiles for *Footnotes* – and begins with the biography of the president serving in 2000.

The need for a revision of the presidential biographies was first raised in an email of a concerned ASA member to the Executive Director Nancy Kidd in summer 2018. The email correspondent argued that the current online biography of Edward A. Ross “doesn't address his leadership in the eugenics movement, leaves out his



racist viewpoints that resulted in calls for his resignation at Stanford, and his support of the State of Wisconsin's sterilization law of 1913." The email further suggested that it would be desirable to edit the biography to reflect that the association does not endorse Ross's views and recognizes the harm they might have done. In response to this email and comparable communications addressing also the biographies of other former presidents, Kidd turned to then-President Bonilla-Silva who recommended asking the History of Sociology Section whether they would be interested in undertaking this project. The then-Chair Elect Gillian Niebrugge-Brantley and Past Chair David Swartz of the section responded positively to the initiative. Following the 2019 Annual Meeting in New York, an ad-hoc group working out guidelines for the revision process was set up. Upon approval of these guidelines by the Executive Committee in spring 2020, the Committee on ASA Presidential Biographies (CAPB) was formed.

CAPB is charged with two tasks: first, overseeing the revision of the currently available online presidential biographies, and second, establishing and maintaining a process for recruitment of biographies of new presidents. The committee consist of five members of the History of Sociology Section plus as ex officio

members the current Section Chair and a representative of the ASA Executive Office. CAPB members from the section are appointed by the Section Chair in consultation with the Section Council and Section Members; the ASA Executive Office representative is appointed by the ASA Executive Director. CAPB members serve for three years, following a first series of staggered terms.

Proposals are currently solicited for the first twenty-eight presidents holding office from 1906 until 1938 (the first five presidents served two-year terms) and are due on March 1, 2021. The call is open to all sociologists who have an interest in engaging more closely with the biography of one of the association's presidents. Biographies can be single or co-authored and neither section membership nor a previous engagement with the biography of the proposed president is a requirement. The revision of the biographies aims for a unified style with an eye toward readability by the public. The revised biographies are not intended to be exhaustive, but to provide a first impression for a lay audience interested in sociology and a starting point for scholars who do research on the history of the discipline. Calls for the presidents who took office since 1939 will follow once the first wave nears completion.

## Extended Deadline: Call for ASA Online Presidential Biographies

The Committee on ASA Presidential Biographies (CAPB) seeks contributions for a revision of the biographies of the Association's more than one hundred former presidents available on its website: <https://www.asanet.org/about-asa/asa-story/asa-history/past-asa-officers/presidents>

The Online Presidential Biographies are one of the tools that the Association uses to remember the history of the discipline and to present it to the public. In order to close gaps in the existing record and to bring the biographies up to date with recent scholarship, the Committee seeks single or co-authored biographies that meet scholarly standards, while written in a publicly accessible style. Contributions shall not exceed 900 words, plus a select bibliography of original and

secondary sources.

The revision of the biographies will be carried out in several waves. For the current inaugural wave, proposals are solicited for biographies of the presidents serving from 1906 to 1938. Prospective authors are asked to submit a short letter of interest and a CV by March 1, 2021. The call is open to all scholars willing to engage with the relevant sources. Previous publications on the president in question are not a requirement. Applicants will be informed about the decision by March 15, 2021.

All contributing authors will be provided with publication guidelines in order to ensure consistency in style. The completed biographies are due nine months after the receipt of the acceptance letter and are subject to a

final editorial review by the committee prior to publication on the ASA website. All biographies will list the name of the author(s).

For further questions and to submit proposals, please contact the chair of the Committee, Stefan Bargheer: [bargheer@aias.au.dk](mailto:bargheer@aias.au.dk)

Committee on ASA Presidential Biographies (CAPB):

Stefan Bargheer (chair)  
Kevin Anderson  
Erynn Masi de Casanova  
Kerby Goff  
Bradley Nash, Jr.  
David Swartz  
Joyce E. Williams

## Recent and Current Member Publications

### Kevin Anderson:

- *Dialectics of Revolution: Hegel, Marxism, and Its Critics Through a Lens of Race, Class, Gender, and Colonialism*, Ottawa, Ontario: Daraja Press, 242 pp. (Collection of essays, a number of them not published previously. Dialectics is treated in a variety of settings, from Hegel and the French Revolution to today. With a particular focus on the dialectic in Lenin, Lukács, Marcuse, and Dunayevskaya, the book also responds to critiques of dialectical thinking by Derrida, Foucault, Negri, Bourdieu, and Rorty. This twenty-first century introduction to the dialectics of revolution highlights race and gender as well as capital and class.)
- *Raya Dunayevskaya's Intersectional Marxism: Race, Class, Gender, and the Dialectics of Liberation*, edited by Kevin B. Anderson, Kieran Durkin, and Heather Brown, New York: Palgrave-Macmillan, 350 pp. (This collection of essays, from a diverse group of writers, brings to life Dunayevskaya's important contributions. Revisiting her rich legacy, the contributors to this volume engage with her penetrating dialectics of liberation that is connected to Black, labor, and women's liberation and to struggles over alienation and exploitation the world over. Dunayevskaya's Marxist-Humanism is recovered for the twenty-first century and turned, as it was with Dunayevskaya herself, to face the multiple alienations and de-humanizations of social life.)
- "Karl Marx," *Cambridge Handbook of Social Theory*, ed. Peter Kivisto, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 45-64.
- "Nationalism and Ethnicity," in *The Marx Revival*, ed. Marcello Musto, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 212-231 (also appeared in Italian.)

### Anthony Blasi:

- *The SAGE Encyclopedia of the Sociology of Religion*, ed. Adam Possamai and Anthony J. Blasi. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 2020 (2 vols). (This is a reference work that your libraries should have; please check whether they have it.)
- *The Abuse of Minors in the Catholic Church. Dismantling the Culture of Cover Ups*, ed. Anthony J. Blasi and Lluís Oviedo. New York: Routledge, 2020. (This is a collection of strictly scientific studies, avoiding the sensationalism often associated with the subject.)
- "Religious Freedom and Microsociology of Law: Thinking with Georges Gurvitch," Anthony J. Blasi, Olga Breskaya, and Giuseppe Giordan. *Sociologia. Rivista Quadrimestrale di Scienze Storiche e Sociali* 54(3): 44-51. (Gurvitch was a classical theorist in the sociology of law, largely in the French-speaking sector of academia. He left Russia in the Leninist era and is at present being rediscovered by Russian scholars. We apply his approach to some European and American cases of religion/state relations.)

**Kieran Durkin:**

- “Adventures in the Anti-humanist Dialectic: Towards the Re-appropriation of Humanism.” *European Journal of Social Theory*. Forthcoming (2021).
- *Raya Dunayevskaya’s Intersectional Marxism: Race, Class, Gender, and the Dialectics of Liberation*, edited by Kevin B. Anderson, Kieran Durkin, and Heather Brown, New York: Palgrave-Macmillan, 350 pp. edited by Kevin B. Anderson, Kieran Durkin, and Heather Brown, New York: Palgrave-Macmillan (2021).
- *Erich Fromm’s Critical Theory: Hope, Humanism, and the Future*, edited by Kieran Durkin and Joan Braune (2020).

**Timothy M. Gill:**

- *The Future of U.S. Empire in the Americas: The Trump Administration and Beyond*. New York: Routledge Press. Gill, Timothy, M. 2000. (With the rise of President Trump, many are coming to question where the United States (U.S.) is headed and, whether we might witness an imperial decline under Trump. Social scientists largely recognize the contemporary hegemonic position of the U.S. at the global level, but questions persist concerning the future of the U.S. Empire. With the Trump Administration at the helm, these questions are all the more salient. Drawing on the expertise of a panel of contributors and guided by Michael Mann’s model of power, this book critically interrogates the future of U.S. global power and provides insights on what we might expect from the U.S. Empire under Trump. Recognizing that U.S. imperial power involves an array of sources of power (ideological, economic, military, and political), the contributors analyze the Trump Administration’s approach towards nine countries in the Western Hemisphere, and five sets of global policies, including inter-American relations, drugs, trade, the environment, and immigration. Each case presents a historical look at the trajectory of relations as they have developed under Trump and what we might expect in the future from the administration. *The Future of U.S. Empire in the Americas* will be of great interest to students and scholars of U.S. foreign policy, Foreign Policy Analysis, political sociology, and American politics.)
- “Beyond the IFIs, Beyond USAID in Chavista Venezuela: Promoting the Free Market in the Middle-Income World,” *Sociology of Development* 6(4): 417-436. Gill, Timothy M. 2020. (Many scholars assert that the U.S. state promotes free market economic policies abroad through the leverage it wields within international financial institutions (IFIs), such as the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. Other scholars have focused on U.S. bilateral aid programs, such as those implemented by USAID, and their emphasis on free market economic policies. In many middle-income countries, though, IFIs and U.S. development agencies do not maintain economic development programs. If the U.S. state cannot promote free market policies through IFIs and its bilateral development agencies, how does it promote them at all in middle-income countries? In this paper, I provide a case study of U.S. foreign policy toward Venezuela, a middle-income country, under the government of President Hugo Chávez (1999–2013). I draw on interviews with U.S. state elites, including several former ambassadors and State Department employees, and U.S. state documents to show how the U.S. encourages free market economic reforms through its support for civil society organizations that embrace these reforms. In particular, I focus on the work of the Center for International Private Enterprise, which has explicitly linked political freedom with economic freedom. Through this organization, the U.S. works with free market think tanks and promotes free market initiatives, all in the form of political rather than economic assistance.)

**Elizabeth Seale:**

- “Strategies for Post-Culture-of-Poverty Research on Poverty, Meaning, and Behavior.” *The American Sociologist* 51(4): 402-424. Seale, Elizabeth 2020. Available at: <https://rdcu.be/b6j2T>.

**Filipe Carreira da Silva:**

- *The Politics of the Book. A Study on the Materiality of Ideas.* University Park: Penn State University Press. Silva, F.C. and Brito Vieira, M. 2019 (<https://www.psupress.org/books/titles/978-0-271-08342-1.html>) (Abstract: It is impossible to separate the content of a book from its form. In this study, Filipe Carreira da Silva and Mónica Brito Vieira expand our understanding of the history of social and political scholarship by examining how the entirety of a book mediates and constitutes meaning in ways that affect its substance, appropriation, and reception over time. Examining the evolving form of classic works of social and political thought, including W. E. B. Du Bois's *The Souls of Black Folk*, G. H. Mead's *Mind, Self, and Society*, and Karl Marx's 1844 *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts*, Carreira da Silva and Brito Vieira show that making these books involved many hands. They explore what publishers, editors, translators, and commentators accomplish by offering the reading public new versions of the works under consideration, examine debates about the intended meaning of the works and discussions over their present relevance, and elucidate the various ways in which content and material form are interwoven. In doing so, Carreira da Silva and Brito Vieira characterize the editorial process as a meaning-producing action involving both collaboration and an ongoing battle for the importance of the book form to a work's disciplinary belonging, ideological positioning, and political significance. Theoretically sophisticated and thoroughly researched, *The Politics of the Book* radically changes our understanding of what doing social and political theory—and its history—implies. It will be welcomed by scholars of book history, the history of social and political thought, and social and political theory.)

**Natalia Ruiz-Junco:**

- “On the Shoulders of Citers: Notes on the Organization of Intellectual Deference.” *The Sociological Quarterly* 61:567-587. Brossard, Baptiste, and Natalia Ruiz-Junco. 2020.

**Helmut Staubmann:**

- Helmut Staubmann “C. Wright Mills’ *The Sociological Imagination* and the Construction of Talcott Parsons as a Conservative Grand Theorist.” In: *The American Sociologist* Vol. 52 (1) (Special Issue on *Talcott Parsons and Politics*, guest editors: Victor Lidz and Helmut Staubmann), online first published October 10, 2020 (Open access: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s12108-020-09463-z>).

## Upcoming Section Events

Stay tuned for upcoming workshops in our *New Voices in the History of Sociology* series. Jonny Bunning will be presenting his new project, “*The Value of a Wife’: Price, Politics, and the Economic Struggle Over Housework in the Long 1970s*” in February. There will be a workshop following this in the Spring also.