

Berkeley Sociology: Past, Present and Future

Michael Burawoy and Jonathan VanAntwerpen

November 2001

The University of California at Berkeley was the last great American university to establish a department of sociology. It came into existence after Chicago, Harvard, and Columbia were well established with dominant traditions of their own... The size of the staff, the size of the student body, and the amplitude of resources all made for centrifugality. The high degree of institutionalization coexisted with a diversity of standpoints, so that the department gained eminence as an aggregation of outstanding and productive sociologists whose works drew the attention of the country and the world but it lacked the coherence which Durkheim, Park, and Parsons gave to their respective circles of colleagues, collaborators, and students. We know from Chicago in its earlier years and from Harvard and Columbia in the several decades after the Second World War how effective a unitary center created by one dominant or two strong consensual figures is. It remains to be seen whether a pluralistic assemblage of eminent figures can be equally effective. Thus far, Berkeley has not shown its capacity to create a *Nachwuchs* which will renew the department while unifying it or to produce a body of graduates who will diffuse its "line" more widely in the United States.

— Edward Shils, 1970

In his Olympian overview of American sociology, Edward Shils, the discipline's conservative *eminence grise*, saw Berkeley as an upstart center of sociology, created from scratch in the 1950s. It hosted a random conglomeration of stars who had been attracted by the largesse of the University of California. He was skeptical whether such a nouveau riche department without any traditions could sustain itself alongside the great departments of Chicago, Columbia and Harvard. Thirty years later, what should we make of his reflections? Has Berkeley managed to create a *Nachwuchs*, a new generation of sociologists who develop a distinctive sociology, or a body of graduate students who diffuse its line? Or is it as splintered, divided and incoherent as Shils thought it was in the 1960s? Furthermore, how accurate was his depiction of the department even then? Was he right to think that for a department to have intellectual coherence, it requires the stamp of a dominant "consensual figure," as Shils claimed was the case for Harvard, Columbia and Chicago? Can a departmental community sustain a tradition without some "great man" at the helm?

As Berkeley sociologists, we must admit at the outset that such questions are, for us, more than a matter of idle historical curiosity. Rather, we have a stake in the story we are about to tell. In this sense, we partake of a longstanding tradition within sociology, one that continues to this day. From Robert Park and Talcott Parsons to Robert Nisbet and Alvin Gouldner, twentieth century American sociologists have storied their discipline's past with a view to current concerns.¹ Whether attempting to reclaim the

classics or arguing that canonical commitments must be reconfigured, sociologists have repeatedly turned to the history of sociology in order to build or dismantle, construct or deconstruct, one “sociological tradition” or another. If the penchant of sociologists to rebuild their discipline with reference to the past is laudable, however, sociological “authors of their own lives” have not been without their critics. “A sociologist writing the history of sociology,” claimed historian Laurence Veysey in 1978, “remains, from the historian’s point of view, an amateur, no different in principle from an untrained Mormon writing the history of Mormonism. Particularistic intellectual commitments inhibit balanced clarity of vision regarding a certain time and place, in the academic world as in any other.”²

As we will argue, a history of Berkeley sociology is long overdue. But how, in light of our “particularistic commitments,” should such a history be written? Rather than despairing in the face of supposedly unattainable “objectivity,” or making unconvincing noises about our lack of intellectual “inhibition,” we have chosen to avail ourselves of a *reflexive* approach to sociological practice that we see as distinctive of sociology at Berkeley. Characterized by an openness to dialogue and discussion of ends, reflexive sociology sees the writing of sociology’s history as a means to more sophisticated sociological self-understanding. It asks, following Alvin Gouldner, not just what sociologists are doing, but what they should be doing.³ It seeks, following Pierre Bourdieu, to objectify the objectifiers, not by ignoring the contentious processes in which and through which sociology’s history is constructed and reconstructed, but by thematizing and theorizing them. Attempting to practice reflexive sociology, sociologists writing histories of sociology can contribute to a better understanding of their discipline – re-constructing its past with a view to re-visioning its future.

As is widely recognized, Berkeley sociology has been a major departmental force in postwar American sociology. What is less understood is how, and why, and to what effect. To be sure, Berkeley has seen a succession of remarkable intellectual figures pass through its corridors. Edward Shils is correct, however, to claim that no one of them has ever successfully imposed his or her viewpoint on the department. Berkeley sociology has been remarkably impervious to its constitution as a “school,” defined by the work of some “great man” who offers a “line” to be disseminated throughout the discipline. But this does not mean that it has been or continues to be incoherent in its intellectual vision or sociological practice. If a commitment to practicing reflexive sociology is an important element of sociology at Berkeley, its complement, we will argue, is a distinctive understanding of sociology’s aim and audience, born of Berkeley sociology’s contentious history – what we will call “public sociology.”

Public sociology is less a *vision of* than it is an *orientation toward* the practice of sociology. It is a sociology that is oriented toward major problems of the day, one that attempts to address them with the tools of social science, and in a manner often informed by historical and comparative perspectives. It is a sociology that seeks as its audience not just other sociologists, but wider communities of discourse, from policy makers to subaltern counter-publics. In its robustly reflexive mode, sociology manifests itself as a public sociology designed to promote public reflection on significant social issues. But it

has a more instrumental mode too, a “policy sociology” with specifically defined goals, responsive to the needs and interests of specific clients. Characterized by both reflexive and public sociology, the Berkeley department has consistently reached out to worlds and issues beyond the walls of its academic home – and just as often has found those worlds and issues breaching the walls from the other side. The practice of Berkeley sociology has been transformed as a result of this mutual interaction.

Just as Berkeley sociology has been attentive to the world beyond the immediate academic environment, so we as students of its history aim to reproduce that attentiveness in our own account. Context is all-important in understanding the trajectory of the department. Unlike so many histories of the Chicago department, for example, which dwell on its internal composition, institutions and conflicts, and make scant reference to external forces, we shall continually reference the influence of outside forces – whether that influence has been exercised through its unconscious insinuation or by active selection. Indeed, this sensitivity to the external, so deeply embedded in the Berkeley sociologist’s intellectual habitus, explains in part why the department should have been so often the site of conflict and struggle.

But we should not think of Berkeley sociology as a blank slate upon which the external world inscribes its rhythms and its tensions, a helpless victim of forces it does not control or of calculating revolutionaries who seek to destabilize its mission. Countering the invading forces and external involvements have been the tendency, necessarily strong in any major department of sociology, toward a more academic logic. At the core of this academic logic is “professional sociology” – the antithesis of a public sociology – claiming an archimedean point outside of the world it studies. Professional sociology adopts the mantle of science to prosecute detached research with its own autonomous norms of development, its distinctive career paths, and its own institutions. Within the academy, however, there is also an oppositional sociology, one that denies the very possibility of detachment and insulation, and denounces the pretence of professional sociology as an act of interested self-deception. In the case of Berkeley sociology, this “critical sociology” helped to set the stage for an increasingly important public sociology. By successfully chipping away at the edifice of professional sociology, critical sociologists made room for a greater degree of departmental reflexivity, and for a sense of sociology and sociologists as intimately connected to the worlds they study.

In our short history of Berkeley sociology, we argue that these four sociologies – public, policy, professional and critical – have continuously coexisted within the department. What has changed is their configuration, their relation one to the other. They have existed in a contested hierarchy that is continually shifting, although nearly always dominated by professional sociology. Even at Berkeley it would be hard to say that public sociology preempts, or ever has, the commitments of a professional sociology. The configuration of these sociological types involves a system of complex and antagonistic interdependencies that have torn the Berkeley department apart but have also been the basis of enormously creative research and teaching. This is the line of argument we take up in the second section of the paper, which presents an interpretation of the institutional transformations and practices that we outline in the first section. We begin

by considering why the department has never been the object of any serious historical analysis. We then critically examine the folk theory of the department's origins and development, the notion that it was created at one point in time, and by one man, who fabricated its ecumenical character in pursuit of scholarly excellence. Instead we show that there was a vibrant sociology before Herbert Blumer's arrival in 1952, whose form and content was further elaborated in the years that followed. The department was shaped by a diverse array of sociologists and social forces, and Blumer was but its titular head and that only for a relatively short time. Following our attempt to dispel the myths concerning Berkeley sociology's past, and to replace them with a more compelling historical narrative, we return to our typology of sociologies – professional and policy, public and critical – examining them in more detail and using them to capture the dynamism and transformation of the department.

A Department without a History

Unlike Harvard, Columbia and especially Chicago, a department that regularly digs and redigs its past, no one has written an official history of the Berkeley sociology department – this despite its colorful past and its elevated status in the world of postwar American sociology. This absence of historical self-consciousness fits well with Shils' view of the department as atomized and incoherent, having no traditions to speak off, and representing merely “a pluralistic assemblage of eminent figures.” And there is no doubt some truth to this claim. The Berkeley department has indeed been very much composed of individual intellectual endeavors, rather than being constituted as a collective enterprise. The lone intellectual producing the groundbreaking book has been, and quite often continues to be, the ideal to which Berkeley sociologists aspire. This applies to both faculty and graduate students. Only recently has the department produced collaborative ventures such as *Habits of the Heart*, *The Good Society* and *Inequality by Design*. And these more recent collective projects perhaps represent a greater sense of intellectual community.

Not only the atomization of intellectual endeavor, but also the divisions within the department have made the construction of a singular historical narrative about Berkeley sociology quite difficult. No one person or group of people, one might argue, could ever muster the credibility to write a history without it being rejected out of hand by an alternative group. Indeed, when we presented this paper at a departmental colloquium, its narrative and interpretive frame were challenged and criticized from all quarters. In a contentious department, historical narratives and interpretations are a contentious matter, a terrain of struggle. But by the same token in a divided department one might expect that different groups would be intensely aware of history, and articulate their own narratives. While our initial interviews and conversations concerning Berkeley sociology have indeed revealed a wide array of contending narratives, however, we have encountered few systematic sociological interpretations of the events and transformations such narratives story. We have thus been struck both by a specific lack of familiarity

with the department's actual history, and by the general difficulties faced when sociologists attempt to turn their own theoretical tools back upon themselves.

No doubt the individualized character of Berkeley sociology as well as the conflicts within the department have contributed to a weakened historical consciousness and to the absence of departmental histories. But perhaps there is a simpler answer to the question, viz. the late development of Berkeley sociology. As we will see, its formal constitution as a department only began in 1946, and the folk wisdom is that Blumer created the department almost *ex nihilo* in 1952. Only in the last decade have the first cohort of sociologists, recruited during the postwar expansion of the department, retired and thus become objects (subjects) of "history." As a result, a number of "participant histories" have begun to appear, including the memoirs of Reinhard Bendix, Robert Nisbet, Charles Glock, and Bob Blauner, all important Berkeley sociologists during different stages of the department's formative years.⁴ Beyond these books, some of the most sustained autobiographical reflection has come, not surprisingly, from Berkeley women sociologists, many of them included in a volume edited by Kathryn Orlans and Ruth Wallace.⁵ Finally, a small book written Neil Smelser and Robin Content offers the most sociological account of a particular period in the department's history, namely the 1970s.⁶

In light of the extraordinarily limited historiography of Berkeley sociology, the historical narrative we construct here is but a first stab at what we hope will become an increasingly collective enterprise, and one that generates multiple historical accounts of the department. But a cautionary note is appropriate, since writing a history of one's own department is a risky business. As the "founding father" of Berkeley sociology, the redoubtable anti-sociologist, Frederick J. Teggart, frequently pronounced, "history is plural not singular." We must expect very different visions of our past, just as we should expect very different visions of the future. We should, in particular, avoid two pitfalls of self-study – pitfalls found in the history of other sociology departments – namely the temptation to defamation on the one side and to celebration on the other. Somehow we have to retain our sociological sensibilities, and our sociological imagination, when we train our eyes on ourselves.

A Myth Dispelled: Berkeley Sociology Before Blumer

Edward Shils' view, that a department achieves coherence through the presence of a dominant figure who stamps the collectivity with his (or her) character, finds resonance in Berkeley's retrospective attempts to create such a figure in the person of Herbert Blumer. Thus, Randall Collins, a graduate student at Berkeley in the 1960s, reproduces this vision in his exposition of four different sociological traditions. Describing Blumer's voyage West, in the 1950s, "to organize a famous sociology department at the University of California, Berkeley," Collins simply repeats the local folk wisdom that Herbert Blumer built the Berkeley Department of Sociology. This sense of departmental self is reinforced by Blumer's own treatment among contemporary Berkeley sociologists. On

the wall of the Sociology Department's "Blumer Room," an enlarged and centered photograph of Blumer – the smiling, pipe-smoking, clearly confident Founder of Berkeley sociology – jumps out from a sea of faculty faces, reminding students and faculty alike of Blumer's iconic importance.

Indeed, Blumer was recruited to chair the department in 1952, with a view to transforming a relative backwater into a first class department. And under his reign the Berkeley department did ascend to national prominence. But Blumer was not alone at Berkeley. Recruited and supported by Clark Kerr, and preceded by two other Kerr recruits, Reinhard Bendix, the industrial sociologist from Chicago, Seymour Martin Lipset, the political sociologist from Columbia, Blumer joined a University with a long sociological history. And Berkeley's sociology department had an already impressive list of sociological figures by the time he arrived. Apart from Lipset and Bendix, who would become among the most distinguished sociologists of their era, there was the China folklorist Wolfram Eberhard, the organization theorist Philip Selznick, social theorists Ken Bock and Robert Nisbet, the social psychologist Tamotsu Shibutani, and the economic historian Margaret Hodgen. This was already a department in the making, and in the years that followed Lipset and Bendix would lead the recruitment of the very eminent roster of sociologists who arrived during the 1950s, and who nurtured an increasing number of up-and-coming graduate students.

If there was indeed sociology at Berkeley before Blumer, when and how was the department created? One candidate for a founding date would be 1923, the year that Frederick Teggart, a fiery Irish immigrant, was given his own department, then called the Department of Social Institutions. But the presence of sociologists on the Berkeley campus can be traced back into the late 19th century. Perhaps Berkeley's earliest defender of sociology was Joseph LeConte. Originally a natural scientist who had worked in the areas of chemistry, biology and geology, LeConte came to Berkeley in 1868. Born and raised as a Southern plantation aristocrat, LeConte was a disciple of August Comte, and a proponent of "organic science." For LeConte, as for his precursor Comte, sociology was to be the crowning achievement of all scientific thought – raised on the foundation of all the other sciences. In a vein very similar to Spencer, LeConte would regard society as akin to the human body with its different parts, all working in harmony. This harmony should not be disrupted by arbitrary reforms, such as emancipation, that were out of sync with laws of society. Just as Comte represented notions of order and progress against the French Revolution, so LeConte would use his own organic science to defend the values and the institution of slavery. Ironically, the most unequivocal propagator of sociology at Berkeley was also perhaps one of its most conservative thinkers.⁷

Another figure in the early history of Berkeley sociology, and the first faculty member to be given a title by that name, was Jessica Peixotto. Peixotto received her PhD in 1900 under the tutelage of Bernard Moses, the founder of Berkeley's political science department. She was only the second woman to receive a PhD from Berkeley. In 1904 Peixotto was appointed "Lecturer in Sociology," giving a course on "Contemporary Socialism." But she quickly found the sociological label a liability, and by 1912 she had

become an assistant professor in “social economics.” Upon joining the economics department she became an uncompromising foe of sociology, regarding it, in the words of Robert Nisbet, as a “mixture of social uplift and metaphysical nonsense.”

Peixotto was joined in her opposition to sociology by Frederick J. Teggart. Indeed, had Teggart known LeConte, he would have regarded him as the quintessential charlatan, a living expression of sociology’s vacuity. While the two men shared a political conservatism, Teggart was an autodidact who had come up through the ranks. He had received his degree from Stanford in 1894, and by 1900 had worked his way up to become the librarian of the Mechanics-Mercantile Library in San Francisco. After an earthquake destroyed the library, he moved to Berkeley’s Bancroft Library, becoming its curator. At Berkeley, he also taught courses, first in the University Extension and then in the history department. But his relations with faculty in the history department were so stormy that in 1919 the University offered him a special Professorship of Social Institutions, to be located in the Political Science Department. Impressed by his scholarship – or was it his cantankerous character? – the University offered him a department of his own in 1923. It was to be called the Department of Social Institutions.

Who was Teggart? What did he stand for? And what was this Department of Social Institutions? Teggart the man was a formidable character. According to Robert Nisbet, his most illustrious student, he was one of the great orators on campus. Students from all disciplines would flock to his introductory course on social theory, in which he expounded on the flaws of all “unilinear histories” – whether the linear narratives of historians or the speculative evolutionary theories of sociologists. Indeed, in this regard, he sounds very contemporary, almost poststructuralist. But Teggart’s aim was historical *science*. He wanted to study the correlation of events, and from that correlation to derive causal connections between events. That was his positive program. In his magnum opus, *Rome and China*, he traced invasions, migrations, and wars on one flank of the Roman Empire to their effects on the other flank. Thus, Teggart represents the beginning of Berkeley’s great tradition of comparative and historical inquiry, and may even be seen as the progenitor of its attention to globalization and transnationalism.

An early historical sociologist, Teggart would have been ill at ease with the progressive elements of that sub-discipline’s postwar rebirth.⁸ Although, according to Nisbet, he was one of the most learned faculty members on campus, he was also an archconservative, and opposed to the New Deal. Teggart was conservative not just in his politics but also in his personal style. He would never call anyone by their first name: “Familiarity,” he would say, “does not breed contempt, it is contempt.” With a foul temper and a raucous laughter, Teggart had contempt for more or less all sociology and contemporary social theory, although his sociological peers would claim that at least some of his disdain was the result of ignorance. Dorris Goodrich, an early graduate student of Robert Nisbet, recalled that Teggart was to have compared sociology with “the Dance of Seven Veils. One after another the veils are removed until at last one discovers ... nothing.” He regarded the dominant Chicago sociology of his time as muckraking social reform, hardly worth the attention of a serious mind. Not for the last time at Berkeley, Teggart’s sociology had a decidedly anti-sociological bent.

In many ways Teggart reminds one of another conservative immigrant sociologist, Pitirim Sorokin, who came to the United States after escaping the Bolshevik Revolution. Sorokin moved first to Minnesota, one of the top departments in the 1920s, and from there was given the chair of sociology at Harvard in 1931 with the brief to establish a new department. Both Teggart and Sorokin were reclusive, intemperate figures, contemptuous of their peers. Although one might say that both made important contributions to sociology, both were dismissive of the way it was practiced by fellow sociologists. Neither man was especially modest and both thought their own work was the true social science, while others at best only practiced pseudo-science. Both wrote with enormous erudition and knowledge about different civilizations and historical processes. Although both were department heads for a long time, their rather dogmatic and intimidating demeanor lost them a strong following. Both failed to effectively to build up their own school of sociology. And both were finally displaced in 1946. Sorokin gave way to the young up-and-coming Talcott Parsons who replaced the Department of Sociology with the new Harvard Department of Social Relations, while at Berkeley Teggart died in 1946, paving the way for sociology's institutional introduction.

As at Harvard, so at Berkeley, the displacement of the old regime was anything but smooth. Following his retirement in 1940, the University had moved to transform Teggart's small department into a Department of Sociology. Both Teggart and his disciple Margaret Hodgen had worked vigorously to block this shift in departmental norm and nomenclature, and they were joined in their opposition to "sociology" by faculty from well-established social science departments, such as A.L. Kroeber in Anthropology, Carl Sauer in Geography and Jessica Peixotto in Economics. Having succeeded at holding "the seductive name of sociology" at bay for many years, however, its opponents at Berkeley were beginning to dwindle by the 1940s, and even Kroeber apparently admitted that the University ought to have such a department. Thus, while Teggart and Hodgen kept sociology off the departmental masthead, if not out of the curriculum, through five more tumultuous years, in 1946 the department did finally change its name, to the Department of Sociology and Social Institutions.

Departmental disagreement was far from over, however. The first two potential chairs of the new departmental dispensation were both women, yet in 1946 neither one of them would get the position. While Margaret Hodgen had chaired the Department of Social Institutions after Teggart's retirement, University administrators were eager to remove her from the position, given her flair for contention – she was later to be one of the last remaining hold-outs in Berkeley's Loyalty Oath controversy – and her clear disdain for sociology. A rising star in the discipline of sociology, Hodgen's rival Dorothy Swaine Thomas had arrived at Berkeley just as Teggart was on his way out, and with the promise, Robert Nisbet later claimed, that she would eventually be made chair of a new department of sociology. Along with Paul Schuster Taylor in Economics, known for his sociological fieldwork and progressive politics, Dorothy Thomas had been one of sociology's key promoters on campus. A demographer trained by the quantitative sociologist William Ogburn of Columbia, she had been appointed Professor of Rural Sociology in Berkeley's College of Agriculture. Thomas had already been a regular

collaborator with her husband W.I. Thomas, the famous maverick sociologist who had been expelled from the University of Chicago, and she would go on to be the President of the American Sociological Society after leaving Berkeley.

Perhaps as a result of their conflicts, and quite likely in no small part due to gender politics within the university, neither Hodgen nor Thomas was made chair.⁹ Instead, university administrators proposed the appointment of Teggart and Hodgen protégé Robert Nisbet, on the War front when the decision was made, and already by that time a member of the department. When Nisbet accepted the post, Hodgen responded by accusing him of intellectual betrayal and academic self-promotion – only a traitor to his mentors would agree to head a department of the reviled sociology – and a series of acrimonious memos and letters were exchanged. At the eye of a storm he had not created, Nisbet lasted but 6 months as chair of the new department.

With the prospect of imminent departmental chaos on the horizon, the University once again stepped in, this time with the appointment of philosopher Edward Strong, perhaps most often remembered as Berkeley's controversial Chancellor during the Free Speech Movement. Dorothy Swaine Thomas was kept out of the department altogether, and she left for the University of Pennsylvania a few years later. Meanwhile, Strong chaired the department for the six years that followed, during which time he continued and elaborated the tradition of comparative historical sociology established by Teggart. With the assistance of Clark Kerr – the Director of Berkeley's new Institute of Industrial Relations who would become the campus' first Chancellor in 1952 – the department recruited Bendix and Lipset, wrested Selznick away from UCLA, and induced Eberhard and Shibutani to join Nisbet, Hodgen, and Kenneth Bock in the new departmental constellation. Largely in line with the Teggart heritage, these appointments were harbingers of a new comparative and historical sociology that would be and still is a trademark of Berkeley sociology.¹⁰

Berkeley Sociology After Blumer: "The Golden Age"

Whatever the antecedents, the establishment of the official Berkeley department of sociology was late, relative to the other social sciences at Berkeley – anthropology was established in 1901, economics in 1902, political science in 1903, and psychology in 1922. But it was also late in relation to other major American sociology departments, many founded in the late 19th and early 20th centuries – Chicago, Wisconsin, Columbia, Michigan, Minnesota. Even Harvard's department predated Berkeley's. Late development, however, had its advantages. Given the support of Chancellor Kerr, and an approaching "tidal wave" of increases in student enrollments, Berkeley could leap to the forefront of the profession by recruiting the best from the other top departments. And, indeed, that is what happened.

After six years under Edward Strong, an interim chair from an outside field, Blumer's arrival from Chicago represented a seemingly decisive turn for the department.

Berkeley's second choice among the Chicago Sociologists – Edward Strong had tried unsuccessfully to recruit Everett C. Hughes to lead the department – Blumer came to Berkeley as chair in 1952, the same year that Clark Kerr, himself as much a sociologist as an economist, became Berkeley's Chancellor. Both men shared a commitment to building a premier department. Kerr's critical role in opposing the Loyalty Oath had made him a popular leader of the faculty, and his administrative star was on the rise. A former student of Paul Taylor, his four-volume dissertation had been a study of depression-era self-help cooperatives among the unemployed. Disaffected by rifts in the Chicago department, and Kerr's colleague from the War Labor Relations Boards, Blumer was thought to be the man who would bring fame and glory to Berkeley sociology, contributing to Kerr's quest to erect a first rate community of social scientists at Berkeley.

What followed this departmental shift was a stunning rise to sociological prominence, as Blumer and Kerr, Lipset and Bendix, worked to lay the foundations for Berkeley Sociology's ascendancy. While Hughes, who became the chair at Chicago, inherited a fractious department already debating the implications of its substantial history, Blumer came to a relatively undeveloped department at Berkeley just as a new infusion of money and talent was pushing the discipline of sociology to greater heights. The Berkeley sociologists rode a wave of substantial financial support, and relative institutional freedom, seeing themselves as the discipline's leading edge, its avant-garde, its innovators. The "implicit mission of the department" during the 1950s, remembers Philip Selznick, was "to turn marginal fields into mainstream fields."

Berkeley's late development allowed it to push past other major departments – Harvard, Columbia, and Chicago – that were increasingly beset by strife, and the department stole some of their best faculty along the way. One of these "thefts" was Neil Smelser, who arrived from Harvard in 1958. "Between 1958 and 1964," he would later reflect, "I experienced, with great intellectual and personal excitement, the greatness of the golden age, both for sociology and for the Berkeley campus as a whole."¹¹ It was indeed a golden age, both for academic sociology at Berkeley and for the entire university. More than anything else the department benefited from an increase in the number of ladder faculty that swept the campus during the decade after Blumer's arrival, filling those positions with some of the most distinguished figures in the field.¹²

It was during this period that Berkeley recruited a long and distinguished line of sociologists, including, in addition to Smelser, William Kornhauser, Kingsley Davis, Guy Swanson, Hanan Selvin, Leo Lowenthal, Franz Schurmann, Erving Goffman, Martin Trow, Nathan Glazer, and David Matza. As these sociologists, together with those already at Berkeley, attempted to set the pace for new disciplinary developments, they did so in the midst of substantial expansion and change in American higher education, the culmination of what Christopher Jencks and David Riesman would later call "the academic revolution."¹³ The power of the academic profession was on the rise, as distinct disciplines further established their national prominence and autonomy. As the logic of professional sociology developed, and the discipline replaced the institution as the primary locus of professorial loyalty, Berkeley sociologists took themselves to be not

simply following the trends but setting them. And they were indeed defining and redefining the new sub-fields of American sociology – industrial sociology, political sociology, organizational sociology, social theory, social psychology. In the wake of these golden years, Berkeley sociology emerged from relative obscurity to become the leading department in the country. Ranked 8th in the country in 1959, by 1966 it had jumped to first, where it remained until 1970 – before it fell from grace.

To capture the tremendous expansion of sociology in the 1950s – and, in fact, Berkeley’s own disciplinary ascendancy – Seymour Martin Lipset and Neil Smelser gathered together a collection of articles by leading figures in the discipline. They published them in 1961, in a tone of subdued exaltation, under the title *Sociology: The Progress of a Decade*. In their introduction to the volume, Lipset and Smelser emplotted the story of American sociology’s ineluctable advancement, writing that the articles they had chosen were intended to mark “the complete triumph since World War I of the new ‘scientific sociology.’” Sociology, they claimed, was leaving behind its early policy orientation, the social problem complex of urban America associated with the Chicago School, and advancing toward a functional analysis of society, systematic social theory, and the development of scientific research methodology. The heroes of this transition were men who had been Lipset and Smelser’s teachers at Columbia and Harvard, respectively: Robert Lynd and Talcott Parsons, in addition to Pitirim Sorokin, Robert Merton, and Paul Lazarsfeld. The still unfinished project of sociological enlightenment was now being carried on by younger sociologists trained at Harvard and Columbia – those, the authors wrote, “who will set the tone in decades to come.” Not a few of these were Lipset and Smelser’s colleagues at Berkeley. Thus, just as the Berkeley authors storied the discipline’s past, they charted their vision for professional sociology’s future. The next generation of sociologists would be well poised to catapult the discipline to greater scientific excellence, standing on the shoulders of the giants who had preceded them.

The story of sociology’s scientific advance was not without its bumps in the disciplinary road, however, and Lipset and Smelser attempted to take at least some stock of the “intellectual turbulence” that had accompanied this transition. They noted that “formal theory and precise methods” had been charged with political conservatism, lack of an historical orientation, and failure to adequately analyze conflict and social change. And they identified the sources of these criticisms with such luminaries as C. Wright Mills and Barrington Moore, in addition to Robert Lynd and Pitirim Sorokin themselves. Thus, those of the older generation were simultaneously scientific heroes and nostalgic reactionaries, both early pioneers and ideologically blinded critics of an inevitable progress.¹⁴ At times, Lipset and Smelser seemed to regard this humanist disaffection as a temporary backlash against the inevitable secularization of sociology, the differentiation of sociology from its ethical and practical soil. In this vein, they argued that just as the natural sciences had emancipated themselves from their religious origins, so scientific sociology would rid itself of the ideological excesses of an earlier moralism.

Instead of rejecting the concerns of the critics outright, however, Lipset and Smelser sought to assimilate them to the functionalist model they claimed as their own,

presenting the current disagreements as a reflection of the disciplinary tensions inherent in sociology's scientific growth. In the careful and authoritative tone of professional sociology – most of the “vitriol” of the recent debates had come, they claimed, from the critics of the new scientific path – Lipset and Smelser briefly addressed each of the basic concerns taken to animate the critical sociologists' “polemic” against disciplinary evolution. The critics had erred, they wrote, not in their concern with history, politics and social change, but rather in thinking that such concern was in conflict with the new scientific model of sociology. Once this erroneous assumption had been exposed, all parties involved would be able to see that it was “not necessary to consider the issue in either-or terms.”¹⁵ One could be a good, rigorously scientific functionalist, and still evince a concern with history and social change, and with “the political and moral implications of sociological work.” And indeed, this was just the position that Lipset and Smelser claimed for themselves.¹⁶ Here was an attempt by a developing professional sociology to co-opt the early impulses of its critical counterpart, to assimilate the concerns of the latter into professional sociology's reigning scientific paradigm.

But the story would not end there. While Lipset and Smelser struck the confident tone of scientific pioneers whose program was destined for disciplinary success, American sociology's trajectory turned out to be far less simple. No sooner had the authors proclaimed the triumph of scientific sociology than Berkeley succumbed to political turmoil that swept through the sociology department no less than through the university. This was no backlash from the past, but an onslaught from the present, an onslaught that, among other things, was hostile to sociology's growing professionalization.

A Department Divided: The Implosion of Berkeley Sociology?

While Lipset and Smelser were triumphantly envisioning a sociology for tomorrow, things were already astir among the actual sociologists of tomorrow, the Berkeley graduate students. Across the country, the GI Bill had drawn all sorts of people from different walks of life into the burgeoning discipline of sociology. At Chicago the students of Everett Hughes – including such distinguished sociologists as Howard Becker, Eliot Friedson, Erving Goffman, Joseph Gusfield, Fred Davis and Donald Roy – came to be known as “The Second Chicago School.” They were micro-sociologists, interested in the inner working of institutions and in social problems. With Goffman, Blumer and Shibutani on the faculty at different times, Berkeley also had its share of symbolic interactionists. But Berkeley attracted a very different group of graduate students as well, many of whom had been communists of one form or another – a group that often had had close ties to the labor movement. These students were able to draw inspiration from the macro-sociology of Bendix, Lipset and Selznick, and particularly from their interest in work, bureaucracy, politics, and stratification. Among these future leaders of sociology were Arthur Stinchcombe, Bob Alford, Bob Blauner, Bill Friedland, Guenther Roth, Bennett Berger and Maurice Zeitlin, all of whom received Berkeley PhDs in the period between 1958 and 1964. From among them would come pioneers of a critical Marxist sociology in the 1960s and 1970s.

There was also a second smaller group in the making. Of the 56 graduate students who received their PhDs in the period 1952-1964, 7 of them were women. This group included Arlene Kaplan Daniels and Dorothy Smith, both of whom would go on to pioneer a feminist sociology in the late 1960s and 1970s. At Berkeley, they worked with the micro-sociologists Goffman, Blumer and Shibutani, having little to do with the likes of Selznick, Lipset, and Bendix.

These, then, were precursors of critical sociology, a Berkeley tradition reaching back into the 1950s. But the explosion of critical sociology at Berkeley, and its consequent warfare with professional sociology – resulting, some would argue, in the implosion of the department – would not occur until the 1960s. Historians Maurice Isserman and Michael Kazin have described the long 1960s as a period of civil war in the United States, a decade during which the nation was divided.¹⁷ At Berkeley, where so much of the student activism of this decade originated, the first big year was 1964. And in the sociology department, the debates about the Free Speech Movement shattered a relatively harmonious and convivial environment. As the campus was plunged into turmoil, that turmoil reverberated through the department, and the faculty divided along lines that supported and opposed student demands for Free Speech.

Philip Selznick was one of the early faculty defenders of student demands and the divisions within the department were marked by his debate with Nathan Glazer, printed in 1965 in the pages of *Commentary*. Selznick, never one to lose sight of the moral dimension of the academy, took up cudgels on behalf of free speech on the Berkeley campus.¹⁸ Where Glazer was horrified by the “direct action” tactics of the students, the violation of the rule against the advocacy of illegal politics on campus, Selznick saw that sometimes the end warranted the means – confrontational tactics were needed to bring issues to the table. And in this case Selznick was adamant that the issue remained that of free speech. Glazer saw things differently. Where Selznick saw the faculty as acting out of principle in its overwhelming support of freedom of speech on campus, Glazer saw the faculty as either bullied into submission or expressing resentment toward the administration. Where Selznick applauded the moral courage of the student leaders, and was convinced it had popular support in the wider student body, Glazer condemned their action as demagogic and irresponsible. Selznick ended with an impassioned if patronizing defense of the FSM leaders:

These are among our very best students. They are not thugs or scoundrels, neither are they caught up in any impenetrable ideology. They are acting out of what they have learned, without the patience and restraint of maturity. The students had a just cause and they yearned for affirmation of it. If there was an excess of zeal, it did not forfeit their claim to our sense of fellowship. In a community of scholars, that is something we should reject, not in fearful recoil from the first signs of stirring and change, but only as a last extremity. Happily, there is no prospect of that at Berkeley.¹⁹

But Selznick had spoken too soon, and as the student movement radicalized, he would ultimately move further away from it. Other faculty – including Kornhauser, Matza, and Blauner – remained on the side of the students, and departmental politics became increasingly defined and polarized by the student movement.

As Clark Kerr told us, sociology was the first Berkeley department “to be politicized,” and 1968 was the hottest year of all. In that year Eldridge Cleaver was invited to give a course on campus, called Sociology 139X, and sponsored by the new black faculty member Troy Duster, among others. The UC Regents attempted to stop the course, prompting massive demonstration in its defense and a climactic vote of the Academic Senate in its support. The Cleaver drama was followed in quick succession by the Third World Strike, demanding the formation of an Ethnic Studies Department, and the protest to defend People’s Park, in which one person was shot.

The 1960s were to be formative years for the department, stamping it with their character for at least two and or even three decades to come. The effects of the fights over student activism can be seen in Arthur Stinchcombe’s 1971 *Orientation to the Department of Sociology*. Aiming his remarks at incoming graduate students, Stinchcombe, then chair of the department, described the break up of what he called the “ancien regime,” ruled by an oligarchy of competence, into a tripartite division – “a student side,” “a faculty side” and a “wishy-washy majority that sometimes goes one way, sometimes the other.” The “student side” called for more radical and relevant sociology and supported student demands for greater participation in department decisions. The “faculty side,” on the other hand, supported the principles of the old regime, leaving the center as a “kind of professionalized left intelligentsia that hopes to make sociological standards of evidence and argument more useful to broad left policy.”

Ten years after the publication of Lipset and Smelser’s 1961 panegyric to scientific sociology, that very sociology, at least at Berkeley, was recognizably under siege. The department itself had become almost ungovernable, as faculty divided in the face of insurgency not only from graduate students but also from staff. Charles Glock, department chair from 1967-1968 and 1969-71, described the state of war between staff and faculty: “The Department’s outer office resembled a recruiting station for leftist causes. A portrait of Che Guevara was prominently displayed as were other revolutionary posters. Faculty whom staff considered on the wrong side were catered to with the minimum amount of courtesy and respect that staff thought they could get away with.”

Stinchcombe’s response to this departmental chaos was extraordinarily frank. The purpose of the department, he claimed unequivocally, was the pursuit of sociological knowledge. “The absolute requirement for appointment or promotion in the department,” he told the students, “is based on intellectual distinction as shown in published work, and as judged by the senior faculty of the Department on the advice of distinguished faculty in other places.” Referring to two pathologies of graduate students – ignorance (especially of faculty work) and sectarianism (especially in respect of choice of method) – Stinchcombe warned students never to “define your intellectual identity by what you refuse to do or cannot do.”

Faculty who could not tolerate the student uprisings or their attendant incivilities and refusals simply left the department altogether. Lipset went to Harvard in 1965, with Glazer following in 1969; Martin Trow moved to Berkeley's Graduate School of Public Policy in 1969, while Erving Goffman went to University of Pennsylvania in the same year; and in 1971, Reinhard Bendix moved to Berkeley's Political Science Department. The denouement of student radicalism at Berkeley was very different than the one at Chicago, for example, where heavy repression was meted out to radical students and faculty. There the political turn of events led to the exodus of radicals – Marlene Dixon, who was denied renewal, and Dick Flacks, who ultimately left for UC-Santa Barbara.

Following the contentious 1960s, the 1970s were a period of uneasy reconstruction. Berkeley had established a reputation as a place to avoid if you were serious about an academic career and its graduate students were, to use the euphemism of the times, “untrained.” Between 1963 and 1970, 24 faculty were recruited and all but 9 left without tenure. Even through the 1970s almost every other tenure vote was a struggle. Nonetheless, Arlie Hochschild received tenure in 1975, as Harry Edwards did in 1977. Jeffrey Paige, on the other hand was denied tenure in 1975, the year before he received the American Sociological Association's best book of year award for his *Agrarian Revolution*. But things were changing. If in 1969 the regular faculty was all white and male, by 1974-75, the 26 faculty included 3 black males and 3 white women and one Mexican American male.²⁰

A sense of the continuing contention within the department can be gleaned from Neil Smelser and Robin Content's *The Changing Academic Market* – an account of the recruitment process of 1976, during Smelser's chairship. This was the recruitment process that brought Bonnell, Burt and Burawoy to the Berkeley sociology department. The authors document the log rolling that took place between the different factions in the department, as well as taking stock of broader changes taking place in the academic job market. On the one hand, the 1960s had created new constituencies – specifically racial minorities and women – to be included in the university at all levels. On the other hand, universities had stopped expanding, and the supply of PhDs was outstripping the demand. The old boy networks no longer operated so effectively and the faculty recruitment process became more bureaucratized and regularized. Still, Smelser and Content conclude that for all the care taken to widen the pool of applicants, the elite character of recruitment remained.

The 1970s came to an end with an infamous case of sexual harassment in the department. When Elbaki Hermassi came up for tenure, one of the senior members of the faculty brought up charges of “sexual harassment,” at that time barely a recognizable category. The case became a cause celebre among women students at Berkeley, both graduate and undergraduate, and Hermassi was eventually forced to resign. This, together with the tenuring of Burawoy, Bonnell and Gitlin in quick succession during the early 1980s, led to another exodus from the department – the departure of Wilensky, Swanson and Nonet and the retirements of Selznick, Glock and Clausen. Critical sociology seemed

to have won the battle but not the war. Under the leadership of Troy Duster and others, the department began to rebuild the more professional wing of the department.

Making Sense of Berkeley Sociology

What sociological sense can we make of these events? Given our interest in public sociology, we take as point of departure an account of “social science as public philosophy” offered by Robert Bellah and his colleagues:

Social science as public philosophy is public not just in the sense that its findings are publicly available or useful to some group or institution outside the scholarly world. It is public in that it seeks to engage the public in dialogue. It also seeks to engage the ‘community of the competent,’ the specialists and the experts, in dialogue, but it does not seek to stay within the boundaries of the specialist community while studying the rest of society from outside.

Bellah et al.’s vision of what we have called *public sociology* can be distinguished from *professional sociology*, in that the former enters into a public dialogue while in the case of the latter the dialogue is confined to the community of experts and specialists, the academic discipline of sociology. Professional sociology is concerned to create a place for sociology within the academic realm, a niche among other social sciences. Indeed, much of the early American sociology was concerned to differentiate itself from neighboring academic disciplines. Professional sociology has its own norms and values, studying the world as though it were an external object, accumulating a body of knowledge and theory that interprets and explains. Public sociology should also be distinguished from *policy sociology*, which is concerned to “apply” sociology to the world of social problems. Here the concern is less with mutual enlightenment but with social engineering. Solutions are more than public discussion and edification.

This gives us three types of sociology: professional, public and policy. They can be organized along two dimensions. The first dimension refers to the audience, “knowledge for whom?” That is, do we write and do research for a public or an academic audience? “Civic” audiences are multiple and overlapping, and include communities in civil society and government agencies, broad intellectual audiences reached through the mainstream press and corporations reached through consultation. But there is a second dimension that asks Robert Lynd’s question: “Knowledge for What?” Here we distinguish between two types of relations between sociology and its clients – dialogic or monologic – and ask whether sociological practice involves an instrumental deployment of knowledge or a reflexive consideration of the relation between sociology and its clients. If we combine these dimensions then we arrive at a two by two table and a fourth type of sociology that is both academic and reflexive, what we might call a *critical sociology*. It is critical in two senses: it is critical of the world it studies but also of professional sociology’s failure to be reflexive about its role in that world’s reproduction. Its audience is primarily other sociologists and not a broader public. The prototype here is Alvin Gouldner’s *The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology*.

	ACADEMIC	CIVIC
INSTRUMENTAL	<i>professional sociology</i>	<i>policy sociology</i>
REFLEXIVE	<i>critical sociology</i>	<i>public sociology</i>

Each type of sociology suffers from its own distinctive dilemmas. Professional sociology is often in danger of verging on the trivial or remote. If it becomes too self-referential, it loses touch with the big questions that motivated sociology's foundational works or ignores the self-understanding of the world it studies. At the other extreme, policy sociology can become prisoner of the agencies it serves. It can abandon its intellectual preoccupations with the abiding problems of the age as it becomes a research arm, a mere marketing agent of its paymaster.

The dilemmas of both professional and policy sociology stem from their instrumental character, their failure to enter into dialogue with broader publics. But that is not to say that reflexive sociology is without its own pathologies. Like policy sociology, public sociology may never secure an engagement with the public but rather may be colonized by the mass media. Relations between sociologists and their publics are mediated by corporate media. The civic world is not a desert but a world of institutional power. When Arlie Hochschild writes *Time Bind*, a book that notes how paid work has become more attractive to women as the home suffers from speed-up, so *US News and World Report* complains that she is encouraging irresponsible women to abandon their true domestic roles. Sociologists seldom have the power to shape the reception of the work they produce. Critical sociology also faces dilemmas and pathologies, including a certain unfounded moral superiority based on too little attention to its own interests in critique. Its isolationist tendencies can often propel it to the ignored margins of the academic world. Indeed, we might say that critical sociology cannot have an autonomous existence, because its *raison d'être* lies with its nemesis, professional sociology.

In considering this scheme a number of qualifications are necessary. First, these four categories are ideal types, but they are not in practice mutually exclusive. Any given work of sociology may actually fit more than one category, although it might be classified primarily in one or another. Furthermore, the intentions of the author may not be a reliable index of a particular sociological work's import. An archetypal work of professional sociology might be Parsons' *The Structure of Social Action*, in that it attempted to establish sociology as a distinct academic discipline. But *Structure* also has a critical moment, as it attends to the importance of agency. Robert Blauner's work on

racial oppression might be considered archetypically critical sociology, but it too had a public moment. The first Coleman report on schooling and race, which proposed racial integration, could be regarded as archetypically policy sociology. Yet, of course, it also contributed to both public and professional sociology. Bellah et al's *Habits of the Heart* was conceived of as a form of public discussion about the nature of US society, but you might construe it also as a form of critical sociology, in that it criticized both important elements of US society and their expression in professional sociology.

Second, it is even more difficult to locate specific sociologists in any one of these categories, although individual careers can often be considered as movement between categories. One may start out as a critical sociologist, become a professional sociologist, then turn to policy sociology and perhaps finally return to critical or public sociology. It is even possible for sociologists to wear different hats at the same time, writing one book for sociologists while at the same time consulting for a government agency. The point, of course, is that these categories pose questions. They cast light on the trajectory of careers, pointing toward both the tensions within and the transformations of individual sociological lives.

Third, not only is the mapping of sociological work and sociologists onto this space complex; the *inter-relations* among the 4 types of sociology are equally complicated. The first point we would like to underline is that professional sociology is at the heart of this configuration. There can be no critical sociology without professional sociology to criticize, there can be no policy sociology without the findings and legitimacy of professional sociology, and there can be no public sociology without the techniques, methods, findings, traditions and legitimacy of professional sociology. But the relations of interdependence also go the other way. The standing of professional sociology within the academy depends upon its success in the civic realm. Works such as David Reisman's *The Lonely Crowd*, for instance, have offered the discipline a greater degree of public legitimacy. Likewise, works of policy sociology – the Moynihan Report being a now classic example – have stimulated public debate about issues of race and poverty, contributing to the sense that the discipline of sociology serves an important social function. Finally, it could also be said that the dynamism of professional sociology is in large part a result of the criticism it receives from feminism, Marxism, and other critical sociologies.

The Phases of Berkeley Sociology

This scheme is also useful in delineating the history of the sociology department at Berkeley. Berkeley sociology began as a pre-professional enterprise. The Department of Social Institutions wanted as little to do with the idea of sociology as possible. One might say it represented sociology's prehistory. Teggart's positive sociology would fit quite well in subsequent comparative historical inquiry, but it was framed as hostile to sociology. The rise of Berkeley sociology after WWII occurred in tandem with a more general expansion of the social sciences. These were the golden years of professional

sociology – a sociology that saw itself as leaving behind its pre-scientific, philosophical past.

Lipset and Smelser's introduction to *Sociology: Progress of a Decade* perhaps best captures the euphoria of the times, as professional sociology seemed to have largely conquered both its internal critics as well as its external doubters. Edward Shils' *The Calling of Sociology*, published in the same year, exalts the other side of the picture, a sort of public sociology, consensual sociology as he calls it, rooted in the recognition of "other" as rational and autonomous. The rise of sociology, he argued, reflects the rise of a consensual, civil society at the heart of which is mutual recognition or, in the language of Parsons, complementary role expectations. For Shils, policy sociology (what he calls manipulative sociology) on the one side and critical sociology on the other are distortions of sociology's true mission – the promotion of a consensual society.

That was 1961. The 1960s, however, would re-energize a critical sociology that questioned the idea of consensus as both norm and reality, challenging the hegemony of both structural functionalism and raw empiricism. The challenge at Berkeley was as profound as it was anywhere, since this was the heart of both the old and the new. Alternative sociologies emerged from both graduate students and faculty. *The Berkeley Journal of Sociology*, for example, has always been a powerful representative of the critical tradition. During the 1960s and in the years that followed, critical sociology would have a momentum of its own, even as it was partly absorbed by professional sociology and partly transformed into a public sociology. Of particular importance here are the writings of Todd Gitlin, Troy Duster, Arlie Hochschild, Kristin Luker, Robert Bellah, Bob Blauner, and the media presence of Harry Edwards.

Now we may be witnessing an increasing move toward policy sociology – and exemplars here include the work of Jerry Karabel, Kristin Luker and Troy Duster at the Rockridge Foundation, or the work of Kim Voss in relation to the labor movement, or Peter Evans at the World Bank and UNCTAD. They, of course, keep their feet in the camp of academic sociology – even engaging in critical sociology – but at the same time they move more and more into the world of social policy. The rise of policy sociology, furthermore, and perhaps its replacement of public sociology as the currently dominant mode of civic sociology, is consonant with larger structural changes within the University. When higher education in general, and UC-Berkeley in particular, were undergoing rapid expansion during the 1950s and 1960s, the University had a great deal of public support, and therefore, perhaps, a greater sense of its scholarly civic mission. Today, as Berkeley's current Chancellor has noted, we are witnessing the continuing privatization of public universities, a process initiated in the early 1980s, under the leadership of Ronald Reagan.²¹ The constituencies to which the University responds have changed, and the orientations of Berkeley sociologists, one might argue, have changed along with them.

Structural changes within the University have impacted not only public sociology, but academic sociology as well. As public support, in the form of state funding, for the UC has dropped, student contributions, in the form of annual fees, have risen, and

students are now, according to Berkeley's Chancellor, "the largest single group of private contributors" to the University. As a result of these and other changes, including those wrought by the campus activism of the 1960s, students now represent a significant constituency for the University. While professional sociology continues to be produced and taught, and indeed remains in many ways at the center of the curriculum, critical sociology has come into its own as a presumed part of a solid sociological education. Berkeley students looking for classes in Marxism-Leninism in 1965 might have been attracted to leftist posters on the pillars of Sather Gate, advertising such courses, to be "taught by Revolutionaries."²² Today students looking to read Marx and Lenin can do so as part of a required course in sociological theory, to be taught by the chair of the sociology department. In like manner, feminist sociology and critical race studies have become an expected and integral part of the curriculum. Critical sociology has, at least in part, been institutionalized, and has found an academic audience in undergraduate students.

But qualifications are again in order. We are not suggesting that there is some linear displacement in which one form of sociology displaces another. Rather all four sociologies always coexist. What changes in the configuration of their relations and their relative strengths. To reiterate, at no point does professional sociology disappear, at no point is its domination overthrown. The best we can say is that its hegemony was challenged in the 1960s and 1970s, and that it absorbed the challenge and reconstituted itself. Professional sociology today shows the marks of its meeting with Marxism, feminism, critical race theory, and other forms of critical sociology.

Nonetheless, many of the battles in the department forced faculty and students into opposing camps. If the 1950s were relatively harmonious it was because different perspectives could be embraced under a singular notion of sociology. But the outbreak of the FSM and the subsequent struggles for inclusion and diversity tore the department apart, creating a chasm between professional sociology and critical sociology. Critical sociologists would charge professionals with a collusive relation to structures of power, accusing them of selling out to policy sociology. Subsequently public sociologists saw themselves very much in opposition to the professional sociologists. Throughout the 1970s and 1980s the department remained balkanized.

What has happened more recently, we would argue, is that these divisions have broken down. Individuals move quite easily between these boxes all the time. Loic Wacquant, for example, occupies all boxes simultaneously, or at least three of them. The book *Inequality By Design*, written by 6 committed professional sociologists, is a powerful venture into the realm of public sociology. The new ASA journal *Contexts*, currently edited by Claude Fischer, represents another bridge between professional and public sociology. It seems especially apt that *Contexts* was established in the Berkeley department. What has happened in the last decade, therefore, demonstrates the fluidity between these types of sociology, which in an earlier period had come to seem more firmly compartmentalized.

But one should beware of any euphoria or proclamations of continuing harmony. Recall the triumphalism of Lipset and Smelser in 1961, to be followed only three years later by FSM at Berkeley and civil strife all over the country. Should there be another round of struggle, or should the university again be put on trial, the Berkeley department might once again fragment into warring factions. When Lipset and Smelser wrote in 1961, sociology was indeed enjoying an ascendancy, both in terms of its legitimacy within the academy and in the wider world – a legitimacy it probably has not enjoyed since, and precisely because of the critical perspectives it has harbored. These critical perspectives have come with an expanded understanding of sociology's clientele. The undergraduates and graduate constituencies it serves are often from the more marginalized sectors of society. The 1960s have changed sociology irrevocably into a field of study that is now more open to diverse perspectives. Once the genie was let out of the box, there was no way of putting it back.

¹ Robert E. Park and Ernest W. Burgess, *Introduction to the Science of Sociology* (Chicago, 1921); Talcott Parsons, *The Structure of Social Action* (New York, 1937); Robert Nisbet, *The Sociological Tradition* (New York, 1966); Alvin Gouldner, *The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology* (New York, 1970). For discussion of these four works, along with Pitirim Sorokin's *Contemporary Sociological Theories* (New York, 1928), as "key archetypal narratives" in the history of sociology, see Donald N. Levine, *Visions of the Sociological Tradition* (Chicago, 1995).

² Veysey, "Reappraising the Chicago School of Sociology," *Reviews in American History* 6 (March, 1978), 114-19.

³ Gouldner, *The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology* 488-9.

⁴ Reinhard Bendix was one of the towering European intellectuals in the department from 1947 until he left for the political science department in 1971. His memoir, *From Berlin to Berkeley* (1986), largely focuses on the life of his father and his own career in Chicago and the early years in Berkeley. Robert Nisbet was the most celebrated student of Frederick Teggart and the first chair of the sociology department, whose appointment stretched from 1945 (?) to 1953. He wrote his own memoirs of Berkeley in the Depression and World War Two, *Teachers and Scholars* published in 1992. Charles Glock was a faculty member in the department from 1959 to 1979 and chair of the department in 1968-69 and 1970-1972. He came from Columbia, a student of Lazarsfeld, to set up the Survey Research Center. Bob Blauner was a graduate student in the department in the 1950s and a faculty member from 1964 until he retired in 1993. From the beginning, Blauner was a critical sociologist who wrote about work and alienation, racial oppression, and the men's movement.

⁵ Predating the memoirs by the four men mentioned above is an earlier collection of memoirs by Berkeley's first women sociologists, those who received their doctorates between 1952 and 1972. *Gender and the Academic Experience* was edited by two of the contributors, Kathryn Orleans and Ruth Wallace, and appeared in 1994.

⁶ See Smelser and Content, *The Changing Academic Market* (1980). The book analyzes the recruitment of 3 junior faculty in 1976, when Smelser was chair, situating this in the department's history, as well as in the overall changes in higher education after the cessation of postwar university expansion.

In addition to these fragments of participant history, an interesting collection of documents in the University Archives has been the basis for a short paper on the transitional period of the 1940s. The archives include Margaret Hodgen's heatedly partisan accumulation of historical materials, submitted to the Bancroft Library in 1971. Stephen Murray has written an important article based on these documents and on interviews with Robert Nisbet and Ken Bock, two of Frederick Teggart's students and disciples.

⁷ See S. Lyman.

⁸ See Dennis Smith, *The Rise of Historical Sociology*

⁹ See Strong's memo on the matter.

¹⁰ Margaret Hodgen would remain a member of the department until 1951, when she was discharged for refusing to sign the loyalty oath. She was then reinstated in 1953 but never taught in the department again. Robert Nisbet also stayed in the department until 1953 when he left to become Dean at the Riverside Campus and subsequently became a celebrated conservative social theorist, marked very much by Teggart's thinking. Dorothy Swaine Thomas, who had conducted a series of studies on the Japanese Internment Camps, left for the University of Pennsylvania in 1947 (soon after W.I. Thomas died) where she pursued a very successful career as a demographer. In 1952 (?) she became the first woman President of the American Sociological Association.

¹¹ Smelser, "Foreward" to Clark Kerr's *The Gold and the Blue* vol. I. xx.

¹² While Chancellor and then President Clark Kerr was undoubtedly a supporter of sociology, the department falls fairly low on a list of those that made the most substantial departmental gains in ladder faculty between 1953-54 and 1962-63. In the College of Letters and Science, the new FTEs in English (36) and History (23) far outnumbered those in Sociology and Social Institutions (14). "History," Kerr writes of this period, "was a more central department to both the social sciences and the humanities than any other." See *The Gold and the Blue* 88, 85. Sociology's growth during this "golden age," therefore, cannot be primarily attributed to an extraordinary attention of Kerr's part. Rather, the department's growth simply struggled to keep up with that occurring in other departments, and the department rose to the top at about the same pace as the university as a whole. By the mid-sixties, when Berkeley's would be rated the "best balanced distinguished university" in the country, Berkeley sociology had also risen to a number one ranking.

¹³ Christopher Jencks and David Riesman, *The Academic Revolution* (New York, 1968).

¹⁴ "Those with moral and ideological identifications," wrote Lipset and Smelser in one of their more patronizing moments, "experience a sense of loss as sociological thought strives – with varying degrees of success – for a closer approximation to standards of scientific adequacy" (8). While offering the critics the backhanded compliment of having seen the "partial truth," they reiterated their contention that "those identified with the more scientific side of sociology" had taken the higher ground of detachment and scholarly civility, being "much less defensive, aggressive, and vigorous on their side of the controversy" (8). Thus, Lipset and Smelser seemed to implicitly assume a set of developmental stages through which individual sociologists might be said to travel – stages analogous to the disciplinary stages that signaled scientific advance. Without explicit evaluation, their re-counting of the discipline's debates subtly painted the critics into a corner of base and unscientific attributes – overly ideological moral commitment, aggression, psychological defensiveness, and a nostalgia for the past – all the while practicing, rhetorically, what they implicitly preached: aloof restraint and moral detachment. Mills, Sorokin and Lynd, however would not be the last to take issue with the assumptions hidden by this style of scholarly argumentation. As critical sociology drew greater crowds throughout the 1960s, its rhetoric became increasingly inflammatory, a reaction against, and a telling contrast to, the pretence to impartiality embedded in so much professional sociology.

¹⁵ "As we see it, then, there is no necessary clash between systematic theory and a concern with social change and historical specificity" (7).

¹⁶ Lipset and Smelser, 6. While clearly pushing the functionalist paradigm, the authors implicitly sided with, at the same time as they sought to distinguish themselves from, the critics. Following their laundry list of criticisms of the new scientific sociology, they wrote: "While these criticisms often come from the same source, they are not necessarily interrelated. We would classify ourselves, for instance, as functionalists concerned primarily with historical and comparative work and concerned with the political and moral implications of sociological research" (5-6).

¹⁷ Maurice Isserman and Michael Kazin, *America Divided: The Civil War of the 1960s* (Oxford University Press, 2000).

¹⁸ Nathan Glazer, "What Happened at Berkeley," *Commentary*, February, 1985, pp.39-47; Philip Selznick, Nathan Glazer (?), "Berkeley," *Commentary*, March, 1965, pp.80-85.

¹⁹ Selznick, 84.

²⁰ By 2001, there were 5 minorities and 11 women, out of 28 ladder faculty.

²¹ Robert M. Berdahl delivered an address entitled "The Privatization of Public Universities" on May 23, 2000 in Erfurt, Germany. See <http://www.chance.berkeley.edu/cio/chancellor/sp/privatization.htm>.

²² See W.J. Rorabaugh, *Berkeley at War: The 1960s* (Oxford University Press 1989).