

In summation, this is an unusually wide-ranging, theoretically self-conscious, empirically sound, and highly provocative work, even if at its end the roots of Russian “otherness” are still not fully exposed. It is the kind of study where readers learn almost as much from the weak points as from the strong. Sadly, however, it must be mentioned in closing that the effect of Shanin’s work has been lessened by some purely formal difficulties for which his publisher, Yale University Press, seems principally responsible. Shanin’s prose is generally effective and in places even elegant, but his writing does have some grating stylistic peculiarities most focused in a simply bizarre usage of the direct article. Judging from the author’s works under other imprints, however, problems arising from this could and should have been corrected in copy-editing. Similarly, most if not all of the inconsistent and mistaken identifications, misspellings, etc., that abound in the text and, especially, the endnotes ought to have been caught. Although the second volume is in somewhat better shape than the first, both contain so many typographical errors that this reviewer wonders if proofreading was even attempted. Teodor Shanin and his readers deserve better treatment from a major scholarly publisher.

Henry Reichman
California State University, Hayward

Jane Addams and the Men of the Chicago School, 1892–1918, by Mary Jo Deegan (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988).

The Department of Sociology at the University of Chicago – the first in the nation – was established in 1892. The Chicago School of Sociology, however, did not come into being until some twenty-five years later. Or so we have been told. In her book, Mary Jo Deegan argues that the Chicago tradition of urban studies dates back to the 1890s, that it was pioneered by early Chicago sociologists committed to progressive reforms, that the primary credit for it goes to the network of women sociologists gathered around Jane Addams, and that the main reason for the subsequent neglect of this early contribution is the increasingly apolitical, anti-reform, and sexist stance taken by male Chicago sociologists in the 1920s.

In the first four chapters, the author deals with the early stages in the evolution of Chicago sociology. She does not confine her analysis to the full-time members of the Department (Small, Henderson, Vincent, and Thomas), but extends it to include adjunct faculty chiefly employed in the Extension Division (Zuebelin, Bemis, Abbott, Breckinridge, and Mead) and, most importantly, she documents professional, political, and personal ties between the sociology faculty and a group of female scholars lead by Jane Addams.

The next four chapters are focused on what is conventionally identified as

Chicago sociology, with the bulk of discussion devoted to Park and Burgess. The final chapters examine Jane Addams's assorted contributions, including her theory of cultural feminism and what Deegan calls "critical pragmatism."

Much evidence concerning Addams's role in Chicago sociology revolves around the Hull House Settlement. Established in the early 1890s by Addams and her friends, Hull House was far more than an outlet for female reformers' philanthropic activities. As the author convincingly shows, it was also "the institutional center for research and social thought" that provided women sociologists with a rare opportunity to study modern society. The Hull House residents' intellectual ambitions can be gleaned from *Hull House Maps and Papers*, a volume of original sociological investigations and reflections published in 1895. Long before Thomas and Znaniecki embarked on their study of Polish peasants and Park and Burgess articulated their research program, female sociologists were engaged in field research, setting the stage for what later would become known as the Chicago tradition of urban studies. Particularly impressive were the multi-colored maps depicting demographic distribution of residents in the neighboring region – the technique that would later become the hallmark of Chicago sociology. Addams, Kelley, Starr, Lathorp, and other researchers involved in this project also offered insights into the laborers' working conditions, immigrant communities, trade unions, social agencies, delinquency, and kindred topics we have come to associate with the Chicago tradition of sociological research.

Hull House female sociologists were not alone in their undertaking. They developed strong ties to the first generation of male sociologists employed by the university of Chicago – Small, Henderson, Vincent, Zuebelin, Bemis, Thomas, and Mead. What drew all these people together was their common commitment to progressive reforms and determination to translate their sociological ideas into practical action. On the whole, Deegan contends, male sociologists were less politically daring than their female counterparts (most notably Florence Kelley and Jane Addams), but their political beliefs and many substantive ideas were remarkably similar to those of female sociologists. The case in point is an elaborate sociology of women developed by Thomas that transcends his early biological reductionism and bears striking resemblance to the views championed by Addams.

Add to this the painstakingly documented evidence of personal ties, family relations, and joint projects that bound together Addams and Chicago sociologists, and the question inevitably arises why so little attention has been paid to the impact of Hull House on Chicago sociology.

According to Deegan, we are dealing with a massive, even if only half-conscious, attempt to deny women sociologists their due place in the history of the Chicago school. The chief culprits are male Chicago sociologists, start-

ing with Park and Burgess, who, while drawing heavily on the original insights furnished by Hull House female social scientists, failed to acknowledge their intellectual debt to them. As to the deeper reasons, Deegan points to the pattern of institutionalized sexism at the University of Chicago, political conservatism of the male faculty, and the hostility toward female scholars and their vision of sociology as an applied, practical, reform-oriented discipline.

It is this part of the book that the reader is likely to find most original and most controversial at the same time. The author is a committed feminist. Chicago sociology is not just the subject matter for her but an object matter as well, one of the many examples of institutionalized sexism that permeates modern society in general and the academic world in particular. Her book is the first of three projected volumes on early women sociologists that document their original and largely unrecognized contribution to the discipline.

Deegan's thesis has merit. Sexism, implicit or explicit, crept into the policies of the University and the Department. As the case of Grace Abbott indicates, women's climb through the ranks in the Department of Sociology was long and arduous. Confined to the applied fields, female scholars must have felt discouraged from grand theorizing as indulged in by male sociologists. And the splintering of the School of Social Service Administration into an independent unit, which absorbed practically all of the female sociologists, erected further barriers to fruitful interchange between the male and female social scientists at the University of Chicago.

Although evidence gathered by the author leaves little doubt that sexism was part of the institutional environment at the University of Chicago, I find Deegan's thesis overdrawn and some of her "proofs" positively unconvincing.

It is important to emphasize that Hull House type sociology was not practiced exclusively, or even chiefly, by women. Evidence presented in the book suggests that male sociologists were very much involved in all the causes and activities associated with Hull House. Charles Zuebelin, an early member of the Department of Sociology, contributed vital sections to *Hull House Maps and Papers*. Henderson and Mead were involved in statistical surveys. Small, Vincent, and Bemis supported reform and took part in Hull House undertakings. The fact that "the early male Chicago sociologists shared the concerns and fate of the women who were dismissed from later accounts of the development of Chicago sociology" (p. 62) undermines the argument that the later dismissal and neglect was an expression of hostility toward women sociologists. Early male sociologists were equally the victims.

The author admits, even if only grudgingly, that both Park and Burgess recognized the role of Hull House publications for the development of sociology as a discipline. In 1916, 1924, and as late as 1946, Burgess lauded the pioneering

efforts of Hull House researchers. The same is true (although to a lesser extent) about Park, who is known to have cited *Hull House Maps and Publications* in his lectures. One could argue that these acknowledgments do not go far enough, that they are few and far between, but they clearly follow the pattern common among academics who do not like to dwell on their intellectual debts and are apt to stress the differences rather than similarities with their predecessors. Whatever could be said about the present-day interpreters of the Chicago School (and they are definitely delinquent in their coverage of the early history), there is no evidence that Park and Burgess endeavored to suppress the work of Hull House sociologists.

Nor do I find convincing information proffered by the author that is designed to demonstrate Park's and Burgess's personal "hostility toward women as intellectuals" (p. 162). Several reports point out that the relationship between Park and two women sociologists, Abbott and Breckinridge, had been strained. The nature of the conflict, Deegan admits, is unclear. Just about the only clue coming from an insider, Harriet Mowers, indicates that the responsibility for the strain might lie with the women from the Social Service Administration who "did all they could to cause trouble so far as sociology is concerned" (p. 155). All the same, the author takes these strained relations as bona fide evidence of Park's hostility toward women sociologists.

Much is made in the book of Park's deprecating remarks about "do-gooders," his emphasis on sociology as objective science, and the central place that conflict was accorded in Park's and Burgess' famous textbook. These are contrasted to avowed progressivism, humanistic methodology, and an emphasis on cooperative interactions characteristic of the sociology advocated by Addams and other reform-minded Chicago sociologists. I do not see how the epistemological position taken by Chicago sociologists in the 1920s can be called scientific and positivistic. Burgess ("Statistics and Case Studies as Methods of Sociological Research" *Sociology and Sociological Research* 1927: 120), resolutely rejected "the worship of statistical technique" and urged combining it with "the method of case study." Robert Park ("News as a Form of Knowledge," pp. 72–74, in *The Collected Papers of Robert Ezra Park*, vol. III, edited by Everett Cherrington et al.), was equally adamant about the tendency "to substitute for the flux of events and the changing character of things a logical formula" and strongly supported the researcher's "personal and first hand involvement with the world." To be sure, the rhetoric of objectivity and technocratic metaphors crop up in Park and Burgess, but they were by no means alien to early Chicago sociologists (for instance, see Thomas's remarks about "knowledge of the laws of behavior" and "a technique for the control of behavior" that appear on page 183).

The emphasis on conflict in the latter Chicago sociologists is hardly proof of their sexist, pugilistic inclinations. It has more to do with Simmel than Spencer,

and it has long since been shown to be compatible with emancipatory scholarship. Besides, this emphasis is complemented by an extensive and very influential discussion of interaction and cooperation that appears in chapter 5 of Park and Burgess's introductory text and that, inexplicably, receives no mention in Deegan's monograph.

Finally, I want to take issue with the author's conclusion about "the inherently conservative assumptions underlying the Chicago School" (p. 187). It is true that in the 1920s Chicago sociologists failed to take on master institutions and vested interests the way their predecessors did in the Progressive era. It is also true that they were reexamining some of the political assumptions concerning the inevitability of progress and efficacy of reform. Still, I do not think that Park's animosity toward "do-goodism" amounts to anti-progressivism and Burgess's critique of early sociological research spells value-neutrality.

Both men's life-long involvement with progressive causes defies this conclusion. As the author herself admits, Park had accumulated ample records as a reformer, beginning with his tenure as a muckraking journalist, days at the Congo Reform Association, work for the black leader Booker T. Washington, and service on the Chicago Commission of Race Relations. The same goes for Burgess, a one time Hull House resident and a veteran of many progressive battles. What Park and Burgess opposed was not reform but attempts to give a seal of scientific approval to a particular ideology, the situation where political agendas cease to guide inquiry and start to ordain scientific conclusions. Both men displayed definite ideological ambivalence, but I find nothing dishonest or contemptible about this stance, particularly after the massive collapse of democratic institutions in Europe following World War I. It is this unanticipated outcome of radical programs that undermined the progressives' optimism about the amicable resolution of all social conflicts and brought to a close the Progressive era (see D. Shalin, "Mead, Socialism and the Progressive Agenda." *American Journal of Sociology* 1988: 913–951). And it is this outcome far more than male chauvinism that accounts for the widespread skepticism about "do-goodism" and reform-bound sociology evident in the 1920s.

All said and done, I wish to reiterate that Deegan's thesis has merit. There was a pattern of institutional sexism throughout the history of the Chicago School. Even though the University of Chicago and its Sociology Department were at the forefront of national efforts to bring women into academe both as students and teachers, these efforts were half-hearted at best. The "dual sphere" doctrine that assigned to each gender unique characteristics and values pushed women toward applied fields and discouraged their preoccupation with academic (abstract, theoretical) topics. Addams's cultural feminism, with its unabashedly sexist premise that "women were biologically superior to men" (p. 242), contributed to this division of labor between sexes. The School of Social Service Administration that split from the Department of Sociology in 1920

further prolonged the segregation between female and male social scientists. The emergence of the SSA, favored by women as much as by men, might account for the fact that sociology has never developed its own separate, non-academic professional base. I hope this latter point, barely outlined in the book, will be further developed in the subsequent volumes projected by the author.

To conclude, Mary Jo Deegan wrote an important book. Women and men who take the fight against sexism as their own may disagree about some of her specific conclusions and interpretations, but they all should be grateful to the author for her illuminating analysis of the role that early women sociologists played in establishing the discipline.

Dmitri N. Shalin
Southern Illinois University at Carbondale