



National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file - Votre référence

Our file - Notre référence

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the *Canadian Copyright Act*, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la *Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur*, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

Canada

A CHICAGO REPRISE IN THE *CHAMPAGNE YEARS*
OF CANADIAN SOCIOLOGY, 1935-1964

Thomas Palantzas ☺

Department of Sociology
Lakehead University
Thunder Bay, Ontario

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for a Master's degree in
Sociology at Lakehead University, Thunder Bay, Ontario: May 1994.



National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file *Voire référence*

Our file *Notre référence*

THE AUTHOR HAS GRANTED AN IRREVOCABLE NON-EXCLUSIVE LICENCE ALLOWING THE NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA TO REPRODUCE, LOAN, DISTRIBUTE OR SELL COPIES OF HIS/HER THESIS BY ANY MEANS AND IN ANY FORM OR FORMAT, MAKING THIS THESIS AVAILABLE TO INTERESTED PERSONS.

L'AUTEUR A ACCORDE UNE LICENCE IRREVOCABLE ET NON EXCLUSIVE PERMETTANT A LA BIBLIOTHEQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA DE REPRODUIRE, PRETER, DISTRIBUER OU VENDRE DES COPIES DE SA THESE DE QUELQUE MANIERE ET SOUS QUELQUE FORME QUE CE SOIT POUR METTRE DES EXEMPLAIRES DE CETTE THESE A LA DISPOSITION DES PERSONNE INTERESSEES.

THE AUTHOR RETAINS OWNERSHIP OF THE COPYRIGHT IN HIS/HER THESIS. NEITHER THE THESIS NOR SUBSTANTIAL EXTRACTS FROM IT MAY BE PRINTED OR OTHERWISE REPRODUCED WITHOUT HIS/HER PERMISSION.

L'AUTEUR CONSERVE LA PROPRIETE DU DROIT D'AUTEUR QUI PROTEGE SA THESE. NI LA THESE NI DES EXTRAITS SUBSTANTIELS DE CELLE-CI NE DOIVENT ETRE IMPRIMES OU AUTREMENT REPRODUITS SANS SON AUTORISATION.

ISBN 0-315-97061-8

Canada

Name THOMAS PALANTZAS

Dissertation Abstracts International is arranged by broad, general subject categories. Please select the one subject which most nearly describes the content of your dissertation. Enter the corresponding four-digit code in the spaces provided.

SOCIOLOGY - THEORY AND METHODS

SUBJECT TERM

0344

SUBJECT CODE

U·M·I

Subject Categories

THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

COMMUNICATIONS AND THE ARTS

Architecture 0729
 Art History 0377
 Cinema 0900
 Dance 0378
 Fine Arts 0357
 Information Science 0723
 Journalism 0391
 Library Science 0399
 Mass Communications 0708
 Music 0413
 Speech Communication 0459
 Theater 0465

EDUCATION

General 0515
 Administration 0514
 Adult and Continuing 0516
 Agricultural 0517
 Art 0273
 Bilingual and Multicultural 0282
 Business 0698
 Community College 0275
 Curriculum and Instruction 0727
 Early Childhood 0518
 Elementary 0524
 Finance 0277
 Guidance and Counseling 0519
 Health 0680
 Higher 0745
 History of 0520
 Home Economics 0278
 Industrial 0521
 Language and Literature 0279
 Mathematics 0280
 Music 0522
 Philosophy of 0998
 Physical 0523

Psychology 0525
 Reading 0535
 Religious 0527
 Sciences 0714
 Secondary 0533
 Social Sciences 0534
 Sociology of 0340
 Special 0529
 Teacher Training 0530
 Technology 0710
 Tests and Measurements 0288
 Vocational 0747

LANGUAGE, LITERATURE AND LINGUISTICS

Language
 General 0679
 Ancient 0289
 Linguistics 0290
 Modern 0291
 Literature
 General 0401
 Classical 0294
 Comparative 0295
 Medieval 0297
 Modern 0298
 African 0316
 American 0591
 Asian 0305
 Canadian (English) 0352
 Canadian (French) 0355
 English 0593
 Germanic 0311
 Latin American 0312
 Middle Eastern 0315
 Romance 0313
 Slavic and East European 0314

PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION AND THEOLOGY

Philosophy 0422
 Religion
 General 0318
 Biblical Studies 0321
 Clergy 0319
 History of 0320
 Philosophy of 0322
 Theology 0469

SOCIAL SCIENCES

American Studies 0323
 Anthropology
 Archaeology 0324
 Cultural 0326
 Physical 0327
 Business Administration
 General 0310
 Accounting 0272
 Banking 0770
 Management 0454
 Marketing 0338
 Canadian Studies 0385
 Economics
 General 0501
 Agricultural 0503
 Commerce-Business 0505
 Finance 0508
 History 0509
 Labor 0510
 Theory 0511
 Folklore 0358
 Geography 0366
 Gerontology 0351
 History
 General 0578

Ancient 0579
 Medieval 0581
 Modern 0582
 Black 0328
 African 0331
 Asia, Australia and Oceania 0332
 Canadian 0334
 European 0335
 Latin American 0336
 Middle Eastern 0333
 United States 0337
 History of Science 0585
 Law 0398
 Political Science
 General 0615
 International Law and Relations 0616
 Public Administration 0617
 Recreation 0814
 Social Work 0452
 Sociology
 General 0626
 Criminology and Penology 0627
 Demography 0938
 Ethnic and Racial Studies 0631
 Individual and Family Studies 0628
 Industrial and Labor Relations 0629
 Public and Social Welfare 0630
 Social Structure and Development 0700
 Theory and Methods 0344
 Transportation 0709
 Urban and Regional Planning 0999
 Women's Studies 0453

THE SCIENCES AND ENGINEERING

BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

Agriculture
 General 0473
 Agronomy 0285
 Animal Culture and Nutrition 0475
 Animal Pathology 0476
 Food Science and Technology 0359
 Forestry and Wildlife 0478
 Plant Culture 0479
 Plant Pathology 0480
 Plant Physiology 0817
 Range Management 0777
 Wood Technology 0746
 Biology
 General 0306
 Anatomy 0287
 Biostatistics 0308
 Botany 0309
 Cell 0379
 Ecology 0329
 Entomology 0353
 Genetics 0369
 Limnology 0793
 Microbiology 0410
 Molecular 0307
 Neuroscience 0317
 Oceanography 0416
 Physiology 0433
 Radiation 0821
 Veterinary Science 0778
 Zoology 0472
 Biophysics
 General 0786
 Medical 0760
 EARTH SCIENCES
 Biogeochemistry 0425
 Geochemistry 0996

Geodesy 0370
 Geology 0372
 Geophysics 0373
 Hydrology 0388
 Mineralogy 0411
 Paleobotany 0345
 Paleocology 0426
 Paleontology 0418
 Paleozoology 0985
 Palynology 0427
 Physical Geography 0368
 Physical Oceanography 0415

HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

Environmental Sciences 0768
 Health Sciences
 General 0566
 Audiology 0300
 Chemotherapy 0992
 Dentistry 0567
 Education 0350
 Hospital Management 0769
 Human Development 0758
 Immunology 0982
 Medicine and Surgery 0564
 Mental Health 0347
 Nursing 0569
 Nutrition 0570
 Obstetrics and Gynecology 0380
 Occupational Health and Therapy 0354
 Ophthalmology 0381
 Pathology 0571
 Pharmacology 0419
 Pharmacy 0572
 Physical Therapy 0382
 Public Health 0573
 Radiology 0574
 Recreation 0575

Speech Pathology 0460
 Toxicology 0383
 Home Economics 0386

PHYSICAL SCIENCES

Pure Sciences
 Chemistry
 General 0485
 Agricultural 0749
 Analytical 0486
 Biochemistry 0487
 Inorganic 0488
 Nuclear 0738
 Organic 0490
 Pharmaceutical 0491
 Physical 0494
 Polymer 0495
 Radiation 0754
 Mathematics 0405
 Physics
 General 0605
 Acoustics 0986
 Astronomy and Astrophysics 0606
 Atmospheric Science 0608
 Atomic 0748
 Electronics and Electricity 0607
 Elementary Particles and High Energy 0798
 Fluid and Plasma 0759
 Molecular 0609
 Nuclear 0610
 Optics 0752
 Radiation 0756
 Solid State 0611
 Statistics 0463
 Applied Sciences
 Applied Mechanics 0346
 Computer Science 0984

Engineering
 General 0537
 Aerospace 0538
 Agricultural 0539
 Automotive 0540
 Biomedical 0541
 Chemical 0542
 Civil 0543
 Electronics and Electrical 0544
 Heat and Thermodynamics 0348
 Hydraulic 0545
 Industrial 0546
 Marine 0547
 Materials Science 0794
 Mechanical 0548
 Metallurgy 0743
 Mining 0551
 Nuclear 0552
 Packaging 0549
 Petroleum 0765
 Sanitary and Municipal 0554
 System Science 0790
 Geotechnology 0428
 Operations Research 0796
 Plastics Technology 0795
 Textile Technology 0994

PSYCHOLOGY

General 0621
 Behavioral 0384
 Clinical 0622
 Developmental 0620
 Experimental 0623
 Industrial 0624
 Personality 0625
 Physiological 0989
 Psychological 0349
 Psychometrics 0632
 Social 0451



A Chicago Reprise in the *Champagne Years*
of Canadian Sociology, 1935-1964

(M.A. Thesis Paper)

Thomas Palantzas

Department of Sociology
Lakehead University
Thunder Bay, Ontario

ABSTRACT

The prominence of the Chicago School as a dominant sociological tradition has frequently been documented as falling roughly between 1920 and the mid-1930s. Undeniably, a scholarly influence left its mark at many university campuses during this period and thereafter, as Chicago graduates and their students took up the task of building new departments. Retracing the limits of this influence in Canada begins with a look at McGill University, whose early reputation as a dominant centre of instruction and home to the first Department of Sociology beginning in 1925 set the pace for the development of the discipline in this country. The examination undertakes a content and contextual analysis of sociology articles and their McGill authors published in the *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science*, and presents findings in support of the argument that a Chicago influence did pervade the sociological thought therein, well into the 1950s.

ABSTRACT

The prominence of the Chicago School as a dominant sociological tradition has frequently been documented as falling roughly between 1920 and the mid-1930s. Undeniably, a scholarly influence left its mark at many university campuses during this period and thereafter, as Chicago graduates and their students took up the task of building new departments. Retracing the limits of this influence in Canada begins with a look at McGill University, whose early reputation as a dominant centre of instruction and home to the first Department of Sociology beginning in 1925 set the pace for the development of the discipline in this country. The examination undertakes a content and contextual analysis of sociology articles and their McGill authors published in the *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science*, and presents findings in support of the argument that a Chicago influence did pervade the sociological thought therein, well into the 1950s.

Contents

PREFACE	i
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 1: ESTABLISHING THE PARAMETERS	6
CHAPTER 2: THE C.P.S.A., THE JOURNAL, AND SOCIOLOGY	16
CHAPTER 3: CHICAGO SOCIOLOGY	32
CHAPTER 4: MCGILL SOCIOLOGY: A CHICAGO HERITAGE	62
Carl Addington Dawson	71
Everett Cherrington Hughes	87
Robert E. Lee Faris	96
Forrest Emmanuel LaViolette	101
Oswald Hall	112
Aileen Dansken Ross	125
William A. Westley	127
Howard Ernest Roseborough	129
CONCLUDING REMARKS	142

APPENDIX A: McGill University, List of Sociology Staff by year, 1922-1967.	144
APPENDIX B: McGill University Sociology Staff in the CJEPS, not included in this study.	146
APPENDIX C: Sociology Articles in the CJEPS under study.	150
APPENDIX D: Statistical Information reported in the CJEPS regarding Publishing Procedure (1953-66).	151
APPENDIX E: C.P.S.A. Meetings, Memberships, and CJEPS particulars.	152
APPENDIX F: The C.P.S.A. and the International Sociological Association (I.S.A.): An early chronology.	153
APPENDIX G: Ottawa Chapter of the C.P.S.A.: Executive Council, 1956-1966.	154
APPENDIX H: Anthropology and Sociology Chapter of the C.P.S.A.: Executive Council, 1955-1966.	155
APPENDIX I: Presidents of the C.P.S.A. and Chairmen of the Anthropology and Sociology Chapter of the C.P.S.A..	156
REFERENCES	157

Preface

It would seem most appropriate to begin with a qualifying note of sorts as it pertains to two key terms which are found in the title of this study.

The second term is more easily identified as originating from the thoughts of one of Canada's most distinguished sociologists, Oswald Hall. During a 1989 interview I asked Professor Hall to reflect on the early days of sociology's development in Canada and to comment on the general mood of the day. He recalled that this was the dawn of an era in which there was a real sense of movement in the field and an awareness that a new science was being developed in Canada. The ambience seemed most characteristic of a time that saw a mere handful of sociologists struggling to conceive a new discipline within Canadian social science, which in hindsight has been referred to as "the years of champagne" by Professor Hall. Whereas the undertaking may not have been a totally collaborative effort, due to geographical or administrative factors, it was nonetheless a venture with a notably national flavour, and one in which the participants readily realised the importance of their central role in establishing the groundwork. Professor Hall's analogy is indeed indicative of a festive period in the history of Canadian sociology.

The first term makes direct reference to one of the earliest and most dominant of American sociological traditions emerging from the Department of Sociology at the University of

Chicago. Although Chicago's prominence as a leading centre of sociology has frequently been documented as falling roughly between 1920 and the mid-30s, the premise is that its sociological tradition experienced a "reprise" in Canadian sociological writings during a period following its apparent "decline" in the U.S., extending as late as the 1950s. Chicago's influence on Canadian sociology is the main focus, as an analysis of some of the early sociological works shall certainly reveal the tradition's scholarly presence.

The period of 1935-1964 is indicative of a time in the history of Canadian sociology that witnessed the emergence and distribution of Canadian social scholarship at the national and, to a somewhat lesser extent, international level. Sociologists were provided, for the first time in this country, with a forum for publication within a Canadian periodical designed specifically with the social sciences in mind. This study, therefore, undertakes to examine the *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science* (CJEPS) and its role in the development of a set of ideas within the discipline.

It is usually customary at this point to acknowledge my gratitude to those persons responsible for fostering and sustaining this project along the way. I very much doubt that this work would have even materialised were it not for those long intellectual discussions with David A. Nock and his assured belief in my capabilities. A graduate course he offered on Canadian Society proved to be invaluable in helping me to overcome certain initial reservations, as the importance of such an undertaking began to unfold. It is thus with the utmost respect that I accepted Professor Nock as my thesis supervisor, and with the same respect that I offer to him much of the credit for the work undertaken herein. I am reminded, however, of the maxim put forth by W.I. Thomas, which has on numerous occasions found reference in discussion with David Nock, yet if I may paraphrase in respect to the present study: calling something *good* can only be as good as that which is perceived in its consequences. The consequences, of course, are all my own.

To the second and third members of my supervising committee, many thanks are offered to Randle W. Nelsen for his good humour and timely suggestions, and to Gerd Schroeter for the intensity of his criticisms and subsequent guidance. I cannot imagine a better combination of intellectual prowess than what has been experienced from these three professionals.

To the sociology faculty of the University of Toronto, my most sincere gratitude goes out to Douglas F. Campbell, Dennis W. Magill, Roger O'Toole, and especially to Professor Emeritus Oswald Hall, for their time and interest in seeing this study become a reality. My best wishes for continued success go out to Nathan Keyfitz in Austria, whose long distance correspondence affair proved to be most valuable. I need to also acknowledge the timely assistance of Stephen G. Triantis, Professor of Economics, for helping to paint a clearer picture of what the old Department of Political Economy looked like during the tenure of Harold A. Innis.

Many thanks are extended to Maurice Pinard for the valuable information he provided about some of the McGill University sociology staff. I am also most grateful for the information provided by Mary Salisbury pertaining to the academic career of her brother, the late Howard Roseborough.

After all is said and done, however, the last word must always go to Eleni.

Introduction

This investigation focuses on McGill University and its early reputation as a prominent centre of instruction, which set the pace for the development of the discipline in this country. Although a representative sample of sociologists has been selected for this study (the criteria for which are outlined in Chapter 1), a qualifying note on those who were not has also been provided.

Whereas the first Department of Sociology in Canada had been established at McGill in 1925, the faculty usually consisted of no more than two sociologists at any one time during the first two decades of its operation (1925-46). This number would increase to between four and five members over the next fourteen years to 1960 (see Appendix A). Compared to, for example, the University of Toronto, which had increased its sociology staff to eleven members by the end of its first thirty years of offering the subject (1933-64), McGill possessed a relatively minimal teaching pool, relying in large part on their graduate students for additional assistance.

A list of McGill contributors to the CJEPS, other than those included in this study, is provided in Appendix B, although this is by no means exhaustive of all sociology appointments within the institution. The list is comprised of those faculty members who appeared in the *journal* through either the publication of an article (the term *article* as employed within this study is defined in Chapter 1), review article, book review, note, memorandum, or served on the Editorial Advisory Board for CJEPS, the Board of Editors, or held an office within the C.P.S.A.. As such, it may be

considered a representative sample of McGill sociologists and their publications in the only Canadian journal of the day that accepted submissions from a comparatively junior social science during these developmental years.

Moreover, the total list is representative of approximately 23 per cent of all sociologists or affiliated persons who did appear in the journal in one or another of the aforementioned capacities. When this statistic is broken down to reflect the years before and after 1950, the finding is 32 per cent and 16 per cent representation respectively; and when considering Canadian-only submissions, the finding is 42 per cent and 20 per cent respectively. In other words, as far as what was being published in the CJEPS is concerned, McGill University was affiliated with many of the most visible names in Canadian sociology. This is obviously more apparent when counting Canadian-only affiliations for the pre-1950 period, which, when further considering the relatively limited staff pool during this period, seems to amplify the work coming out of the Department of Sociology.

Rounding out some of the other prominent names that appeared in the CJEPS: affiliated with the University of Toronto were Robert Morrison MacIver, Edward Johns Urwick, Charles William Merton Hart, Samuel Delbert Clark, John Davidson Ketchum, Jean Robertson Burnet, P. James Giffen, Ely Chinoy, Seymour Martin Lipset, Sylvia T. Wargon, J.W. Watson, Douglas Robert Pullman, John R. Seeley, Theodor J. Geiger, Jelle C. Riemersma, Norman B. Ryder, Leo Zakuta, Dennis Hume Wrong, Nathan Keyfitz, Richard J. Coughlin, Donald Earl Willmott, Robert L. James, T.H. Marshall, William D.H. Johnson, and Norman Wallis Bell; those connected with the University of British Columbia were Coral Wesley Topping, Kaspar D. Naegele, and Bernard R. Blishen; affiliated with Laval University were Father Georges-Henri Lévesque, Marc-Adelard Tremblay, Guy Rocher (also with Montreal), Gérald-Adelard Fortin, and Yves de Jocas; connected with the University of Montreal were Jacques Brazeau and Denis Szabo; with the University of Alberta were Mildred A. Schwartz and Donald L. Spence; affiliated with Carleton University were John Porter, Muni C. Frumhartz, and Peter C. Pineo; McMaster University had

Frank G. Vallee, Frank E. Jones, and Edmund W. Vaz; and Thelma H. McCormack from York University. As well, some of the names associated with sociology in the U.S. included: Robert Ezra Park (Chicago), Talcott Parsons (Harvard), Helen MacGill Hughes (Chicago), Reinhard Bendix (Berkeley), C. Wright Mills (Columbia), and Robert C. Angell (Michigan). Of particular note, however, are two more sociologists who played a prominent role in the development of sociology in French Canada.

Jean-Charles Falardeau (1913-1989; M.A.(1941) Laval) had been the first full-time professional sociologist hired in the newly formed Faculty of Social Sciences at Laval (1943) (previously the School of Social Sciences created in 1938 and headed by G.-H. Lévesque). During the year of his appointment he was visited by E.C. Hughes (then at Chicago), who helped co-ordinate and establish the *Programme de recherches sociales pour le Québec*, a research programme which was geared towards utilising the ecological approach espoused by the "Chicago School" of sociology (Falardeau studied at Chicago at the doctoral level between 1941-43). He was promoted to the rank of associate professor in 1946 and was later granted a year's leave of absence to lecture as visiting professor of sociology at the University of Bordeaux, France (1949). One year later, as *professeur agrégé* (associate professor), he was appointed titulaire (professor) of Institutional Sociology at Laval (1950), to be followed by the chairmanship of the Department of Sociology in 1951. Although he did not review any books for CJEPS, he did publish three articles (1944, 1947, and 1949). He sat as a member of the Editorial Advisory Board for the CJEPS for six years (1946-1947, 1951-1952, 1955-1956) and as its chairman for one year (1964). He served as an elected member of the Executive Council of the C.P.S.A. for three years (1946-1947 and 1951), its Vice-President for three years (1952, 1955-1956), and as its fourth and final sociologist President (1964). He also served as Chairman of the S.S.R.C.C. Committee on Biculturalism (1952-58). Professor Falardeau died in June of 1989.

Hubert Guindon (b. Bourget, Ontario: 1929) was first appointed assistant professor of sociology at the University of Montreal (1954) following three years of graduate work at the

University of Chicago (1950-53). He would stay at Montreal, participating within the Social Research Group there along the way, until 1960 when, under an air of some controversy following the publication of his only article in the *CJEPS* that year, he was *offered* a two-year sabbatical leave in order to complete his Ph.D.. Upon returning to Montreal from his sabbatical in Paris, he was offered and accepted an appointment at Sir George Williams University (later to merge with Loyola College to become Concordia University in 1974) as associate professor of sociology (1962). He would stay there for the next seven years, teaming up with Kurt Jonassohn to overlook the Summer Institute which undertook to invite some of the more prominent names in sociology to teach undergraduate courses. In the shadow of some budgetary constraints, which did not allow for a graduate programme in sociology to emerge, Guindon, who was now a full professor (1966), resigned from Sir George Williams and accepted an appointment as visiting professor at Carleton University, and more specifically the Institute of Canadian Studies (1969). One year later, perhaps in light of a nostalgia for Montreal, he returned to Sir George Williams where he has remained to this day. He sat on the Editorial Advisory Board for *CJEPS* (1964) and the Executive Council of the C.P.S.A. for two years (1964-1965); was President of the Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association (1970-71); Canadian Delegate and member of the Executive for the International Sociological Association (1970-74); and became a Fellow of the Royal Society of Canada in 1978. A book edited by two of his former students (Roberta Hamilton and John L. McMullan Quebec Society: Tradition, Modernity, and Nationhood (1988)) had provided for the first time a collection of some of Hubert Guindon's most reputable articles.

It seems that sociology in Quebec has often been addressed as a distinct tradition and as such has been differentiated in the literature from what has come to be recognised as a "Canadian" sociological tradition. It thus becomes difficult to speak of a Canadian sociology *de facto* without in the same breath including a qualifying prefix identifying the cultural connection. Undoubtedly a major dividing factor underlying this distinction is directly attributable to regional

disparities including: ethnicity, language, religion, economics, and technological development.

A historical assessment of sociology's evolution in Canada thus seems to begin from three main intellectual sources: (1) the influence on French-Canadian sociology of the Roman Catholic Church and of Frederick Le Play (1806-82) through the pioneering work of Léon Gérin (1863-1951); (2) the influence of the British model of social science study as at the University of Toronto; and (3) the influence of an American-style empiricism as may be found at McGill University. Such an analysis may be further reduced to a comparison of European versus North American approaches in that the latter approach also includes the early efforts to establish a Canadian brand of sociology. Since this study is concerned with the history of anglophone sociology in Canada, and since it is agreed that Anglo-Canadian society is relatively without boundary in light of continuing continentalist relations with the U.S., it seems appropriate to address the issue from a much more contemporary, and in effect relevant, perspective in questioning the extent of an American influence on Canadian sociological thought.

Chapter 1

ESTABLISHING THE PARAMETERS

In assessing the development of a sociology programme at McGill University, repeated references have been made to the assertion that a "Chicago tradition" had been established (Jones, 1977:161) by an "able Chicago-trained" man (Faris, 1979:124), who may well have been instrumental in founding the first "Chicago colony" in Canada (Nock, 1987:1). Conversely, there are those commentators who, for a variety of reasons, argue that "it is incorrect to regard McGill sociology as an American import" (Shore, 1987:xiv), since there was no initial effort to import the subject, but rather an attempt "to develop it as a Canadian venture" (Hall, 1964:116). Still others have brought into question the concept (Harvey, 1987), or simply the label (Cavan, 1983), that there ever was a "Chicago School" at all. There is, however, the undeniable fact that the contextual development of the subject at McGill was influenced not only by a wide range of Chicago-style methodologies (see Shore, 1987), but also fostered by a staff which was in effect comprised of Chicago-trained sociologists and their students for approximately four decades from the time of its beginnings in 1922 to 1962 (Brym, 1986:5).

While allegations that an American product was being propounded at McGill continued, the rival University of Toronto (Hall, 1988:11) maintained a "deeply ingrained" British academic tradition (Hiller, 1982:6). In this respect, sociology as a subject was being nurtured by the

Department of Political Economy, contemporaneously referred to as the "mother of departments" (Drummond, 1983:96), and incorporated within an interdisciplinary framework that prevented it "from being accepted within the university as a bone fide distinctive discipline" (Campbell, 1983:146).

The development of sociology at these two universities differed in many ways and for varied reasons. The uniformity in approach and substance available at McGill, along with the distinction of a *seemingly* autonomous department, contrasted with the diversity and interdependence at Toronto, resulting in a reputation that "sociology was stronger at McGill than at Toronto" (Burnet, 1981:28). Moreover, following a modest university growth in the 1920s, more social scientists began participating in the distribution of knowledge in Canada (Drummond, 1983:74). The Department of Political Economy at Toronto came under pressure from the university's president in the mid-30s to "take the lead" in the pursuit of scholarship (Bladen, 1960:1), seemingly in response to the installation of the McGill Social Science Research Project (M.S.S.R.P.) in 1930 and the possibility of obtaining "strategic grants" from the United States (Irving, 1986). An academic vehicle was requested to co-ordinate a wide distribution of intellectual materials on a national basis, with the University of Toronto as the initiator. Hence a new social-science quarterly was agreed upon, in consultation with the University of Toronto Press and the Canadian Political Science Association (C.P.S.A.), which subsequently led to the birth of the *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science* in 1935.

Although precautions were taken "to ensure that the *Journal* would not simply be a Toronto affair many Canadian social scientists talked and acted as if it was....[and] it was suspected that Toronto was trying to buy control of Canadian social science" (Drummond, 1983: 75). Initial reaction was one of caution: "Would McGill feel it must keep up with Toronto?" (Bladen, 1960:1). Would a competing journal emerge, as with the establishment of the *American Sociological Review* in that same year (1935) (see Lengermann, 1979), and if so would the development of Canadian social science suffer? Considering that up until 1960 the U of T Press

was the only English-language university press in Canada,¹ there seemed little choice in the matter.

Whereas there were alternative Canadian bulletins and journals for other social scientists to consider,² the CJEPS provided the only Canadian forum for works in sociology.³ Indeed, there were a number of American periodicals for these sociologists to consider (and they did), yet if sociology was to establish itself in Canada as a reputable discipline and a distinctly "Canadian venture," sociologists would have to concentrate on writing that characteristic history within their own national boundaries and pertaining to the structure of Canadian society. Similarly, Edward Shils (1970:816) has noted that: "[p]art of the scientific self-conception of sociology is expressed in its preferred form of publication, the journal article."

One factor involved in furthering a framework along lines special to itself is the discipline's ability to gain "access to the means of intellectual production." Analogously, Norbert Wiley (1979) discusses this process, pertaining to the development of sociological theories, as one important means by which theory domination may be achieved within a scholarly discipline. He points out that the tools involved in approaching this end include,

"professional jobs, access to journal publication, graduate students, access to university and commercial publishers, and money for research. In addition,...the control of the organizational and ceremonial structures of the major professional associations of the discipline" (p.48).

By adopting this framework in examining the early developmental period of Canadian sociology, it becomes evident that the discipline had yet to emerge as a competing force within the social science community. A discussion on the Association, the journal and sociology's place therein follows in chapter two.

Prior to 1960, "[o]nly about a dozen English-language books on Canada had been written by accredited sociologists" (Brym, 1986:3), whereas 50 sociological articles bearing a Canadian address had appeared in the CJEPS. Over half of these (i.e., 29) originated from the two major departments at Toronto (n=17) and McGill (n=12), thus providing an opportunity to examine what

could be referred to as the "mainstream" in Canadian sociology. The previous argument, however, has indicated a Chicago influence at McGill and a political economy influence at Toronto, suggesting that a mainstream approach per se may have been absent in Canadian social thought. Moreover, a more recent argument asserts that, "[w]hile the former was under the influence of the Chicago school, the latter was under the influence of structural-functional school [sic]" (Chekki, 1987:65). This does not necessarily imply a discrepancy, but rather the need for specifying a qualifying time period for each.

A number of researchers (e.g., Carey, 1975; Evans, 1986-87; Harvey, 1987; Kuklick, 1973; Lengermann, 1979) have made reference to the work of Thomas Kuhn (1970) and more specifically to his theory of "scientific" or "paradigm revolutions." Generally speaking, a Kuhnian viewpoint begins by identifying a scientific "community" as one which shares some time-bound distinctive paradigm or "tradition of scientific practice" (p.6). Such a "paradigm period" exists as long as there is consensus within the group, yet it is subject to change as new scientific interpretations or paradigms emerge, leading to intra-group conflict and a resulting power struggle (Lengermann, 1979:187). Such a period of transformation, or shift from one traditional commitment to the next, is what Kuhn refers to as a paradigm revolution.

The difficulty stems from equating sociology with natural science and compartmentalising each sociological tradition historically as mutually exclusive and wholly independent of any other. Yet Kuhn does assert that "new paradigms are born from old ones" (p.149) and that scientific debates which occur during those "pre-paradigm" periods (i.e., episodes of revolution) "do not vanish once and for all with the appearance of a [new] paradigm" (p.48). Hence an image arises of numerous alternative paradigms constantly nipping from all angles at some predominant paradigm, while the process itself is in a constant flux.

Sociologist Edward Tiryakian (1979) has also adopted Kuhn's general thesis in his own examination of the history of sociology. He relabels the Kuhnian concept of "scientific community" with that of "school," which he argues "is a more general heuristic concept for

purposes of historical analysis of a given discipline" (p.216). He proceeds to build on the Kuhnian perspective by first integrating a characteristically humanistic bent in identifying a "school" as "a real group of intellectuals, a small community of persons whose origin and formative period can be localized in time and place....distinguished from that of the *school of thought* usage" (p.216). This then develops into a general definition of "school" as consisting "of a scientific community integrated around a central figure, an intellectual charismatic leader, and a paradigm of empirical reality which is subject to investigation" (p.218).

Because the examination focuses on the historical development of sociology specifically, Tiryakian applies this conceptualisation to schools within the discipline, in a somewhat similar manner to Wiley's (1979) discussion on theories, by identifying those factors (or tools) involved in producing a successful (or dominant) school:

"First,...a school needs a founder-leader....Second,...an institutional affiliationThird,...a journal, review, or other means of regularly publishing its research and theoretical developments....Fourth, a school's identity is also provided by means of a document in the nature of a professional proclamation of its basic mode of perceiving and relating to the world" (pp.222-223).

Hence Wiley's approach seems to converge in places with Tiryakian's, although the former focuses in part on sociology as a system of ideas and the latter follows a path of analysing sociology as an institution and profession.

A third approach emerges from a model of theory groups espoused by Nicholas Mullins (1973). The Mullins theory is based on a progressive four-stage model of group development identified by the normal, network, cluster, and specialty stages. Essentially, the theory pertains to the pattern of associations -- those social and intellectual relations and changes -- found within "the general science communication structure."

The process may be transitional, although not necessarily, advancing from: a low level of social and intellectual organisation within a scientific *community* (generic sense) that may share *some* common research condition (normal stage); to a level of group formation, or "a *thickening* of the scientific communication network", involving a consensus amongst "like-minded scientists

...and the creation of student-teacher links" (pp.21-22) (network stage); to a "major change" in which "[c]lusters of students and colleagues form around the key figures in a group in one or a few institutions" (p.22), both socially and intellectually (cluster stage); to a stage which follows the emergence of a maturing and successful student cohort, that disperses from the parent location to undertake other appointments, subsequently resulting in the weakening of original personal relations and necessarily leading to the institutionalisation of a new specialty based on the work that had been done to that point (specialty stage). Thus Mullins expands on an issue of personnel and personal connections resulting from an exchange of ideas within a theoretically congruent network of scientists.

It becomes evident that these approaches are interconnected in many ways. Of course the exchange of ideas is by no means limited to these perspectives. For example, Edward Shils (1970) addresses the history of sociology through an impressive account of the discipline's academic institutionalisation. Herman and Julia Schwendinger (1974) provide an historical assessment based on a criticism of the discipline's ideological ties to a politically repressive American conservatism. The sociological historian Martin Bulmer (1985) retraces the conditions leading to the formation of a "school," outlined by nine characteristic features, building in part on the factors (or tools) discussed by Wiley and Tiryakian. Lee Harvey (1987:247), who criticises a *nominalist* interpretation of the concept of "school" as being "unsystematic" and noncontributory to the overall organisation of scientific knowledge, asserts that a metascientific approach would succeed in recognising "the social academic unit [i.e., "school"] as having a role in the production of scientific knowledge."

The evidence is clear that the study of sociology's development can be as diverse in method as a researcher's sociological interests, perspectives, and preferences (Lofland, 1983:491) in establishing a framework for analysis and in competing for attention within the profession. It is this diversity which provides the discipline with the attribute of being a dynamic intellectual endeavour pursuing knowledge pertaining to an equally dynamic social world. Yet the

development of sociological ideas may be as uniform as the *natural* development of social behaviour, or as discontinuous as that behaviour which encounters various stimuli in the course of social life. The former line of thought seems to suggest an ideal-type of model of social processes, which may be useful for comparative purposes, whereas the latter undertakes the study of the pattern of social change from a perspective that is characteristic of the social and intellectual structures of the period. Subsequently, the discussion returns to the Kuhnian thesis on paradigm periods and revolutions, as well as to the more or less complementary views of, for example, Mullins, Shils, Wiley and Tiryakian, in addressing the examination of the history of sociology.

The development of sociology in Canada, as in the U.S., seems to have progressed along similar lines, in that predominant traditions or paradigms have come and gone, having attached their influence to the endeavour along the way in different measures. Of particular concern is the influence derived from one of the dominant and earliest of American traditions emerging from the Chicago department of sociology. Its prominence as a leading centre of sociology, frequently documented as roughly between 1920 and the mid-30s (Bulmer, 1985; Carey, 1975; Cavan, 1983; Faris, 1979), undeniably left its mark on many campuses as former Chicago students took up the task of building up new departments, even when confronted with scornful resistance (Brym, 1986: 6; Clark, 1975:227, Faris, 1979:124). The task of retracing the limits of its influence in Canada will first require the operationalisation of the term "Chicago influence" as it is used throughout this study, which is the issue addressed in chapter three.

A question which arises relates to the impact of such an influence and its demonstrated ability to pervade systematic study and maintain scholarly interest in related fields within the discipline. As part of a recent study Richard Evans (1986-87) challenged the widely held assumption that Chicago sociology "declined" during the 1930s. His approach included an examination of the publishing patterns of two preeminent American journals (*American Journal of Sociology* and *American Sociological Review*) and the testing of a hypothesis that "what is

published in the journals reflects, at least in part, the state of the profession" (p.111). The findings indicate "that rather than experiencing *decline* in this period [to 1945], Chicago was experiencing *competition* from other theoretical and institutional centers" (p.125). Indeed, Evans has managed to provide further support to an assertion presented earlier by Robert E.L. Faris (1979:123):

"There is no history of a decline to relate, at least in absolute magnitude. The position of special dominance, however, so notable in the 1920's, inevitably faded as strong departments of sociology emerged at other universities."

Yet Evans himself has called for support in the search for a more "definitive picture" of Chicago's longevity, through an examination of books and "several minor sociological and related journals of this period" (p.125). The present undertaking recognises such a request and uses it as a **springboard** of sorts to advance knowledge in this area.

This study examines sociology articles originating from McGill University that were published in the CJEPS during the period 1935-1964.⁴ The selection process is based on the following criteria in an attempt to provide the most representative picture of sociology at McGill: (1) "articles" does not include notes, memoranda, review articles, or book reviews; (2) the author has noted affiliation by including the name of McGill University; (3) the author holds a full-time appointment in sociology at McGill; (4) the author does not hold a "visiting" status at McGill when submitting the article; and (5) the author has maintained an appointment in the discipline of sociology following the publication of the article.

By employing these guidelines, a total of 8 sociologists and 13 articles (see Appendix C) have been included in this study (accompanied by the corresponding number of articles for each): C.A. Dawson (3), E.C. Hughes (1), R.E.L. Faris (1), F.E. LaViolette (2), O. Hall (2), A.D. Ross (2), W.A. Westley (1), and H.E. Roseborough (1). It is noted that this sample represents about 24 per cent of all sociology articles (n=54) appearing in the journal during this period, originating from Canadian addresses, and approximately 18 per cent of the total number (n=72). Available information pertaining to gatekeeping processes is limited to the latter period of the journal (1953-66) (see Appendix D). Whereas such detail does provide a sense of sociology's relative status

within the Association, it should be noted that the subject had already been around in Canada for some thirty years, and that it had yet to gain any kind of matching representation in comparison to the two dominant disciplines.

The articles are divided into two groups representing the early (1935-49) and later (1950-64) years of CJEPS. This has been adopted as a rough indicator of the concept of "paradigm periods" in the development of sociology; with the early period representative of the Chicago influence in Canada (Evans, 1986-87) and the later period that of structural functionalism (in the Parsonsian sense). There is, of course, the tradition of "objectivism" to consider, with a transition process anticipated to overlap the end and the beginning of these two periods.

Moreover, the years surrounding the 1950 division are also important when considering certain pivotal events relative to Chicago sociology and McGill. At Chicago: William F. Ogburn retired from the faculty in 1951, Herbert Blumer moved to the University of California at Berkeley in 1952, Louis Wirth died in 1952, as did Ellsworth Faris in 1953, leaving Ernest Burgess the senior man until his retirement in 1957 (although he had retired from teaching in 1951). At McGill: Forrest E. LaViolette resigned to accept an appointment at Tulane University in 1950, and Carl Dawson retired in 1952.

The analysis is not dependent on quantitative techniques (although these may be used in a supplementary way for clarification purposes), but rather on a survey of written documents accompanied by qualitative judgments and decisions. There is no attempt to place the *results* into neat and rigid cells. Instead, it proceeds along a sociology of knowledge approach, supplementing and complementing a contextual analysis with an examination of external social, economic, and intellectual conditions (institutions) as they may affect the events surrounding a particular stage in the development of sociology in this country.

It needs to be clear that this is not an attempt to retrace the historical evolution of the discipline in Canada or at McGill, for there are a number of excellent works which do this. Rather, the focus is on the authors of these articles, their scholarly approach to the study of sociology and

the influence of a characteristically Chicago method of social inquiry. The parameter extends to the major Canadian journal of the day, the events surrounding the C.P.S.A., and the development of sociology in Canada in this context.

Notes to Chapter 1

1. For example, the McGill University Press commenced operation in 1960.
2. For example, Economics and Political Science were dealt with in *Queen's Quarterly* (1893-), the *Canadian Banker* (1893-), the *Queen's University Bulletins* (1910-28), McMaster's *Canadian Economic Service* (1927-34), the *Dalhousie Review* (1920-) and the *University of Toronto Quarterly* (1931-) (Taylor, 1967:585).
3. There were, however, a few multidisciplinary projects in the 1930s and 1940s resulting in a limited number of sociology monographs which, along with CJEPS, served "as the primary evidence of activity in the sociology-in-political-economy years" (Hiller, 1982:17).
4. Although CJEPS extended to 1967, the minutes of the 1964 annual meeting of the C.P.S.A. included: "The inauguration of the CANADIAN REVIEW OF SOCIOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY implied the withdrawal of the JOURNAL [i.e., CJEPS] from these fields" (p.440). Volume One of the CRSA was completed in November, 1964.

Chapter 2

THE C.P.S.A., THE JOURNAL, AND SOCIOLOGY

The CJEPS became recognised as "the official organ" of the C.P.S.A., which itself was emerging as a credible organisation concerned with investigating "the reality of Canadian nationality" (MacGibbon, 1935:2), through the "study of economic, political, and social problems in Canada." Success was dependent upon the maintenance of the interdisciplinary nature of the Association and "the necessity of publishing a sufficient variety of articles to appeal to the divergent interests of [the] membership" (Bladen, 1937:473). Distribution of scholarly knowledge had begun to shift to the modest journal article -- i.e., the "packaging" of knowledge in thirty pages or less -- and away from lengthy books (Hall, 1989). It certainly seemed an effective way of generating and maintaining an exchange of ideas at both national and to a somewhat lesser degree international levels.

Whereas economics and political science articles frequently appeared in the journal (especially the former), comparatively minimal space was allotted for sociology and anthropology as well. This was of course understandable considering that "[i]n 1938 there were fewer than ten trained sociologists in the country" (Clark, 1975:231) compared with a C.P.S.A. membership of 900 (see Appendix E). Even later in 1955, when formation of the Anthropology and Sociology Chapter of the C.P.S.A. was projected, there was a total of 12 members in the Chapter compared with

1,504 in the Association. And in 1957, when the Chapter adopted its own constitution and was recognised as fully formed, the membership stood at 50 compared to a C.P.S.A. total of 1,700. But sociology was offered a mechanism for publishing articles and the opportunity to contribute to the knowledge of general social processes was not neglected.

The subject's status within the social science community first received notoriety within the CJEPS in an article appearing in the first number of the journal. In a single paragraph it was determined that:

"Sociology is not yet a fit subject for intelligence....[It] loves to discourse...about such little matters as civilization and progress, and their cause and cure. It is fairly harmless and sometimes stimulating, and never gets us anywhere -- as science....If, on the other hand, it tries to be scientific and intelligent,...it merely becomes ludicrous at the expense of its interest" (Urwick, 1935:73).

The first indication of sociology's contribution to this community through the Association appeared when, at the tenth annual meeting of the C.P.S.A. on May 23, 1938, it was reported that "Sociology" also participated in the general sessional proceedings through the presentation of two academic papers; Carl Dawson organised and chaired a session where Everett Hughes and Robert French present papers. Two years later, the subject's status would be elevated by inclusion in round-table discussions at the annual meetings (with the presentation of a paper by Professor C.W.M. Hart), as well as having (under special conditions arranged by the University of Toronto Press) fifty extra pages in the May number of Volume 6 (1940) of the CJEPS devoted to the publication of five articles¹ in sociology (compared to twenty-three in other fields). This high *quota* of five sociology articles would be again realised in the 1947, 1949, 1952, and 1957 volumes, and for only in 1958 did six sociology articles appear. Yet the 1940 edition provided a good introduction to Canada's social science community of the diversity in approaches within sociology, possibly dispelling certain preconceived notions that the discipline was static or even unscientific. Two years followed before a fully-trained sociologist -- Carl Dawson -- received an appointment as Association president.²

Prior to 1950, the general feeling within the C.P.S.A. regarding sociology and its place

within the Association as well as the journal, did not so much reflect a categorical apprehension that the subject was either second, third, or fourth rate compared to the other social sciences. Rather, the consideration was based on the fact that there was no significant corps of sociologists in the country at the time and consequently no great interest in the publication of sociology articles was immediately apparent (Triantis, 1989). After all, the C.P.S.A. was not only an organisation concerned with discoursing on various political, economic and social issues, but also a business that relied on membership fees, subscriptions, and the University of Toronto Press for certain concessions (such as allowing "free" pages of text) as well as guaranteeing annual losses as they might arise. This became more apparent as the Association continually called out for further support from its membership within the pages of the secretary-treasurer's annual report, and through the publication of the annual auditor's report, providing the readership with a complete breakdown of the organisation's fiscal activity.

As far as articles and notes appearing in *CJEPS*, the U of T Press began by paying contributors \$1.00 per page prior to 1941, and the managing editor of the journal a fee of \$100 per issue (Bladen, 1938:461). In 1941, the practice of regular payments for contributions was stopped (Ashley, 1941:479), and although the managing editor continued to receive a nominal fee, those sitting on the editorial board received, as Oswald Hall (1989) recounts, "not even a chocolate bar and a cup of coffee. [After all] this is an honorific affair...They didn't look upon intellectual materials as being private property. The wider distribution it could get, the better." What contributors did receive were twenty-five courtesy copies of their published article and if a book was reviewed they got to keep it (Triantis, 1989). When textbooks began appearing and *CJEPS* articles were being copied, the C.P.S.A. Executive adopted a policy of charging for commercial reprints, usually forwarding one half of a flat-rate payment to authors or their heirs (Eastman, 1961:386). The managing editor had made it clear, with concurrence from the director of the U of T Press, that all rights pertaining to contributed materials resided with the journal (Eastman, 1962:436).

It should also be noted that the original intent behind the journal's inception was to encourage³ publication of papers written by Canadian economists on Canadian economics (Bladen, 1960:1). As such, subtle references to the "founding fathers" of the C.P.S.A. and the journal (mostly economists with a few political scientists), along with a reminder that the majority of the membership had a disciplinary interest in economics and thus required more space in the CJEPS (Eastman, 1962:436-37), continued to surface (albeit sporadically) at the meetings. Some noise had been heard from the political scientists as well, inquiring into the possibility of holding a full compliment of four sessions in their own field at the meetings (Macpherson, 1954:377). Yet such attempts at "splintering" the Association were quickly depressed by reiterating the *value* of maintaining an interdisciplinary exchange of ideas amongst the various branches of knowledge and "the opportunity [the meetings] gave for learning of developments in other than one's own field" (Macpherson, 1954:377). The C.P.S.A. put into praxis what it preached on a number of occasions, responding perhaps to earlier examples of interdisciplinary co-operation and their success in attracting highly needed financial support.

Prior to 1940, funding for social science research from Canadian sources was limited to private contributions and basically inconsequential systems of government grants and scholarships through the National Research Council in Ottawa (established in 1916). The situation might have grown worse were it not for some timely interest from the United States and a few of the philanthropic foundations willing to support such research. Two important studies resulted from funding by the Carnegie Corporation of New York: the *Relations of Canada and the United States* series,⁴ beginning in the 1930s with funding from the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Division of Economics and History, and the *Canadian Frontiers of Settlement* series (1934-40),⁵ resulting in a nine-volume examination of pioneer problems in Canada's West (three of which were sociological studies involving the work of C.A. Dawson). Although the Carnegie Corporation continued to provide much-needed financial support, it was a large infusion of funding from the Rockefeller Foundation that helped put social science research in Canada on its feet and moving.

As early as 1930, a Rockefeller grant of \$110,000 was received by McGill University "for a five-year program of coordinated, interdisciplinary social science research, the main focus of which was to be unemployment in Canada, with a particular emphasis on Montreal" (Irving, 1986: 6). This was the first grant ever made to a Canadian university by either the Rockefeller Foundation or the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial "in connection with the program for strengthening institutional centers for advanced work in the social sciences, though the desirability of an extension of the program to Canada was recognized from the outset."⁶ The programme came to be known as the McGill Social Science Research Project (under the direction of Leonard C. Marsh), and for the next eleven years⁷ a coterie of twelve faculty members⁸ and thirty-eight graduate students comprised of economists, sociologists, psychologists, philosophers, as well as persons in law, engineering, education, and medicine, undertook to examine the various problems of Montreal during the Depression years. A number of sociology M.A. papers resulted, as well as a few publications, including Lloyd G. Reynolds' The British Immigrant (1935) and Everett Hughes' French Canada in Transition (1943). Realising that this was a golden opportunity to stimulate a research programme in Canada, the C.P.S.A. proceeded to investigate the feasibility of such an outcome.

In 1938, a committee of C.P.S.A. representatives was set up to join with other social science organisations in Canada to examine the possibility of co-ordinated research within the country. The five-member committee was comprised of the following social scientists and their areas of study: J.F. Booth (Ottawa) surveyed the field of Agricultural Economics, Harold A. Innis (Economist, U. of Toronto) looked at Economics, R. MacGregor Dawson (Political Scientist, U. of Toronto) at Political Science, Carl A. Dawson (Sociologist, McGill University) at Sociology, and D.C. MacGregor (Economist, U. of Toronto) at Statistics (CJEPS, 1939:520). Eventually, the survey led to the founding of the Canadian Social Science Research Council (C.S.S.R.C.) in 1940 (changed to the Social Science Research Council of Canada (S.S.R.C.C.) in the fifties), with a continuation of the same mandate "to coordinate research activities in the social sciences and to

attempt to secure funding" (Hiller, 1982:18). This was indeed an important step in the organisation of social science research in Canada, especially since government initiative appeared to be lacking.

Perhaps what made the C.S.S.R.C. at least initially attractive to American support was that same interdisciplinary characteristic which the C.P.S.A. continued to advocate. Such a feature was particularly attractive to one of its largest benefactors, the Rockefeller Foundation, which seemed to avoid funding research that focused on specific topics, preferring instead to "encourage scientific research in the social sciences in a broad way" (Shore, 1987:210). As such, the M.S.S.R.P. may have been on shaky ground with its focus on the *unemployment* issue, although the use of a multidisciplinary approach helped to see it through a second and third extension on its funding. A good example of this was the support given to the C.S.S.R.C. for the sponsoring of the *Social Credit in Alberta* series⁹ during the 1940s. Under the direction and editorship of sociologist S.D. Clark, a group of ten social scientists, made up of economists, political scientists and sociologists (S.D. Clark along with his two graduate students, Jean Burnet and W.E. Mann), produced a volume each in this series that examined the background to and development of the Social Credit movement in Alberta.¹⁰

Rockefeller money continued to be used by the C.S.S.R.C. during the forties and fifties through the availability of pre-doctoral fellowships ranging from \$750-\$2,000 in value. For example, four such fellowships were awarded in 1948, nine in 1949, and twenty-four in 1953.¹¹ The funding was also used to start the C.S.S.R.C. Grants in Aid of Research programme, which usually provided a \$300 amount "to help defray the special expenses involved in research projects proposed by Canadian scholars in the Social Sciences" (CJEPS, 1950:542).

The Rockefeller Foundation, the Carnegie Foundation, the Russell Sage Foundation, and the Ford Foundation continued to provide grants for Canadian social science research, until the establishment of the Canada Council by the federal government in 1957 redirected that role.¹² The result was a structural change of major proportions, in that long-term multidisciplinary projects

could no longer be adequately funded by the government, providing instead grants geared towards short-term and one-person projects (Hiller, 1982:18). Indeed, the role of the American organisations revealed itself as an initiatory boost to help generate an involvement in social science research in Canada with the eventual next step that of continuing the process at a national and local level.

American support during these hard times in the Canadian social sciences proved to be an enormous benefit in helping to create a firm scholarly base from which researchers could continue the process of advancing a characteristically national product. This may have been particularly evident in the discipline of sociology, as it proceeded to detach itself from old connections with social work, philanthropy, and reform. By being provided the opportunity to carry out research, and the means with which to publish the findings, the new discipline appeared to be well on its way to establishing itself as a reputable *science*. The endeavour would once again receive assistance in the early 1950s with recognition extending beyond national boundaries.

In September 1949, a conference was held in Oslo, Norway, where a preparatory committee, looking to establish the International Sociological Association (I.S.A.), was discussing the possibility of creating an international forum for sociologists to join together in scholarly discourse. The C.P.S.A. was represented at this meeting by Carl Dawson of McGill who, along with S.D. Clark from the University of Toronto and Jean-Charles Falardeau of Laval University, proceeded to participate as members of the I.S.A. council and as C.P.S.A. representatives at the first World Congress of Sociology in 1950 (see Appendix F). Participation was extremely encouraging as "[s]ome seventy papers from more than twenty-five countries had been submitted for presentation at the Congress and were read or reported on" (CJEPS, 1951:242). Of the three inaugural international meetings held in 1950 (i.e., by the I.S.A., the International Economic Association, and the International Political Science Association), the sociology sessions were by far the largest in representation. Canadian sociologists would continue to represent the C.P.S.A.¹³ at these world congresses every three or four years, with more names accompanying

the duo of S.D. Clark and J.-C. Falardeau, such as Oswald Hall, Maurice Tremblay, and Nathan Keyfitz (who also participated in the I.E.A. round-table in Austria in 1955). And with the establishment of the I.S.A.'s quarterly journal *Current Sociology* in 1953, Canadian social research was provided with an additional outlet for publishing articles along with a much wider readership.

As the C.P.S.A. membership began to approach the 1,500 mark in 1954, the Executive Council decided to expand on both its contacts and number of annual meetings by authorising the formation of an Ottawa Chapter. Disciplinary representation on the Chapter's Executive did not seem to vary significantly from that of the Association (see Appendix G), whereas the participants appeared to be based either in the Ottawa region or Montreal. Some of the names in sociology participating within the Chapter included: John Porter (Carleton), Muni Frumhartz (Carleton), Marcel Rioux (Carleton), Nathan Keyfitz (Dominion Bureau of Statistics), and the Reverend Gilles-M. Belanger (Laval). The Chapter met annually during the winter months (as compared to the spring meetings of the overall membership) and interacted through a number of organised study groups in discussions on contemporary issues of concern.¹⁴ Indeed, the idea of expansion seemed to walk together with that of detachment, in the sense that the Ottawa group now had the opportunity to confront topics with a local relevance, as well as making themselves more readily accessible to funding through government or private agencies based in Ottawa that may be considering the social sciences for various research projects. Yet the formation of the Ottawa Chapter may have served as a catalyst of sorts for the first disciplinary expansion of the C.P.S.A. in 1957.

In 1955, during the 27th annual business meeting of the C.P.S.A., a small quasi-organised committee of Canadian sociologists, led by S.D. Clark, approached the Council with a proposal "for a more cohesive and effective form of organization than they felt was at [that time] provided with the C.P.S.A." (Macpherson, 1955:374). Suggested changes included the addition of the word *Sociology* to the title of the journal, i.e., "The Canadian Journal of Economics, Political Science, and Sociology", as well as Council authorisation for the formation of a Sociological Chapter of the

Association. Ultimately, the name of the journal remained unaltered, however, authorisation was granted for the formation of a Sociology and Social Anthropology Chapter the following year. This in turn led to the adoption of a constitution on June 14, 1957 and the establishment of the Anthropology and Sociology Chapter of the C.P.S.A..

As far as the Council seemed to be concerned, providing sociology with a "more effective place within the Association, [reflected] the high value it put on the contribution of sociology and on the unity of the social sciences in Canada" (Macpherson, 1955:374). Formation of the Chapter did not go unchallenged, as the attending members were again reminded of the interdisciplinary nature of the Association and the strength of maintaining a united front. This sentiment was also heard within the ranks of sociologists, who seemed to regard "the formation of a chapter as a step leading to the eventual reorganization of the Association into more separate groups" (Eastman, 1956:385). It is unclear from the pages of the CJEPS which group of sociologists presented the dissenting vote on the formation of the chapter, yet the names which appeared to be in the forefront of the eventually successful *detachment* included: S.D. Clark (U of T), David N. Solomon (McGill), Kaspar D. Naegele (U.B.C.), and anthropologist Harry B. Hawthorn (U.B.C.). The chapter began with a membership of 12 in 1955, and had reached 50 by 1957 when it was formally recognised.

One of the first organisational tasks of the new chapter was to carry out a census, with financial assistance from the C.S.S.R.C., in order to determine the number of current research projects underway within the fields in Canada. The returns indicated that 75 projects were underway in 1957, as compared to 48 projects in 1955, providing a baseline from which the chapter could proceed in effectively realising their main objective -- "the enhancement of research and instruction in anthropology and sociology" (Eastman, 1958:412). An Executive Committee was formed, with elections following thereafter at each annual meeting until 1966 (see Appendix H).

With the administrative body in place, and with a general overview of what sort of research was being carried out in the fields, the next step was the establishment of a Committee on

Publications with the task of collecting manuscripts from Canadians who may be interested in publishing. In the process, the Executive Committee prepared a directory of anthropologists and sociologists in Canada, which was made available through Marcel Rioux at Carleton (Eastman, 1959:343). By 1959, the chapter had attained a membership of 71 and their first representative chairman S.D. Clark had just completed his term as President of the C.P.S.A. (the third sociologist to hold that office).

Although the chapter continued to adhere to its main objective, it did not lose touch with the fact that it remained a part of the overall Association. For example, in 1958 J.-C. Falardeau was one of two C.P.S.A. representatives attending the first meeting of the newly formed Canadian National Commission for UNESCO on February 5 and 6 (Eastman, 1958:412). In 1961, Richard J. Coughlin (U of T) acted as C.P.S.A. representative and read a paper at the Scientific Congress, University of Hong Kong, held from September 11-16 (Eastman, 1962:438). And in 1962, Reverend Jacques Lazure (director of the Department of Sociology, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Ottawa) represented the C.P.S.A. at the founding conference of the Canadian Council on Urban and Regional Research from March 15 to 17 in Ottawa (Eastman, 1962:437).

As well, a C.P.S.A. Committee on Statistics had been appointed in 1958 to examine the work being done in that area, with two of the nine members participating being sociologists: John Porter and S.D. Clark (*ex officio*). That number would increase in 1959 to three, as Nathan Keyfitz (U of T) joined the committee. One year later, the first Conference on Statistics was held at the C.P.S.A. annual meetings, with papers read by David N. Solomon (McGill) and P. James Giffen (U of T) among others. The Conference became a part of the annual meetings thereafter and sociologists continued to participate (as they had been doing at regular sessions of the meetings) through either the presentation of papers, the chairing of round tables, or as members on the committee. Some of these names included: David N. Solomon (McGill), Gérald-A. Fortin (Laval), Yves Martin (Laval), Bernard R. Blishen (U.B.C.), Donald E. Willmott (U of T), P. James Giffen (U of T), Raymond Breton (University of Montreal), Reginald A.H. Robson (U.B.C.),

Howard E. Roseborough (McGill), and Yves de Jocas (Laval). Indeed, statistical study was an integral part of the Association, as the one-time Canadian Statistical Association had ceased to function when the C.P.S.A. was formed (Eastman, 1957:414).

The Committee on Publications continued to receive Canadian manuscripts and two years later, in April of 1960, the very first issue of the chapter's *Bulletin* appeared, edited by Simon Yasin working out of the Ottawa address of 198 Macy Boulevard. A second number appeared the next year under Yasin, to be followed by a special issue in 1962 and a fourth issue in 1963 under the new editorship of Connie McFarlane. As the collection of works in anthropology and sociology began to accumulate, the general sense seemed to be that the disciplines were looking towards further expansion. Two regional conferences were arranged, with one in December 1961 at Banff and the other in January 1962 at Carleton University, with many of the chapter's members in attendance (Eastman, 1962:437). Another conference was held in Banff the following December (1962), which saw a number of western sociologists and anthropologists joining together with colleagues from some of the western border states in order to arrange the establishment of the Western Association of Sociology and Anthropology (W.A.S.A.) (Eastman, 1963:374). And in February 1963, a further sociological conference was held in Toronto with the topic of discussion that of "Problems of Urban Development." What followed must have been telegraphed as there was to be no reprisal, at least published.

In January 1964, the chapter reached an agreement with the University of Alberta, Calgary, for the establishment of the *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* (CRSA). The first issue appeared in February, with Jean R. Burnet as the Editor-in-Chief and Henry Zentner as the Managing Editor. The first full volume followed in November. Although the CRSA was meant to be a bilingual journal, only one of 29 articles received by the end of May was in French, six were anthropological and most of the remainder were sociological. Up to that point, 7 articles had been accepted, 21 rejected, one was in the process of being read, and 32 people from 15 universities in Canada and the U.S. had served as editorial readers (Eastman, 1964:441).

Whereas the original arrangements for the review had been reached between the University of Alberta and the chapter, the Association was quick to assume full responsibility.

The C.P.S.A. Executive reported that the Association was ultimately legally responsible for the journal, even though the University of Alberta had guaranteed a loss of up to \$4,000. They went on to praise the CJEPS' managing editor and the editorial staff of the University of Toronto Press for their assistance with the review, and subsequently amended their constitution in order to make provision for a joint subscription to the CJEPS and the CRSA (Eastman, 1964:441). They then proceeded to indicate that the major problem with the new journal was a lack of contributors, which implied an inadequate standard, and the unlikelihood of being able to publish quarterly. With a membership of 106 in 1964, however, the Chapter Executive responded with the appointment of a committee to look into the possibility of forming an autonomous organisation.

In 1966, the Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association (C.S.A.A.) was formed and the C.P.S.A. constitution was amended "so as to delete therefrom all references to the Anthropology-Sociology Chapter and to the Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology" (Dupre, 1966:383). One year later, CJEPS published its final volume and was replaced by two new journals: the *Canadian Journal of Economics* and the *Canadian Journal of Political Science*. As well, the C.P.S.A. "bifurcated" into two new groups: the Canadian Economics Association and the new Canadian Political Science Association, assuming the two new journals as their respective periodicals, both with assistance from the Canada Council to the tune of \$6,000 for 1967 and \$14,500 for 1968 (Clarkson, 1967:452). The interdisciplinary nature of Canadian social science was replaced by fragmentation and specialisation; as student enrolment increased dramatically in the sixties, faculty appointments were geared to keeping pace with both teaching and a competitive drive for research funding. The **champagne years** had come to an end with the replacement of an old guard strong in multidisciplinary activity and committed to scholarly work in the pursuit of scholarly knowledge, by a new agenda which looked to competition and personal advancement, not only within the social sciences, but within each discipline as well.

Returning to an earlier hypothesis, Norbert Wiley (1979:48) had indicated that a theory group's strength was measured by its ability to gain "access to the means of intellectual production." By applying this concept to the development of sociology in Canada, the evidence seems to be clear why this development was relatively hampered prior to the 1960s. Although "professional jobs" were available, the number of sociologists was limited to fewer than ten in 1938 and "only sixty-one" in 1960 (Hiller, 1979:129), compared to a much larger pool in the dominant social sciences. Prior to 1961, only nine sociology Ph.D.s had been conferred; all were at the University of Toronto (Helmes-Hayes, 1988:63).¹⁵ At the same time, social research was being "kept alive" by funding from various American foundations (Hiller, 1982:18). Moreover, there was no control of any "major professional association" until the founding of the C.S.A.A. in 1966.

Until 1960, CJEPS was the only Canadian journal publishing sociology articles; it would be joined by a Laval product -- *Recherches sociographiques* -- although it concentrated on Quebec society and the interaction of a mostly francophone sociological community (Keyfitz, 1974:19). In April 1960, the first issue of *Bulletin* appeared as a product of the Anthropology and Sociology Chapter of the C.P.S.A., and "as a means of exchanging information of professional interest among the members of the Chapter" (Eastman, 1960:486). This in turn led to the first issue of the CRSA in February 1964 and the claim by sociology to at least shared control of a means of scholarly production.

The discussion thusfar has provided a background or rationale for the remainder of this work; namely, the examination of CJEPS as a research tool is qualified by identifying its importance in the development of Canadian social science and particularly for that of sociology. Moreover, the role of the C.P.S.A. cannot be discounted, for as Harry Hiller (1982:151) indicates: "At the disciplinary level, the survival of the Canadian social science community was strongly dependent on the Canadian Political Science Association to provide the mechanisms to bring researchers and scholars together." These "mechanisms" included the CJEPS, annual business and chapter meetings, formation of the C.S.S.R.C., the securing of "strategic grants" and generally

an ethos that advocated the importance of interdisciplinary activity.

Also provided is a general introduction to many of the principals discussed in the remainder of this study, as well as to their respective universities and their role in the institutionalisation of the discipline. In a sense, the discussion thusfar may be said to fit in with what Nicholas Mullins (1973) has identified as the "normal stage" (lowest level) of group development, in that the social and intellectual organisation of this scientific community has followed along a relatively common research condition, namely, a distinctively national approach in the study of Canadian problems. The next step is to build on this concept of group development and examine the extent to which a characteristically Chicagoan methodology influenced the work of some of Canada's eminent sociologists.

Notes to Chapter 2

1. Robert E. Park "Physics and Society" (pp.135-152); Carl Dawson "Sociology as a Specialized Science" (pp.153-169); C.W.M. Hart "Some Obstacles to a Scientific Sociology" (pp.170-186); Talcott Parsons "The Motivation of Economic Activities" (pp.187-202); S.D. Clark "Economic Expansion and the Moral Order" (pp.203-225). These papers were reprinted in C.W.M. Hart (ed). Essays in Sociology (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1940).

2. Whereas E.J. Urwick held the office of President of the C.P.S.A. in 1932, Carl Dawson was the first fully-trained sociologist appointed to this position in 1942. He would be followed by Georges-Henri Lévesque in 1951, S.D. Clark in 1958, and Jean-Charles Falardeau in 1964. For a list of C.P.S.A. presidents between 1913-1967 refer to Appendix I, which also contains a list of the chairmen of the Anthropology and Sociology Chapter for the years 1955-1965.

3. The first attempt at encouraging Canadian publication of articles in economics came with the publication of Volume I of The Papers and Proceedings of the Canadian Political Science Association (also known as the *Proceedings*) in 1913. Following a period of interruption due to the First World War, this series continued with Volumes II to VI (1930-34), and thereafter in CJEPS as the minutes to the annual business meetings. Accompanying this series was a second set of publications, Contributions to Canadian Economics, that consisted of seven volumes from

1928-34. This series undertook to examine the economic question in Canada for the period 1920-34, and may basically be identified as the forerunner of the CJEPS.

4. Studies prepared under the direction of James T. Shotwell and published by The Ryerson Press in Toronto and Yale University Press in New Haven. For more on the Carnegie series, see for example Carl C. Berger "Internationalism, Continentalism, and the Writing of History: Comments on the Carnegie Series on the Relations of Canada and the United States." In Richard A. Preston (ed). The Influence of the United States on Canadian Development (Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1972), pp.32-54.

5. Edited by W.A. Mackintosh and W.L.G. Joerg (Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada). Dennis Wilcox-Magill (1983:9) has indicated that this project was "[i]nitiating in 1929 under a grant from the Social Science Research Council, New York."

6. The Rockefeller Foundation Annual Report for 1930, went on to report that, "[p]romising developments at McGill University, Montreal, during 1929-30 led the Foundation to make a five-year grant for the support of social science research under the administration of the university authorities", pp.219-20.

7. An additional grant of \$50,000 was received for continuation of the project from 1 June 1936 to 31 May 1940, along with one final extension to 1942 in order to finish-up some uncompleted works (Irving, 1986; also Wilcox-Magill and Helmes-Hayes, 1986, for a closer examination of Leonard C. Marsh and his contribution to social reform in Canada; as well, see Marlene Shore's (1987) historical account of the project in her Chapter 6).

8. The following list of council members was published at the beginning of Lloyd G. Reynolds' The British Immigrant (1935):

SOCIAL RESEARCH COUNCIL

Arthur E. Morgan, Principal and Vice-Chancellor
of McGill University, *Chairman*

*Prof. J.A. Coote,
(Industrial Engineering)

*Dean P.E. Corbett,
(Faculty of Law)

*Prof. C.A. Dawson,
(Sociology)

*Prof. Grant Fleming,
(Public Health)

*Prof. J.C. Hemmeon,
(Economics)

Prof. C.W. Hendel,
(Philosophy)

*Prof. John Hughes,
(Education)

*Leonard C. Marsh, *Director*

*Executive Committee

George Hodge, Esq.
Personnel Dept., C.P.R.

*Prof. C.E. Kellogg,
(Psychology)

Dr. F.G. Pedley,
Montreal Council of
Social Agencies

Julian C. Smith, Esq.
Shawinigan Water and
Power Company

Arthur B. Wood, Esq.
Sun Life Assurance Co.

Dean W.D. Woodhead,
(Faculty of Arts)

9. Beginning with an initial grant of \$25,000, the Rockefeller Foundation proceeded to expend approximately \$40,000 in all for the project (Hiller, 1982:54).

10. The three sociological works in this series were: Jean Burnet's Next-Year Country: A Study of Rural Social Organization in Alberta. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1951 (No.3); William Edward Mann's Sect, Cult, and Church in Alberta. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1955 (No.6); and S.D. Clark's Movements of Political Protest in Canada, 1640-1840. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1959 (No.10). All ten volumes were published by the U of T Press over a ten-year period from 1950 to 1959.

11. Occasional C.S.S.R.C. announcements appearing in the CJEPS: for example, 1948:388, 1949:230, and 1953:532.

12. Financial assistance from the federal government in Canada was certainly late in coming, especially considering that legislation for the provision of federal grants to universities had been enacted in 1951 following recommendations made in the Massey Report.

13. C.P.S.A. representation would continue until 1966 when the Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association was formed.

14. For example, a number of seminars were held in Ottawa during the two academic years between 1965-67, at which the Chapter discussed various problems related with cities and regions throughout Canada, as well as demonstrating how an increased interest in interdisciplinary work could assist the area of urban studies in the country. A number of the papers were published in N.H. Lithwick and Gilles Paquet (eds). Urban Studies: A Canadian Perspective (Toronto: Methuen Publications, 1968). The only sociological work in the collection was Peter C. Pineo's "Social Consequences of Urbanization," pp.179-203.

15. There is, however, disagreement as to whether the thesis by Charles Melville Bayley, "The Social Structure of the Italian and Ukrainian Immigrant Communities in Montreal" (1939), was indeed for a Ph.D. or rather for an M.A. degree at McGill. Spitzer and Silvester (1976:556) list it as part of a Ph.D. degree under Carl Dawson, as does Martin Kuhn (1978:11) in his table, as the earliest sociology Ph.D. degree completed at McGill. Conversely, Marlene Shore (1987:316,41n) in her excellent historical account of the development of sociology at McGill, indicates that the work was an M.A. thesis. A check of the McGill Directory of Graduates: 1890-1965 also reveals that Bayley had received his M.A. in 1939 (p.41). The first sociology Ph.D. to be conferred at McGill would have to wait until 1972.

Chapter 3

CHICAGO SOCIOLOGY

In order to begin the analysis it is first necessary to identify what constitutes a Chicago approach to doing sociology. There are a number of perspectives which may be adopted (some of which have been outlined in chapter one), each bearing some degree of utility relative to the concept being measured or defined. Although the perspectives may vary considerably along micro-macro or empirical-theoretical dimensions, they share at least one common feature; namely, their research design begins by identifying the unit of analysis. Hence the unit of analysis for this study has been indicated as the journal article, and more specifically, sociology articles published in CJEPS having originated from McGill University. The investigation focuses in large part on these written materials and particularly on the methodological approach taken by the author. This does not imply a quantitative content analysis – i.e., leading to a mathematical or statistical analysis -- but rather a contextual survey which seeks to identify certain key features of a "Chicago influence" on the approach that was used.

The concept of "Chicago influence" is identified by two main indicators: (1) the adoption of Chicago-style methodologies, and (2) what Mullins (1973) has presented as the "scientific communication network". The first includes an examination of the research method employed by the author, the area of sociological interest addressed, and the underlying objective of the

research. The second indicator proceeds from an examination of the personal, intellectual, and academic relationships as pertains to the network connections produced between the McGill and Chicago groups. The remainder of this chapter addresses the former issue in outlining the various methodologies characteristic of a Chicago approach in doing social research, as a guideline for the contextual survey to follow. The latter issue shall be explored in chapter four.

The Chicago School pioneered and developed a wide range of approaches and research techniques (Cavan, 1983; Faris, 1967; Kurtz, 1984; Madge, 1964; Matthews, 1977). To use a synopsis provided by Lester Kurtz (1984:84):

"From the mapping of neighborhoods..., to ethnographic field studies..., to the development of quantitative research methods..., the methods used by Chicago sociologists were grounded in the pragmatic principle of the application of science to solve problems."

Social investigation was carried out through the use of research techniques which included: life histories, personal documents, case studies, objective and participant observation, natural areas and ecological zones, scaling, and statistics. The search for facts was largely accomplished under the guidance of the theory of **human ecology**, "the hallmark of Chicago sociology" (Shore, 1987:xv). Such a wide range of approaches was rather indicative of the eclecticism which characterised Chicago sociology, yet its reign as a dominant school appears to have been "unified by its field of interest rather than by its methods" (Madge, 1964:125).

During the first twenty-five years following its inception in 1892, the Department of Sociology at Chicago was basically engaged in a procedural debate with the older more-established social sciences (Cavan, 1983:409). The founder and first head of the department (between 1892-1925), Albion Woodbury Small (1854-1926), was ultimately responsible for fostering the removal of sociology from a theological agenda (emphasising philanthropy) and an ameliorative social work programme (focused on welfare systems and social reform), advocating

instead the importance of an objective, and essentially scientific, approach to understanding human behaviour. The break with the humanitarian tradition did not come readily, yet due to the efforts of three key figures in the department, realisation of the new research programme was soon to follow.

The sociological historian Martin Bulmer (1984:11,45) asserts that: "This first phase of American sociology ended with the publication of *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America* in 1918-20," which he recognises as a "landmark" research study in taking sociology away from "abstract theory and library research and toward the study of the empirical world utilizing a theoretical framework." The 2250 page five-volume publication was the co-production of William Isaac Thomas (1863-1947) and Polish sociologist Florian Znaniecki (1882-1958), who spent eight years collecting data from a variety of sources including: personal statements on life histories,¹ family letters, diaries, newspaper files, public documents, and institutional records. Moreover, this body of ethnographic data was included in the publication as perhaps an example, or inspiration, for other researchers "to undertake [the] labor of data gathering on a massive scale" (Faris, 1979:18). It seemed to set the stage for a new conceptual research programme, based on empiricism and an inductive approach, on which Robert Faris (1971:545) commented as follows: "Sociologists after this study could never again be content with the easy and broad generalization based on meager and second-hand data."

The study addressed the issue of urban culture, for which "the authors saw their task as one of discovering the causal laws underlying the *breakdown* of traditional Polish peasant society as it came into contact with a *more complex* urban environment" (Thomas, 1983a:389). In other words, the analysis was concerned with those sociological processes of disorganisation characteristic of an industrialised social system evident in turn-of-the-century America. In this sense, the area of study was rather contemporary, since many American cities were experiencing large influxes of new workers from Europe, who, having settled mainly in slum areas characterised by poverty, disease, crime and suicide, bore the brunt of the criticism that they were ultimately

responsible for the resultant disorganisation. This in turn led to the appointment of the Dillingham Congressional Commission in 1907 to study the impact of immigration into the U.S.. The commissioners concluded in 1910 that "immigrants from Mediterranean regions were biologically inferior to other immigrants" (Howard and Rifkin, 1977:67). By 1924 a new immigration law was passed based on eugenics standards, and it was to remain on the books until 1965.

The study by Thomas and Znaniecki provided little support for a biologically deterministic perspective, or for a behavioristic viewpoint that advocated the importance of environmental factors as determinants of behaviour (in a strict sense). Rather, as Herbert Blumer has so vigorously indicated, the "fundamental premise" underlying this work was "that of recognizing that a human group consists of people who are living...having to cope with situations that arise in their experience, organizing their behavior and their conduct in the light of those situations which they encounter, coming to develop all kinds of collective arrangements which are ongoing affairs" (in Lofland, 1980:261). Individuals are endowed with the capability to make choices and to "modify or alter the meanings and symbols that they use in action and interaction on the basis of their interpretation of the situation" (Ritzer, 1988:201). "In short," as R.E.L. Faris (1971:545) asserts, "it is the *definition of the situation* that gives the direction to behavior, not the environment of physical conditions."² Indeed, W.I. Thomas seemed to recognise this capacity in his concept of "definition of the situation" as provided in his apophthegm: "If men define situations as real, they are real in their consequences" (Faris, 1979:18).

The emphasis is on the "living person," on interactions with other living persons within a social situation, and on "a world in which social structure is created and maintained by the behaviors of humans *acting upon* (rather than primarily acted upon by) their world" (Thomas, 1983b:480). It is the beginning of a theoretical product labeled **symbolic interactionism**: with roots in the action and interaction concepts of Georg Simmel (1858-1918); the social-psychological phenomenon of consciousness and its analysis through the method of "sympathetic introspection" advanced by Charles Horton Cooley (1864-1929) of the University of Michigan; and in a similar

interest on consciousness as a scientific conception enunciated by George Herbert Mead (1863-1931), a philosopher at Chicago (1894-1931) (Ritzer, 1988:47-50). Simmel essentially provided the theoretical background, "Cooley developed the concept of the social self, Mead showed in detail how this aspect of mental organization is acquired within the social process....[and] William I. Thomas, through his teaching, writing, and research influence, gave support to th[is] general tradition...even though some of his contributions were inconsistent with it" (Faris, 1952:381).

One of the main inconsistencies between human behaviour and social structure pertained to the discussion on the social processes of disorganisation and reorganisation. Sociologist Jim Thomas (1983b:480) provides a general definition of the concept of social disorganisation as "a decrease in the influence of existing social rules of behavior on individual members." He indicates that on the one hand the social world is said to exist as a response to the interrelationships of individual thought and action, yet at the same time "they nonetheless remain constrained and influenced by external social factors that disrupt [sic], prevent, or shape social behavior" (Ibid). Unfortunately, the concept of social structure did not fit well with the theoretical principles on human action and interaction advanced by Cooley, Mead, and in some respect by W.I. Thomas. For Mead, the problem seemed to rest with his choice of ordering in his conception of society, in that "society is prior to the individual, and mental processes emerge from society" (Ritzer, 1988: 180). However, a fuller appreciation of the principles of what came to be known as **symbolic interactionism**,³ would have to wait until the 1950s when Herbert Blumer went on to become one of the most important thinkers in this tradition.

Although symbolic interactionism does find its intellectual roots in the philosophical, psychological, and social psychological perspectives of some of the early Chicagoans, the theory, as recognised in today's literature, was in its developmental stage and did not resemble the present programme. This is not to say that the ideas were not an integral part of what was being expounded at Chicago, for the work associated with the social psychology tradition contributed largely as one of the three main strains in the overall working programme (Carey, 1975:4; Faris,

1979:88). Other names associated with the field at Chicago included: philosopher-psychologist-pragmatist John Dewey (1859-1952) who was a colleague of Cooley's briefly at the University of Michigan, yet later was instrumental in bringing G.H. Mead to the University of Chicago (1894); Robert Ezra Park (1864-1944), who became familiar with both Dewey and Mead while a student at Michigan, was influenced to some extent by Mead in his conception of social psychological processes, although he went on to carve his sociological niche through "his pioneer work in human ecology and more especially for his study of the city" (Rucker, 1969:135); Ellsworth Faris (1874-1953), who completed his Chicago Ph.D. in Psychology (1914) under Dewey and Mead (among others) and proceeded to become one of the most dedicated proponents of the field in a Meadian tradition; finally, Herbert Blumer (1900-1987), also a student at Chicago under Mead and the author of the Ph.D. thesis "Method in Social Psychology" (1928), appointed to replace Mead in teaching his advanced course in social psychology following Mead's failing health (Rucker, 1969: 136), and who of course proceeded to advance the interactionist tradition well beyond his Chicago years (e.g., when he went to Berkeley in 1952).

Social psychology, however, did not reach the status of a dominant theoretical tradition within the Chicago sociology programme. It would not become synonymous with the reputation being built around the term "Chicago School" across the country and the type of sociology characterising the general intellectual climate there. There are two possible reasons.

The first appears to strike at the field's formative period and the simple argument that what was being taught *within* the university did not make its way in any far reaching manner to other centres of instruction. George Mead never published a book on social psychology. His name was attached posthumously to a publication of his lecture notes entitled Mind, Self and Society (1934),⁴ but the timing of its appearance happened to coincide with alternate conceptual currents in sociology and it did not receive the attention that it may have deserved. As well, Ellsworth Faris never wrote his book on social psychology either,⁵ although his son, Robert Faris, would acknowledge his indebtedness to his father's work in his book entitled Social Psychology, which

appeared one year before the senior Faris' death (Faris, 1952:iv). Even though they had the means to publish regularly within their grasp -- i.e., the *American Journal of Sociology* -- there was no great output to speak of.

A second reason for social psychology's apparent abatement, had to do with a broad reorientation of sociology's development as a "pure science." Empirical study was being emphasised in an attempt to build a *science* of sociology that offered the best possible application of sociological knowledge for social improvement. It was not a radical shift from the previously held currents of thought involving pragmatism, Darwinianism and behaviourism,⁶ but as Robert Park (1940:149) would later write:

"The social sciences have certainly not been unaffected by the method and conceptions of the physical sciences, and this influence has served at any rate to take social studies out of the field of purely dialectical discussion, and direct inquiry to the relation of things rather than ideas."

Hence there was a move away from an idealistic sort of mind-object approach, and towards that of a *natural* scientific methodology for social inquiry.⁷

Over the years, *The Polish Peasant* has become a classic empirical study containing a variety of meanings for different researchers. Reference has been made to its broad investigation of culture (Berger and Berger, 1972:38), cultural pluralism (Hagedorn, 1980:292), immigrants (Rocher, 1972:554), social disorganisation-reorganisation (Hiller, 1982:70), social institutions (Ritzer, 1988:47), and even as an illustration of document analysis in data collection (McCall and Simmons, 1969:63). It seems evident, however, that Thomas and Znaniecki developed their argument from the point of a subjective understanding of social relations. They did maintain an intellectual tie with a psychological interpretation in terms of categorising human values and attitudes through the concept of the Four Wishes -- new experience, recognition, response, and security -- but it was nevertheless presented in the form of a natural progression, or an ideal-typical successional development. Moreover, the use of life-history documents -- i.e., the case study approach -- along with Thomas's "notions concerning the [alternating] phases of disorganization and reorganization experienced by the immigrants" (Faris, 1979:18-19), seemed

to integrate well with the next methodological development that expanded on the relationship of individual organisms and environment – **human ecology**.

During the years following the First World War, several events contributed to sociology's development as a "science of society." Robert Faris (1971) has described this time as one of "prosperity" and "expansion," in that more departments were emerging at various universities to accommodate higher student enrolments and a greater emphasis on sociological research. What became immediately apparent was the need to systematise scientific investigation through "some standardization of terminology and organization" (Faris, 1971:546). The process began to expand quickly within the social sciences at Chicago, with Robert E. Park very much at the centre of things.

In 1920, Park created the Society for Social Research with its primary purpose "to encourage and stimulate the research of graduate students in sociology" (Bulmer, 1983:354). This interest was characteristic of Park and he would come to devote "extraordinary amounts of time to guiding graduate students under his supervision, so much so that his own writing was neglected as a result" (Bulmer, 1984:97). The society was joined in 1923 by the Local Community Research Committee (L.C.R.C.), "an interdepartmental research committee administering large research funds, controlled by senior faculty members" (Bulmer, 1983:354). The sociology representative on that committee was Ernest Watson Burgess (1886-1966), who has also been deemed its founder with the assistance of a \$25,000 grant from the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Foundation (Hunter,1980:225). Although interdisciplinary co-operation was common at Chicago, social scientists at other universities joined in and helped, along with grant money from the Rockefeller Foundation, to establish the National Social Science Research Council in 1923 (Faris, 1979:54). In fact, between 1923 and 1931, the University of Chicago L.C.R.C. received over \$815,000 in research donations from a variety of agencies,⁸ including the Rockefeller Foundation (Kurtz, 1982: 339n) and the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial which, although established in 1918, was "revitalized five years later with the appointment of Beardsley Rumml, a twenty-seven-year-old

Chicago Ph.D. [and instructor in psychology], as director" (Bannister, 1987:179).

As the social sciences began to organise at Chicago, Robert Park seemed to recognise the urgency for some sort of conceptual framework for sociology, and in 1921 the Introduction to the Science of Sociology was published. The text-book (known as the "green bible") was written in collaboration with Ernest Burgess, whose similar research interests in urban studies helped propel him along with Park to the forefront of sociological research at Chicago. Robert Faris (1979:37) has pointed out that "[t]he direction and content of American sociology after 1921 was mainly set by the Park and Burgess text," yet Martin Bulmer (1984:95) has observed that "its influence on methodology was slight. In the mere sixteen pages on the subject [there] was no reference at all to research strategies or techniques." Indeed, as Morris Janowitz wrote in his introduction to a later edition,

"neither Park nor Burgess were system builders and were content to present a loose collection of concepts....represent[ing] the Chicago school's concern with fusing theory and empirical data....They sought to understand the social order or, in their language, the processes of social control" (Park and Burgess, 1972:vi-viii).

Hence, the eclecticism of the text seemed to fit well with both its title and the intellectual interplay characterising the research programme.

Although the emphasis was being placed more and more on objectivity, the break with the older reformist tradition had yet to be realised in its fullest sense. Even though *The Polish Peasant* showed signs of an emerging science of sociology, "[at] the same time, [W.I.] Thomas had a personal interest in social betterment" (Cavan, 1983:410). The work of Park and Burgess went along similar lines in their attempts to understand the social problems-social processes connection. "Although the objective was scientific," wrote Burgess (1967:5), "behind it lay a faith or hope that this scientific analysis would help dispel prejudice and injustice and ultimately would lead to an improvement in the lot of slum dwellers." Yet it would be safe to say that whereas the reformist bent had not totally disappeared, its prevalence did decrease and notably so. For example, in a content analysis of articles published in the *American Journal of Sociology*, James T. Carey (1975:35) noted that for the period 1910-1919, 33 per cent (n=128) were "reform"

articles, whereas for the period 1920-1929, the percentage had fallen significantly to 13 (n=59).

Park was very much interested in strengthening sociology as an empirical activity.⁹ Perhaps due in *some* part to his journalistic background, Park proceeded to advocate the importance of vigilant observation, interviewing, and record-keeping in the examination of social processes. The social laboratory was the city of Chicago and the focus was on describing the "social milieu" of some "distinct and relatively independent local community" (Bulmer, 1984:99). The demand on the students was for them to "move away from general philosophizing about society and concentrate on first-hand, factual studies of specific aspects of society" (Cavan, 1983:411). As Park would put it, "go get the seat of your pants dirty in real research" (in Bulmer, 1984:97). The result was the publication of a number of monographs, which went on to become hard examples in "the rapid building of an urban research tradition" at the University of Chicago (Faris, 1979:51).

The process appears to have started with students going out to the field, collecting all sorts of data from a variety of neighbourhoods and plotting the data on maps of the city. Ernest Burgess (1967:6) referred to this phase as "Discovering the Physical Pattern of the City," as mapping became recognised as an appropriate method for trying "to find a pattern to this patchwork of differences, and to *make sense of it.*" Various behavioural and social characteristics were discovered, including: "delinquency and crime, family disorganization, suicide, mental disorders, political disorganization" (Faris, 1971:553). This in turn led to the assumption that,

"the city had a characteristic organization and way of life that differentiated it from rural communities. Like rural communities, however, it was composed of natural areas, each having a particular function in the whole economy and life of the city, each area having its distinctive institutions, groups, and personalities" (Burgess and Bogue, 1967:7).

As such, the concept of **natural areas** developed and the examination of "urban subcultures" proceeded through the use of descriptive techniques relying on the researcher's proximity to what was being studied.

The first major study to emerge was Nels Anderson's *The Hobo*, which was published in

1923 as Volume I in the University of Chicago Press *Sociological Series*. Anderson's methodology included unstructured techniques such as: the collection of life histories, informal interviewing, an incidental form of participant observation (although the term itself was not in use as yet),¹⁰ informal descriptions, direct reporting, and any "additional information was obtained from social agencies, missions, lodging houses and other sources" (Bulmer, 1984:98). With Burgess as supervisor and Park as the work's reviewer and editor, Anderson's study went on to become representative of the sort of empirical work undertaken by subsequent sociology graduate students, and typical of the teacher-student relationship that ensued.

There is, however, one further point of interest that was raised in a discussion by Herbert Blumer and Everett C. Hughes, as it pertains not only to Nels Anderson, but to other students that passed under the tutelage of Park:

"They didn't come in to become sociologists. They came in to learn something and Park picked up whatever it was in their experience which he could build on... He took these people and brought out of them whatever he could find there....He made their pasts interesting to them, much more interesting than they ever thought they could be" (in Lofland, 1980:267-68).

In the case of Nels Anderson, he had been in the process of making his way out of a life as a hobo when he arrived at Chicago in 1921 (Bulmer, 1984:98).¹¹ Another example was Louis Wirth (1897-1952), a Germano-Jew,¹² whose 1928 publication The Ghetto "related the Chicago experience of the immigrant Jews to the ecology of the city and to their past experiences in the European ghettos" (Faris, 1979:70).

The concept of the *natural areas* was included in a number of other studies found within the *Sociological Series*, for example: Frederic Thrasher's The Gang (1927), Ernest R. Mowrer's Family Disorganization (1927), Ruth S. Cavan's Suicide (1928), Harvey Zorbaugh's The Gold Coast and the Slum (1929), E. Franklin Frazier's The Negro Family in Chicago (1931), and Walter Reckless' Vice in Chicago (1933). Many of these would become classic studies in urban sociology and "are noteworthy for their concluding concerns with what today is called public policy, but what were then ameliorative recommendations for reform" (Hunter, 1980:221). What these studies

revealed analytically was that the natural areas of a city could be divided according to two perspectives: (1) their *spatial pattern*: the physical variations of land, the structural organisation of residential and commercial buildings and the distribution of institutional, group, and individual activities; and (2) their cultural *life*: living patterns based on custom and other culture specific characteristics (Burgess and Bogue, 1967:7). It appeared that although the approach was characterised by large collections of descriptive-empirical facts (Nock, 1987:10), the criticism that the work was atheoretical – or "dust bowl" empiricism – was inaccurate (Mullins, 1973:45). Mapping spatial organisation gave rise to a procedure in which social processes could be categorised according to common patterns of change.

Ernest Burgess looked at social change in terms of a series of *successive* concentric zones: (I) "The Loop" or downtown central business district; (II) an area in transition, as industrial ventures deteriorate residential quality; (III) an area occupied by factory workers who have been pushed from zone II; (IV) a residential area comprised of exclusive residents in luxury apartments and single-family dwellings; (V) the commuters' zone, made up of suburbs and satellite cities (in Park, et al., 1925:47-62). This urban "expansion" had been employed as a process in describing society as "an order that transcended its individual members and progressed in accordance with the principles of successional development" (Shore, 1987:xvi). In short, it used an approach adapted from plant and animal ecology in the study of "the human community" -- i.e., **human ecology** -- which was defined by the "theory's most important exponent" (Ibid) Roderick Duncan McKenzie (1885-1940) as,

"a study of the spatial and temporal relations of human beings as affected by the selective, distributive, and accommodative forces of the environment. Human ecology is fundamentally interested in the effect of *position*, in both time and space, upon human institutions and human behavior" (in Park, et al., 1925:63-64).

It was a present-oriented approach from which abstractions could be drawn concerning the natural transformation of communities, both from the past and into the future.

In one respect the human ecological approach fit in quite well with the Darwinian idea of

evolution, as well as with Herbert Spencer (1820-1903) and his social Darwinist / Lamarckian¹³ ideas of society "steadily moving in the direction of greater and greater progress" (Ritzer, 1988: 44). Marlene Shore (1987:97; emphasis added) has indicated an "important element" in Darwin's theory adopted by human ecologists:

" Darwin saw nature as an intricate *web of interrelations* that was finely balanced -- he believed that species were prevented from fully realizing their powers of increase by many checks, some of them presented by physical conditions but many more arising from the presence of other species."

The key terminology dealt with the "web of relations," at both individual and group levels, as well as in the individuals' relations to their environment.

This idea of interaction was a crucial component of ecological theory, and it was applied by Park and Burgess in their introductory text in terms of a four-stage processual system for existence within society, later to be known as the "interaction cycle" of race relations (Matthews, 1977:160) -- that is, competition, conflict, accommodation, and assimilation. The four-stage system was introduced in a general manner as representative of the basic processes of interaction. From this higher level, a further explanation was offered in terms of the zonal hypothesis and the influence of five ecological processes on the initial competitive relations and subsequent population distributions: concentration and dispersion, centralisation and decentralisation, segregation, invasion, and succession. What becomes evident here, at least, is a "functional" goal-directed perspective (perhaps utopian to some extent), where the social process culminates within some assimilative mode or *symbiotic* social order (Faris, 1979:45-46). Yet this does not imply a static order approximating a Parsonsian account of an equilibrating social system, but rather, an order characterised as an "ideal type" which may neither exist nor ever be attainable in view of a dynamic social process identified by Morris Janowitz as, "an unending competition and conflict of interests" (in Park and Burgess, 1972:ix).

Paradoxical as this may seem -- i.e., discussing social inequality¹⁴ at the same time as social order -- it should be clear that the ecological approach of Robert Park et al. at Chicago was

not only devoted to the study of contemporary social problems, but was also "offered as a sort of ideal concept -- similar to those of the perfect market or economic man -- which do not exist, although approximations of each may be usefully studied" (Faris, 1979:46). "This view emphasizes empirically grounded sociology," writes Patricia Lengermann (1988:366), "Park asserting that the role of his generation was to bring about the maturation of sociology as an empirical science." Yet she goes on to say that "Park was uncomfortable with the concept of an all inclusive, ideal-type *Society*. He prefers to speak of *societies*, meaning the various general types of human *groupings* in which persons actually experienced society" (Ibid; emphasis added). The ecological framework advanced from an analysis of the *natural* processes occurring within a society, as society proceeds along certain *typical* or *natural* stages of development, in accordance with *natural* laws relative to human nature. The method of *natural history* looked at "the typical and representative rather than the unique character of events" (emphasising the difference between what doing sociology and doing history meant respectively), as a means of better understanding the events -- scientifically (Park and Burgess, 1972:6). This was the underlying principle for conducting empirical studies originally -- to build a "science of society."¹⁵

With the boundaries of natural areas defined, with guidance from the implicit theory of human ecology, and with the four-stage "interaction cycle" identified, empirical study continued in the examination of cultural patterns¹⁶ and social change -- "the most fundamental problem with which students of society have everywhere had to deal" (Park, 1940:138). Basic data in the twenties and thirties was not hard to come by, especially in a metropolitan area like Chicago which was experiencing "so many different racial and national groups, and at such rapid immigration rates, that assimilation became and still remains a major national problem" (Faris, 1971:553). As Albert Hunter¹⁷ (1980:216) has stated: "From its frontier beginnings as Fort Dearborn,...Chicago was both the product and the symbol of the growth of industrial capitalism."

The processes of social disorganisation-reorganisation came under scrutiny, with social disorganisation being studied "as an aspect of an interaction and adjustment process that

eventually leads into social reorganization" (Burgess and Bogue, 1967:10). In 1925, Burgess had presented the concept as follows:

"Disorganization as preliminary to reorganization of attitudes and conduct is almost invariably the lot of the newcomer to the city, and the discarding of the habitual, and often of what has been to him the moral, is not infrequently accompanied by sharp mental conflict and sense of personal loss" (in Park et al., 1925:54).

Although some criticism pointed to an overemphasis on personal and social disorganisation, it failed "to appreciate that much of this research was purposely focused upon disorganization precisely because it was oriented to social problems and social reform" (Hunter, 1980:223). Hence the discussion returns to *The Polish Peasant* and the emphasis on the disorganising condition accompanying immigrant adjustment and reorientation within a new environment.

The study of urbanism at Chicago was characterised by a substantive interest in social phenomena and a specific concern with the individual actor relative to the processes of social differentiation. The approach developed into a concern about "the *role* of ethnicity and immigration in the competition for scarce resources" (Nock, 1987:8; emphasis added), selecting out specific characteristics from the categorisations so as to construct certain identifiers referred to as "social types." It was further recognised that each *type* possessed some fundamental interrelatedness (or what Simmel would have called *Wesenszusammengehörigkeit*), from which *patterns* may be discerned. Analysing these patterns, in turn, reveals that *conflict* appears to be a major common denominator which may innately regulate the manner in which individuals act.

The parallel with Georg Simmel's perspective on social *reciprocity* (or *Vergesellschaftung*) is undoubtedly striking, especially in his analysis of social processes and the idea of social geometry in his reference to patterns. Again, it is a perspective which starts out from "a regulative world principle that everything interacts in some way with everything else" (Frisby, 1984:60), and this can hold true both in the present and in the past, as well as in Germany and the United States. It demonstrates that contemporary study was emphasised by the Chicago sociologists, along with the perception that location (i.e., beyond the parameters of a city) was not an important

consideration. Where the convergence seems to fade (at least on one critical point) is in what Emile Durkheim (1965:49) criticised as "philosophical variations"; that which travels haphazardly from Simmel's mind to his writings is without fact, or method, and without any end in view. Thus it may be safe to say that, to a certain extent, Chicago sociology *filled in*, or, "gave flesh to the speculations of Simmel" (Faris, 1979:82), with a heavy reliance on fact-finding, a wide range of research techniques, and a programme which sought to understand society in the hope of raising a public awareness towards its betterment.

The discussion in this chapter has deliberately attempted to outline "the predominant identification" of Chicago sociology in the 1920s and 1930s, and "the legacy which has been left to the discipline when it reconstructs its history today" (Bulmer, 1981:312-13). Following a review of the substantive material, conceptual organisation, and the various techniques of data collection, the analysis thusfar has focused on the relatively "soft" ethnographic methods which have come to characterise what is generally meant by "Chicago sociology" today. The analysis remains incomplete as long as one further methodological strand goes without mention.

As previously indicated, the first attempts at exploring the city were presented in the form of spot maps. These maps provided *descriptions* of various sociological aspects as observed, to be followed by a comparative analysis of patterns or distributions that could be extrapolated from the data. Following a principle that any information is useful information, researchers proceeded to make "contacts with agencies throughout the city in search of the data they could furnish" (Burgess and Bogue, 1967:6). One valuable source turned out to be the United States Census, which provided data on Chicago tabulated by census tracts (originally laid out in 1910) for the two census years 1920 and 1930 (Ibid, p.7). The population data were added to the already accumulated social data and "it soon became possible to make use of *rates* of various phenomena in the small subdivisions of the city" (Faris, 1979:53).

The usefulness of rate maps was quickly recognised in the 1920s, as numerous studies

presented systematic relations of a variety of research variables to the natural areas of the city. Causal connections were suggested between the ecological zones and various social and demographic variables, including: rates of marriage, home ownership, family disorganisation, delinquency, crime, vice, prostitution, mental disorders, suicide, births, as well as correlating the findings by age, gender, religiosity, family size, social and economic status, occupation, race, and ethnicity. The results generally revealed a direct relationship between proximity to the central core of the city and high incidence of social disorganisation. Disreputable characteristics dissipated, of course, as the investigation moved outwards to the outlying zones.

Although statistical mapping developed into an important research technique for ecological studies (Bulmer, 1981:314), statistical analysis was seen as a superficial method of investigating community conditions, as the researcher needed "to get below the surface of observable behavior" (Burgess and Bogue, 1967:9). The distinction lay between studying and *understanding* "the subjective aspects of life in the city" objectively, and the "superior method" was recognised in the personal document and life history (Ibid). Moreover, there appeared to be somewhat of a consensus within the sociology department in the 1920s that reflected a skepticism in regards to statistics. Ellsworth Faris, Robert Park, Louis Wirth, and Herbert Blumer, all reportedly "cared little for," or showed "contempt for statistics" (Bannister, 1987:174). Ernest Burgess, however, having realised much success with statistical mapping, census tract statistics, and partial correlations, spoke out in favour of accepting statistics as a *complement* to case study research (Bulmer, 1981:316). Yet the issue may have been politically motivated rather than an intellectual dilemma, since the department went without a statistics programme until 1927.

Whereas Chicago sociology was generally known for its use of the case study and a qualitative approach, sociology at Columbia University was characterised by a strong preference for statistics. Under the guidance of Franklin Henry Giddings (1855-1931), the discipline's organiser in 1894 and its head until 1928,¹⁸ "the development of statistics at Columbia flourished, and it was in *this aspect* of sociology that the university held the leadership" in the U.S.

(Faris, 1979:127; emphasis added). More important, perhaps, than this "zeal for quantification," was the decentralised network of Columbia Ph.D.s who proceeded to "build and strengthen their own Ph.D.-producing departments at other universities" (Wiley, 1979:58). These Columbia "missionaries" managed to spread the word of "a methodology based on large-scale quantification ...[and] an ideology of radical positivism which called for full mobilization of the profession in pursuit of objective knowledge" (Lengermann, 1979:192).

The *call* was heard and adopted in a profound manner by the majority of eastern universities, which had maintained a characteristically conservative bent (i.e., a nostalgia for the past), and a connection with classical economic deterministic qualities in their sociological approach to the study of social organisation (Shils, 1970:780; Faris, 1979:126; Schwendinger and Schwendinger, 1974). Yet the development of this newly emerging intellectual paradigm remained less *value-neutral* at the institutional level than what it was attempting to do at the theoretical and methodological levels, striking out against the dominating Chicago position. Without extending this to a full analysis of ideological discrepancies, or to retracing the discipline's academic institutionalisation in the United States, suffice it to say that the contrasting styles emanating from Chicago and Columbia (the two dominant centres of sociological instruction in the U.S. at the time) disagreed to the extent that a "long-term rivalry" developed (Wiley, 1979:59).

It is incorrect, however, to present Chicago sociology as totally anti-quantitative in its approach to social problems. Ernest Burgess, the universalist when it came to using various methodologies, was a supporter of "soft" methods such as the case study, but he did not overlook the value of using the "hard" methods associated with statistics either. Even Park, although uncomfortable with adopting hard research methods,¹⁹ was instrumental in applying Simmel's concept of *social distance* to measurements of racial, ethnic, regional, class, occupational, and religious attitudes. He suggested this idea of measuring social attitudes to Emory Stephen Bogardus (a Chicago Ph.D. in sociology) in February 1925 (Bulmer, 1981:317) and shortly thereafter the Bogardus social-distance scale²⁰ was introduced "as a statistical basis for the life-

history materials" in the field of race and ethnic relations (Faris, 1979:108).

Generally, the most popular statistics course for social science students at Chicago in the 1920s, was offered in the Department of Economics under economist James A. Field (Bulmer, 1981:318), although "[m]any sociology students continued to study statistics with L[ouis] L[eon] Thurstone [1887-1955] in the psychology department" (Bannister, 1987:175). Ruth S. Cavan (1983:414) recalls that, "[c]ase studies and statistics developed side by side and supplemented each other" in the 1920s, and students were provided with the option of using both techniques in their research (among a host of others), as she had done within her work on suicide. By 1927, it appeared as though the members of the sociology department had seen the handwriting on the wall with respect to what Lengermann (1979) has indicated as "the quantification challenge" in sociology emerging from Columbia, and the appointment of a statistician followed.

William Fielding Ogburn (1886-1959) arrived in Chicago with the explicit task of "strengthen[ing] the representation of quantitative methods in the department" (Bulmer, 1981:318). The holder of a Columbia Ph.D. (1912), and clearly a "Giddings man" in his adoption of a methodologically "hard" approach,²¹ Ogburn quickly proceeded to establish a framework for statistical instruction and statistical support (through formal methods of testing) for the large collection of empirical findings accumulated by sociology researchers over the years. His initial attempts, however, were met with some animosity from the anti-quantitative Park contingent, which Robert Bannister (1987:175) has indicated, in a rather thorough chronicle of the events surrounding Ogburn's somewhat shaky acceptance, as a "competition between Ogburn and Park ...[where,] on the spectrum from nominalism to realism, Ogburn was closer to the first, Park to the second." This would further be compounded in 1929 with the completion of the Social Science Research Building,²² and the adoption of Ogburn's suggestion, while chairman of the Committee on Symbolism, for the quotation that was inscribed on its face: "When you cannot measure * your knowledge is * meagre * and * unsatisfactory * Lord Kelvin" (quoted in Bulmer, 1981:312).

Feelings of rivalry would soon dissipate (but did not disappear) within the department, as Ogburn's involvement in the overall scheme of things, that is, building a science and devising new scientific methods, contributed to its growth (Faris, 1979:116). His interest in the study of population and technology's effect on human behaviour led him to address the issue of *social change*, especially with respect to the hard times during the interwar period. Ogburn (1964b:101) refers to this as, "years of great uncertainty," in light of a rapid and extremely influential technological revolution, for which he turns to the social sciences "to render aid" in uncovering the propensity of change and in providing strong predictive powers for the future. He introduces the concept of *cultural lag* to describe the period between society's adoption of a technological innovation and that society's (in)ability to quickly adjust to the next such innovation. He further writes "that there is a continuity in cultural change; one event grows out of another," which may be discovered through social and historical study, yet he returns once again to his original epistemological tendencies in concluding: "With more complete statistics and with better measurement we shall attain fuller knowledge of what is happening to us and where we are going" (Ibid).

The *ideas* that Ogburn expanded on in many ways complemented those of Park. Robert Faris (1979:115) has indicated that the interest in "population study came to be interrelated with urban studies and ecology, thus completing a partial resolution of the separate interests of Park and Ogburn." Moreover, Ogburn's main concern with understanding social change and "the problem of variation in the characteristics of cities" (Duncan, 1964:viii), seemed to walk together with Park's ideas on understanding social processes, and with the Burgess zonal hypothesis on patterns of urban growth. Henrika Kuklick (1973:10) has observed that, "Ogburn's concept of 'cultural lag,'...fit Park's idea of spasmodic change." In fact, Otis Dudley Duncan (1964:ix,xii) (a student of Ogburn's) has shown that "Ogburn began his career as a social scientist with a strong interest in social action and reform....[and] never really relinquished his interest in social problems." It was a strong Giddings' influence that moved him away from an early reformer role

and eventually led him to the field of practical statistical investigation in the definition and measurement of social phenomena, with a commitment to absolute objectivity.

Martin Bulmer (1981) has argued that quantification at Chicago is a much "neglected tradition" in need of further attention. He proceeds to show how this quantitative emphasis was very much alive within the social sciences at the university, including the Department of Sociology. He demonstrates quite clearly that due to the interdisciplinary nature of the social sciences, sociology students originally received *some* instruction in statistical methods from faculty members tied to economics and psychology. With Ogburn's arrival, such instruction was intensified within the sociology department, supplementing that which was being made available from other disciplines. Martin Bulmer succeeds in identifying that quantification techniques did hold a place within the multidisciplinary, multi-sided approach adopted by the sociology research programme, as became apparent with the listing of many ecological variables within numerous graphs and tables. However his attempt to ride the statistical methodology introduced by Ogburn on the coattails of a programme for data collection and interpretation, based on the "case-study-insight method" (Evans, 1986-87:120), seems to glorify what otherwise may be viewed as a marginal component of the "Chicago School."

Sociologist Patricia Lengermann (1979) has set a place for Ogburn within "the Chicago group," as had Henrika Kuklick (1973) before her. Both identify this inclusion in terms of the Chicago-operationalist distinction, which was gaining in force during the early 1930s. Kuklick (1973:15) identifies George Lundberg²³ as operationalism's "chief spokesman," and has summarised his general position as: "sociology could progress as a science only by limiting its problems to those susceptible to operationalized hypotheses and quantitative analysis; all other problems were basically insoluble." Lundberg (1961:57) furthered his argument for a scientific sociology by proposing that sociologists adopt a "value-free" approach when conducting research: "The services of *real* social scientists would be as indispensable to Fascists or to Communists and Democrats, just as are the services of physicists and physicians." Ogburn seemed to share these

same sentiments, in both respects.

In addressing the issue of methods as early as 1922, W.F.Ogburn (1964a:301) maintained that, "we cannot have a science without measurement. And science will grow in the social studies in direct ratio to the use of measurement." As well, Robert Bannister (1987:181-2) has observed that Ogburn's deep commitment "to the absolute objectivity of social research," surfaced most notably during his appointment as director of research for the President's Committee on Recent Social Trends in 1929, under the newly appointed President Herbert Hoover (1929-1933). Along with Howard W. Odum (1884-1954), a Columbia Ph.D. (1910) and colleague, William Ogburn was "willing to move directly to the service of the President as a non-partisan representative of the nation as a whole," contending that, "[t]he data prepared [for the Hoover study] are useful to either conservative or radical, to Republican or Democrat" (Ibid, pp.182-3). Even ten years later, in a general discussion on statistical trends, Ogburn (1964c:230) asserted that "government statistics are collected without bias and are available to conservative and radical alike." It certainly becomes difficult, in light of such a convincing parallel, to speak of William Ogburn as a social scientist separated from the operationalist camp.

Ogburn's professional place within the discipline in the 1930s may be characterised as peripheral on two fronts: Firstly, although considered a "quantifier" in the operationalist sense, his presence on the Chicago faculty and his term as president of the "Chicago-controlled" American Sociological Society (1929), served to diffuse any prior alliance with a rigid positivistic plan. And secondly, his strict sense of relying on the hard method in research kept him on the fringe of the predominantly versatile and qualitatively oriented Chicagoans.

Hence the discussion in this section has served three purposes: (1) to show that quantitative research methods were not excluded from the methodological eclecticism of Chicago sociology, yet did not hold a prominent place therein; (2) to argue that although William Ogburn may have shared certain of the key concepts emerging from the general theory of society at Chicago, his strict advocacy of hard research methods placed him in a peripheral position; and

(3) to introduce a newly emerging intellectual climate that challenged the Chicago centrality within the profession. Moreover, these three points have furthered the discussion of not only what Chicago sociology was, but what it was not as well. In a sense, the words of C. Wright Mills (1967:213) come to mind in terms of a comparison between the object being studied and contrasting objects: "Often you get the best insights...by thinking of the opposite of that with which you are directly concerned." Before concluding this chapter, therefore, it seems appropriate to further the argument concerning what Chicago sociology was not, and this may best be realised by briefly outlining the major intellectual paradigm that challenged and eventually succeeded the Chicago model -- **structural functionalism**.

By the end of the 1930s, American sociology was experiencing what Wiley (1979) referred to as a "period of interregnum," or what Kuhn (1970) called "scientific" or "paradigm revolutions." The once dominant Chicago school was experiencing competition not only from the Columbia positivists, but also from a high intellectual functionalism emerging from Harvard University. "During sociology's long, post-Chicago School interregnum," writes Wiley (1979:68), "the positivists had a method but no theory [following their failed attempt at operationalism], and the rising functionalists had a theory but no method." He goes on to indicate that, "[o]n principle each side was opposed to the other, but practical needs won out, and the forties gradually saw an alliance between functionalism and the positivists in which the latter were officially the junior partners." Hence it took the collaborative efforts of two intellectually polar groups, or what Kuklick (1973:8) refers to as "the new dual papacy of American sociology," to challenge the "theoretically informed empirical research in sociology which the Chicago school represented" (Bulmer, 1984:108).

According to sociologist Edward Shils (1970:790), by the early part of this century European sociology had become peripheral and American sociology central, thus reversing the order of academic preeminence. Following World War II, however, the U.S. provided the arena for the reemergence of what came to be known as the Durkheimian tradition of functionalist theory.

American society was redefining the meaning of their social situation based on the understanding that certain needs or prerequisites had to be met to ensure continued existence. The reality of war, absorption, apathy, and of biological extinction, pushed the unit of social analysis from interpersonal relations to a more holistic approach of looking at the social *system*. A shared cognitive orientation and a shared set of goals would ensure the continuing health or survival of the larger entity -- American society. Stress was on consensus and the interrelations of societal norms, roles and institutions in generating a structural equilibrium, a stability, a functional place for all to contribute to a self-sufficient system, especially against the impending threat of communism.

In hopes of mobilising a reform movement of this type, it was not unusual for governments to seek out the services of social scientists concerning "the organization of political action" (Shils, 1970:781). The theorising coming out of Harvard became attractive, as it presented a number of general propositions about the characteristics of societies attempting to show what social relations existed and how the social system functioned as a whole. Perhaps the most important proponent of functionalist theory following WWII was Harvard sociologist Talcott Parsons (1902-1979), who was largely instrumental in the importation and translation of many influential European works in sociology.

Utilising a high level of generality, Parsons looked at developing an elaborate system of concepts, towards the formulation of a single general theory to be applied across all societies. Emphasising order, stability, and integration, Parsonsian functionalism rose above any conceptualisation of individual personality, advocating instead a positivistic and holistic perspective in the study of social systems. It seems that individual personalities were merely reflections of their socialisation, and once a system's culture, norms, and values were recognised, the actions of its agents could then be identified.

Identifying in large part with the works of Herbert Spencer, Emile Durkheim (1858-1917), Sigmund Freud (1856-1939) and particularly Max Weber (1864-1920), Parsons recognised that

American social science was too empirical and individualistic. He emphasised the importance of "values" and "culture" and that special attention was needed in examining the cultural dimension of social life and the goal-directedness of the citizenry. Following a Weberian typological approach and the Toenniesian dichotomy of *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft*, Parsons proceeded to "develop a conceptual scheme that reflects the systemic interconnectedness of social systems" (Turner, 1986:64).

Recognising that individual personality is a reflection of socialisation and that the structure of the social system "is a reflection of the dominant patterns of value orientations in culture" (ibid, p.66), Parsons develops (in collaboration with Edward Albert Shils) and presents a set of concepts called "pattern variables." Depending on whether individuals are situated in *primary* or *secondary* relations or group settings, these variables, arranged in terms of polar dichotomies, would allow "for a rough categorization of decisions by actors, the value orientations of culture, or the normative demands on status roles" (ibid, p.65). The set of values conducive to a primary (personal) group setting (*Gemeinschaft*) were listed as: ascription, affectivity, diffuseness, particularism, and collectivity orientation. The opposite values representing secondary (impersonal) group settings (*Gesellschaft*) were: achievement, affective neutrality, specificity, universalism, and self-orientation (Lundy and Warne, 1986:148-9). Designed to be mutually exclusive pairs, utilised in terms of a continuum, relationships were identified based on five possible options (respectively): modalities of social object (quality vs quantity); gratification vs discipline; scope of interest; value orientation; and collective vs private. Although the pattern variables were originally used in the analysis of occupations and professions, their utility was expanded to the characterisation and categorisation of societies in general.

One year following the publication of Parsons' The Social System (1951), a criticism in the form of a book review appeared in the *American Journal of Sociology* (July 1952:103-4), that asked the question: "Is the general theory Parsons is presenting really a sociological theory at all?" The reviewer goes on to indicate that, "[c]hange is a crucial aspect of social systems, and

no theory is really a theory of social systems which is not at the same time a theory of change of such systems." The reviewer was S.D. Clark, whose own "fundamental concern...with social change in areas which experienced rapid economic change" (Campbell, 1983:159) led him to consider Parsons' model of society a failure, and subsequently concluded that "Parsons' general theory is not really a general theory at all."

Of particular interest in this review was that Clark raised the name of Robert E. Park, making reference to the commentary that Park was one of the "empirically minded sociologists" compared to Parsons the "*theorist*." Whereas Clark proceeds to say that the distinction is not as clear cut as all that, he does nonetheless paint a picture in which Park and Parsons are portrayed as antithetical social thinkers. Yet as early as 1936, when Parsons lectured at Chicago, the sociologists there "were impressed with his work on the social system" (Hall, 1989). But as Oswald Hall further recounts, when Parsons' The Structure of Social Action (1937) appeared, the Chicago sociologists, "after they had seen how he wrote,...decided that it was *just too much* of a workout for students to read through....kind of a wooden vocabulary that imposed on social order." Moreover, it was immediately noted that Parsons had omitted all reference to the Chicago model, although he "was not noticeably involved with the Giddings positivists either" (Wiley, 1979:63). Oswald Hall goes on to say that, "Parsons created his own sociology...[whereas he] had almost no grievance with sociology in North America that was going on....He was a very, very devoted theoretician."

Working its way systematically from the "voluntaristic theory of social action" (synthesising concepts of utilitarianism, positivism, and idealism), on through to the "social system," "cultural system," "personality system," and to the "behavioural organism," Parsonsian theorising took a major turn by the mid- to late-60s in an attempt to address social change. The evolutionary paradigm put forth by Parsons outlined the *processes* societies undergo across three stages -- primitive, intermediate, and modern. Although he was careful in indicating that such a development was not based on "a unilinear evolutionary theory....he differentiated among these

stages primarily on the basis of cultural dimensions" (Ritzer, 1988:95). In the Parsonsian social system, "culture is embodied in norms and values" (Ibid, p.92), and thus societies can be compared based on the dichotomy of pattern variables as ideal types. Hence a society's level of *modernisation* could be established by examining its inherent values, how these values affect social institutions, and how these institutions address a level of desired modernity through the appropriate means of industrialisation. In other words, a society could not be expected to become industrialised if there was no acceptance of Gesellschaft-like values, and where a society was recognised as being backward (i.e., not proceeding towards modernisation), the assumption could be made that it possessed inappropriate values. Unfortunately Parsons' attempt at dealing with the processes of social change fell short (unaided, for one, by tautological arguments), as he proceeded to present a "comparative *structural* analysis," remaining once again "committed to the study of structures and functions" (Ritzer, 1988:96).

However, it appears that it was the same American spirit that both raised Parsonsian functionalism and stripped it of its credibility. By Parsons' (1961:315) own contention, it was an American "openness" which allowed him to place concepts in an ideological context, yet it was an American "skepticism" concerning high levels of generality which subsequently led to resistance. By the late 1960s, the clearly anti-Marxist structural functionalism moved aside as the predominant school of thought for an emerging radical and critical sociology that looked towards examining social change through an understanding of the much neglected meaning of *capitalism*.

Since many of the methods used in the sociology department at the University of Chicago were developed there, references to their utility are expected to surface within the research of those who encountered either direct influence from attending, or indirect influence (through instruction, publication, or learned meetings) from others who did. Such an examination would need to address what Mullins has identified as a "scientific communication network" made up of personal, intellectual, and academic connections, as well as a contextual analysis of published works. The focus, therefore, in determining the effects of a Chicago influence has been centred

around three propositions: (1) an examination of the treatment given to Chicago sociology at McGill University; (2) the extent to which McGill sociologists tied themselves to a Chicago faculty; and (3) the adoption of Chicago-style methodologies as evidenced in the articles of the *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science*.

Notes to Chapter 3

1. John Madge (1965:78) points out that "the claim made by Thomas and Zraniecki on behalf of such material proved ultimately to have constituted a turning point in the development of social science."
2. Sociologist Dennis Smith (1988:123-4) has correctly observed that Robert Park would also come to adopt this position that "social structure was a consequence of human activity and not *vice versa*."
3. The term **symbolic interactionism** was first coined by Herbert Blumer in 1937 (Ritzer, 1988:174).
4. The lecture notes were compiled by his former students and published by the University of Chicago Press.
5. Faris did, however, publish a volume containing a collection of his essays under the title The Nature of Human Nature (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1937).
6. Behaviourism here does not imply the mechanical stimulus-response type advanced by such methodological behaviourists as John B. Watson, nor the type that was being developed by the radical behaviourists, such as B.F. Skinner. Rather, as Jonathan H. Turner indicates, "Mead accepted the basic premise of behaviorism -- that is, the view that reinforcement guides and directs action....in ways that allowed for the consideration of mind and self" (1986:312).
7. Dennis Smith (1988:102) refers to a comment made by Read Bain at a Social Science Research Council conference, devoted to *The Polish Peasant*, in New York in 1938: "in its use of 'human document material' and its commitment to empirical research '*The Polish Peasant* is a monumental instance of the revolt against "armchair sociology" which began about 1900'."
8. Robert Bannister (1987) has reported that between 1923 and 1928, the University of Chicago received grants totaling \$3,398,000, although this figure seems to include monies donated by the Social Science Research Council as well which was likely omitted in the sum reported by Lester Kurtz.

9. Patricia Madoo Lengermann (1988:373-75) in a short yet convincing article, has examined five predominant evaluations of Chicago sociology. Her findings indicate that Chicago sociology: (1) was not atheoretical; (2) had functionalist themes only in the early system as noted in the connection with Herbert Spencer; (3) was symbolic interactionist through George Mead's "influence on the university community, not Park and his role in the sociology program"; (4) did not focus on middle-range theories, but rather included them in the more general theory; (5) included methodological concerns as one of the main foci, not its most distinctive characteristic.

10. The originator of the term "participant observation" has been identified by John Madge (1964) as being the social worker Eduard C. Lindeman, through his book Social Discovery (New York: Republic, 1924). Jennifer Platt (1983) concurs with Madge (as do others according to her findings) and she provides a historical account of the term's original meaning(s) and development. There is, however, a close conceptual tie with Charles Cooley's idea of "sympathetic introspection" (i.e., taking the place of the actor when attempting to study that actor) which Platt does not expand on.

11. He did go on like many other Chicago graduates to contribute significantly to sociology, and particularly in the Maritime region at the University of New Brunswick where he specialised in community studies and urban sociology, until his death in 1986 at the age of 97 (Obituary in S-S, January 1987).

12. Wirth was born in the village of Gemunden, a Jewish community, near the city of Koblenz in Germany's Rhineland (Smith, 1988:153).

13. These two approaches are placed side by side only with respect to the social condition being attached to a Darwinian perspective. French naturalist Chevalier de Lamarck (1744-1829) provided a basic 18th-century materialist argument that all matter is moving slowly, yet continuously, in an upward direction toward perfection. As such, the Lamarckian theory of evolution had a purpose, or an end, or a goal, and thus was teleological. Conversely, however, English naturalist Charles Robert Darwin (1809-1882) viewed this notion of perfection or progress as not nearly as important, and indeed recognised that evolution could also be retrograde depending on what kind of adaptation was occurring in the environment. For Darwin, whatever changes occurred were occurring because those with those changes had been selected for, or were better able to, survive and reproduce in the natural environment. As such, Darwin's theory advanced a sort of happenstance progress which was simply the natural result of natural non-goal-directed processes that occur automatically in nature, without a *designer* (i.e., God). It thus seems appropriate to qualify Spencer's scientific orientation as being "social" Darwinistic, although it appears to converge with Lamarck's conception a lot closer in places. (This argument has been adapted from a PBS series, "The Day the Universe Changed" with programme title "Fit to Rule")

14. R. Helmes-Hayes (1987:387) has examined the concept of social inequality as "a central focus of the human ecological perspective," considering that "struggle, domination, competition, and hierarchy were central concerns of Robert Park and the human ecologists during the 1920s and 1930s."

15. In his examination of various social science techniques and his discussion of the work of Sidney and Beatrice Webb (Methods of Social Study, London: Longmans, 1932), John Madge (1965:121-2) indicates that the importance of first hand observation "is for the social sciences what corresponds with the *natural history* stage in the biological sciences. Though today the emphasis among biologists may be on controlled experiments in biochemistry and biophysics, it is not forgotten that the first stage in mastering the subject of living organisms was the painstaking observation and classification of living things, and that this absorbed generations of scientific work." It certainly seems that Robert Park was proceeding along a similar sort of premise.

16. Henrika Kuklick (1973:11) asserts that addressing the issue "of social problems in culturally relativistic terms was directly related to the rise of the culture concept," which undoubtedly must have been shared with the anthropology department at Chicago, especially prior to its separation from the sociology department in 1929.

17. Dennis Smith (1988:4,10) places Albert Hunter in the "fourth-generation school" of sociologists at Chicago and in the same camp as other "neo-Chicagoans" such as Morris Janowitz, Gerald Suttles, William Kornblum, and Harvey Molotch.

18. For a further discussion of the department's organisation at Columbia, see Seymour Martin Lipset "The Department of Sociology" in R. Gordon Hoxie (ed). A History of The Faculty of Political Science, Columbia University. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1955) pp.284-303. It should be noted that the first "chair" of sociology was founded in 1894 within the Department of Economics and Social Science. Thirty years later, in 1924, the Department of Social Science was listed separately from that of Economics, "and not until 1941 was the name officially changed to that of Department of Sociology" (Hoxie, 1955:61).

19. Park came to "despise statistics," calling it "parlor magic...because it seemed to prohibit the analysis of subjectivity, of the idiosyncratic, and of the peculiar" (Ritzer, 1988:51).

20. Bogardus received his Ph.D. in 1911 following his dissertation on "The Relation of Fatigue to Industrial Accidents." It appears that he may have been approached by Robert Park for the construction of the scale due in some part to a chapter Bogardus had written on *social distance* in a text he published in 1917, Introduction to Sociology (Los Angeles: University of Southern California Press). Bogardus subsequently published Immigration and Race Attitudes (Boston: Heath, 1928), "A Social Distance Scale." SSR, Vol.17, Jan-Feb 1933: 265-71, and Social Distance (Yellow Springs, Ohio: Antioch Press, 1959).

There is also the indication that the Bogardus scale may have been influenced by the work of Chicago psychologist L.L. Thurstone and his scaling method of equal-appearing intervals. This social psychological attitude scale was apparently first presented by Thurstone in an article, "Attitudes Can Be Measured" AJS, Vol.33, 1928:529-54, and again in "Theory of Attitude Measurement" Psychological Bulletin, Vol.36, 1929:222-41. Psychologist Louis Guttman (Cornell) would later improve on this method by presenting his scalogram analysis in the article, "A Basis for Scaling Qualitative Data" ASR, Vol.9, 1944:139-50 (see William D. Crano and Marilyn B. Brewer Principles of Research in Social Psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973).

21. William F. Ogburn was a member of the "F.H.G. Club" at Columbia, which was described as an "elite club of devoted Giddings students" bearing an anti-Chicago disposition, with Ogburn identified as "the most talented" of the bunch (Wiley, 1979:58).

22. Inaugurated in December 1929 and located at 1126 East 59th Street.

23. Born in 1895 (Ph.D. 1925; with a post-graduate year at Columbia, 1927), Lundberg was advocating a "value-free" sociology at Bennington College in 1934, yet made his greatest contribution in this area while assuming a leadership role at the University of Washington, Seattle, until his retirement in the early 1960s. He is perhaps best known for his famous work, Can Science Save Us? (New York: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1961 [1947]).

Chapter 4

McGILL SOCIOLOGY: A CHICAGO HERITAGE

Upon completion of his graduate studies at the University of Chicago in 1922, Carl Dawson departed for McGill University where he accepted an appointment as assistant professor of Social Science and Director of the Social Study and Training Department in the School for Social Workers (established in 1918, closed in 1931, and reopened again in 1945 as the School of Social Work). In 1925, he was promoted to the rank of associate professor of sociology in the Department of Social Science (founded in 1918), which in that same year was renamed the Department of Sociology -- *the first such autonomous department in Canada* (Brym, 1986:3; Clark, 1979:397; Hall, 1988: i6; Hiller, 1982:16; Ostow, 1985:9; Shore, 1987:273, 1990).

Whereas sociology courses were established and offered by Dawson immediately following his appointment (Shore, 1987:122), and it is certain that McGill became one of the earliest Canadian universities to offer such structured courses,¹ as well as the first graduate programme in sociology beginning in 1925, a recent re-examination of available literature has led to the question of just how *autonomous* the department really was.

Reviewing the McGill University Annual Report for selected years reveals a general inconsistency with what would otherwise be seen as a technical point. Further investigation of claims that the department possessed some quality of self-determination, and through the use of

individualising identifiers such as *separate* or *distinct* existed in some sort of differentiated state, has led to the suggestion that the meaning of *autonomy*² may have been diffused over time, as sociology at McGill appears to have been at best residing in a semi-autonomous department since its beginning.

Historian Marlene Shore (1987) has provided a most excellent account of the early years of sociology at McGill, including the discipline's development out of a refurbished social work programme. She describes the sociology graduate programme of 1925 as consisting of theology, social work and sociology masters students, with each undertaking a particular investigation of that part of the city of Montreal which "fell under the rubric of sociology, social work, or theology," all within the same department (pp.125,144). In fact, a check of the sixteen M.A.s awarded in the Department of Sociology for the period 1926-32, appears to indicate that thirteen of the recipients were either in social work (n=7) or theology (n=6).³

A further check of the supervisory committees for these M.A.s reveals that in most cases Carl Dawson shared this duty with names such as: J.C. Hemmeon, Department of Economics and Political Science; G. Latham, Department of English; and particularly Ernest M. Best, a member of the theological colleges affiliated with McGill (Spitzer and Silvester, 1976). In other words, during his first decade of teaching at McGill, despite being joined by Everett Hughes in 1927, the indication is that Dawson had yet to establish an independent programme for sociological research (in a strict sense), relying instead on cross-disciplinary assistance.

This was not unusual, considering that sociology had been attracting some 200-300 students during a time when the overall McGill student population stood at between 2-3,000 (Shore, 1990). Its connection with a post-war current of thought regarding social betterment, and the fact that its courses were for the first time utilising Canadian research material, made sociology attractive during these economically depressed years. To this end, Aileen D. Ross (1984:4) has recalled that social work was still tied to sociology up until 1933, when McGill administrators seemed to somehow realise that it was a mistake to try and "marry 'well-doing' with 'science'" and

subsequently the two disciplines were separated. Yet M. Shore (1987:143) does describe the resultant studies as "written in an ecological perspective and employ[ing] all the techniques of Chicago sociology."

During the period 1930-40, implementation of the McGill Social Science Research Project appears to have furthered Dawson's aspirations to gain full control of the department's agenda and the subsequent training of *sociology* graduates. The focus of the project was to be on unemployment in Montreal; and by 1936, twelve staff members from the Departments of Economics, Psychology, Law, Education, Engineering, Public Health, and Sociology, along with thirty-three graduate students as research assistants, had participated in a total of forty separate studies.⁴ Dawson, however, could not agree with the proposal of making *unemployment* the main area of interest for his department, stressing instead the issues of *immigration* and ethnic relations as the main field of study with unemployment as a secondary interest (Shore, 1987:220). His insistence was met with some trepidation from co-operating members of other departments, including Leonard C. Marsh, the director of the project, although in the end Dawson won out.

Yet as Marlene Shore (1987:221) has further indicated: "there were not enough graduate students in sociology in Canada to carry out the research program that [Dawson] had envisioned." Subsequently, part of the graduate student contingent was made up of persons who had studied economics⁵ or history⁶ in their undergraduate years, as well as continued representation from those with a social work background,⁷ and sociology at McGill became attractive insofar as it was tied to Rockefeller grants of \$500-700 annually. During an economic depression this was a welcome source of income. Added to the M.S.S.R.P. were two other important studies in the 1930s employing the services of McGill sociology graduate students: the Pioneer Problems Committee had been studying the settlement process in the Canadian west (resulting in the *Canadian Frontiers of Settlement* publications); and the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace was sponsoring work on a project on Canadian-American relations. What followed was a rather impressive outpouring of sociology theses in the 1930s, bettering the output of the twenties

by a 3:1 ratio and in subsequent comparison that of the forties by about 2.5:1.⁸ For the years 1936-39, the Department of Sociology had one of the largest graduate programmes at McGill with ten students registered in each of the three years.⁹

Even with all this research activity it seemed as though the social sciences at McGill in the 1930s had not lived up to the governing body's expectations, as reflected in the Report of the Principal at the end of the decade:

"In some areas of knowledge, notably the natural, biological and medical sciences, the University has attained remarkable eminence, while progress has moved with leaden feet in many segments of the humanities and the social sciences."¹⁰

Indeed, in the 1930s the Department of Sociology was still borrowing office space (from Psychology) and sharing it (with Social Work) (Ostow, 1984:13), making the task of providing study and discussion space in two large rooms all the more trying. There was also a reliance on the statistical laboratories and staff of the Department of Economics to provide an introductory course in statistics for sociology students. Yet at least on this latter point the arrangement did not sit well with the sociology students, and as Forrest LaViolette recalled, the students "rebelled at this because they were interested in problems which sociologists would work upon rather than what economists would" (in Tomovic, 1975:248).¹¹

From the two graduate years he spent at McGill, S.D. Clark (1979:394) had recollections "of the low regard in which sociology was held in other departments of the university and even more within the larger Canadian academic community." He goes on to say that, "[o]ne certainly had the impression that the Department of Sociology was off in a little corner by itself and that within the larger Canadian academic community the McGill sociology group was largely isolated." David N. Solomon (1968:4) remembered when he first registered in sociology at McGill in the fall of 1935: "Sociology at the time was trying to free itself from the influence of social philosophy and possibly certain types of journalism, and to establish itself in the academic community vis-a-vis history, economics, political science, and psychology." It was a time of struggle for a sociology attempting to establish itself (Ostow, 1984:12) and "to gain a respectable position in the academic

world" (Ross, 1984:4).

It should also be recalled (see chapter two) that 1935 saw the establishment of the *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science* (CJEPS) and the emergence of a general sense of interdisciplinary co-operation within the social scientific community. Although overpowered by high representations from both economics and political science, sociology as a subject and fledgling discipline did at least begin establishing its place within Canadian social science through this publishing mechanism. Yet because sociology in Canada at the time was seemingly associated with an American-influenced McGill product, its immediate acceptance within this academic community was somewhat hampered by vociferous opponents -- such as Professor E.J. Urwick, whose dislike for a Chicago-style of sociology (Clark, 1988:3), coupled with his own efforts at initiating a kind of British sociology based more on social philosophy at the rival University of Toronto (Hall, 1988:11), led to his outright attack in the very first issue of the CJEPS -- who were being read by the rest of the social science community and most likely by McGill officials as well.

By the end of the decade, the social sciences (including sociology) had come under fire by McGill's Board of Governors and Principal for what was perceived as an emerging leftist ideology. In discussing *academic freedom* at McGill during this period, Marlene Shore (1990) has found that certain faculty connections with socialist groups such as the League for Social Reconstruction (LSR) and the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation (CCF), along with numerous publications expounding "collectivist political philosophies," led the university officials to believe that a political radicalism had emerged under the auspices of the M.S.S.R.P., thus refusing the extension of any further Rockefeller grants in this area. This translated into a major setback for the social sciences in the development of their individual disciplines, particularly when considering that local financing for research in the midst of a depression seemed on the most part to be negligible.

The 1940s at McGill are remembered as a decade of student and faculty expansion. Full-

time student enrolment in 1937-38 stood at 3,310, whereas by 1945-46, with veterans returning to Canada following the end of the Second World War, the number more than doubled to 7,558.¹² The total student enrolment in sociology courses had reached 800 by the middle of the decade, while enrolment in the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for the social sciences, psychology, and law had increased by 200 per cent over the 1944-45 session (second only to engineering which increased by 300 per cent).¹³ Graduate students registered in the sociology masters programme for the period 1945-50, numbered 7, 10, 9, 11, and 17 for each academic year respectively.¹⁴ Although the sociology staff was basically comprised of two members for any given year up to 1944, the next quinquennium witnessed the hiring of three new full-time and one part-time staff members (see Appendix A).

A new twist was added in the 1946-47 session. William H. Kelly (A.B. Arizona; Ph.D. Harvard), an anthropologist, was appointed associate professor in the Department of Sociology.¹⁵ He resigned the following year and was replaced by assistant professor Fred W. Voget (B.A. Oregon; Ph.D. Yale), also an anthropologist, who remained on the teaching staff until 1952 when he was replaced (upon his resignation) by another anthropologist, assistant professor Jacob Fried (A.B. Temple; Ph.D. Yale).¹⁶ For the 1953-54 session, the two subheadings of "Sociology" and "Anthropology" were for the first time listed together in the Annual Report under the Department of Sociology. What this seems to indicate is that although the department retained the name of Sociology, the anthropology contribution was being recognised in and of itself, as well as in connection with the sociology programme.

In that year, the department had a teaching staff of 5 full-time members (4 sociologists and 1 anthropologist) and 7 assistants/demonstrators, offering 6 full-session and 13 half-session courses. There was a total of 501 undergraduates enrolled in these courses, although only 9 of them had registered in the honours programme in their 2nd, 3rd, and 4th years. In fact, beginning with the 1950-51 academic year, enrolment in the sociology graduate programme began to decline up to the end of the 1956-57 session, with annual registration figures of 10, 7, 9, 5, 5,

4 and 6 respectively.¹⁷ As far as the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research had reported, the top six departments in 1951-52 (based on graduate registration) were listed in order as: Chemistry (76), Economics (56), Geology (53), Physics (45), Psychology (45), and Biochemistry (41). Moreover, the School of Social Work, with the M.S.W. degree created in 1947-48, had 72 graduate students registered, 27 of which were full-time.¹⁸

There is a strong indication that graduate studies in the physical and biological sciences was an attractive route to follow in the post-World War II years. With atomic power becoming a reality in 1945, the hydrogen bomb in 1952, and satellites, ballistic missiles, automation, and space exploration rounding out the remainder of the 1950s, there seemed little doubt about where the appropriate interest would lie. This was also indicative of grant monies received from external sources and expended by McGill for research in the different areas of study. The 1961-62 Annual Report included a listing of research grant expenditures (by areas of research) of monies received from external bodies: Biological and Medical Sciences received \$3,741,142; Physical Sciences and Engineering, \$1,350,258; Humanities, \$114,261; Social Sciences, \$93,979 (p.16). Furthermore, during the period 1956-61, McGill had awarded almost 50 per cent of all doctoral degrees awarded in Canada in the biological and medical sciences (188 of 395), 30 per cent in the physical sciences and engineering (186 of 606), 15 per cent in the social sciences (25 of 168), and about 1 per cent in the humanities (3 of 256).¹⁹ Indeed, the Report of the Principal and Vice-Chancellor, Frank Cyril James (1903-1973), for the 1961-62 session (his last of twenty-three years in that position), indicated the immediacy of much needed support in the latter two areas:

"The fundamentally important thing is that more money must be spent on research in the Humanities and Social Sciences -- on studies that preserve our heritage of culture and help men to get along together more harmoniously within the community or in the arena of international politics. We are not doing anything like enough to train the university teachers who will be needed in these fields..."²⁰

The inclusion of anthropology as "a sub-department within Sociology" in 1954-55,²¹ may have thus played a role towards this strengthening of the social sciences. The department was renamed the Department of Sociology and Anthropology during the 1958-59 session,²² and was

listed as such by the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research the following year. The joining of these two disciplines seemed to further stimulate graduate activity, as the number of students registered in the sociology (to 1958-59) and anthropology (from 1959-60) M.A. programme began to climb once again; for example, for the two academic years 1957-59, graduate registration numbered 12 and 13 respectively (doubling the figure for 1956-57), and although registration dipped somewhat the following year (9 in 1959-60), the department experienced a steady increase thereafter to the end of the 1960s.²³ Moreover, a Ph.D. programme was started in 1960-61, with a single student registered, and continued with increasing numbers to the end of the decade.²⁴ The first *sociology* Ph.D. was conferred at McGill in 1972.²⁵

On 7 October 1965, the new Stephen Leacock Building for Humanities and Social Sciences was officially opened on the McGill campus. This building would accommodate the disciplines of Economics and Political Science, Sociology and Anthropology, History, Philosophy, and the Institute of Islamic Studies, by providing classroom and office space in one specific area of the campus. It would remain the Department of Sociology and Anthropology until 1969-70, when it was announced in the Annual Report for that year, that "four *new* departments, Anthropology, Economics, Political Science, and Sociology, saw their *first year as independent entities*" (p.31; *emphasis added*).

Professor of Anthropology Richard Frank Salisbury (1927-1989), the last to chair the joint Department of Sociology and Anthropology (between 1966 and 1970) and the first chair of the newly formed Department of Anthropology, has been memorialised as the main figure who "oversaw major growth in and the independence of the anthropology staff."²⁶ Moreover, following his sudden death at the age of 50, an obituary in The McGill News read that Professor of Sociology Howard E. Roseborough "guided the fortunes of sociology at McGill from 1968 on, steering it to becoming an independent department, of which he was the first chairman."²⁷ Yet it is this latter entry in the Annual Report which most notably brings into question the idea of autonomy that sociology may have held at McGill since the founding efforts of Carl Dawson.

Unlike the Department of Sociology at the University of Chicago, it seems difficult to speak of sociology at McGill as part of an interdisciplinary effort within the social sciences. While implementation of the M.S.S.R.P. appeared to be originally geared towards this end, the gradual diminishing of much needed Rockefeller research grants in the mid-30s resulted in inter-departmental competition for these scant resources, rather than co-operation. Marlene Shore (1987:263) concurs on this point by indicating that "academics involved in the project were more interested in using the grants to strengthen their own disciplines." The Department of Sociology was no different in this respect, as both Dawson and Hughes looked to these grants to provide fellowships for their graduate students during the distressing depression years.

Yet to say that sociology at McGill possessed a well-established research programme also has its limitations. Insofar as the flexibility it was allotted by the university's administrative policies based on minimal external funding (both private and public) and budgetary constraints (including a low salary scale), the department developed, as Oswald Hall (1988:21) has indicated, "in effect [as] a one-man enterprise." It would indeed be interesting to speculate what sort of intellectual climate could have developed in Canadian sociology if McGill had even attempted to match the University of Chicago in its offer to attract the services of Everett C. Hughes.

Even so, the political agenda underlying various administrative decisions at McGill seemed unremitting in its endeavour to establish an appropriate mandate for the university; unfortunately there was no inclusion of a provision for an independent sociology programme. Somewhere in the midst of all this, Carl Dawson somehow managed to steer the course of a developing Canadian sociology (perhaps like Deucalion at the helm of the Ark, or as it turns out for some like Charon across the river Styx) through a channel that now appears even narrower than previously perceived.

Carl Addington Dawson

Recognised by many academics²⁸ as the "father" of Canadian sociology (e.g., Campbell, 1983:241; Hiller, 1982:40) and "founder" of sociology in English Canada (Hall, 1964:115; Wilcox-Magill, 1983:3), Carl Dawson ensured a place for himself in the history of Canadian social science following the establishment of the first sociology department in Canada. Upon arriving at McGill University, Dawson immediately undertook the task of "explaining what social research was,...and destroying the widely held assumption that sociology was a reformist discipline" (Shore, 1987:69). With its roots in a reformist social work programme, Dawson recognised the shallowness of social research at McGill and began to advocate a more "objective and scientific quest for facts.... [towards demonstrating] the value of research pursued for its own sake"(ibid). This, Dawson believed, was the first step in the development of sociology as a specialised *science*, to which he devoted the next thirty years of his academic life at McGill.

Carl Dawson was born on March 15, 1887, the first of five children of John Addington Dawson (1863-1940) and Eliza Jane Mountain Wood (1868-1949),²⁹ in the small community of Augustine Cove, Prince Edward Island. He received his B.A. in 1912 from Acadia College in Wolfville, Nova Scotia, at the age of 25. Two years later he left the Maritimes for Chicago where he enrolled in a theological programme at the Divinity School of the University of Chicago. Following eighteen months of war service, he returned to the University of Chicago in 1919 to resume his studies and to instruct in the Department of Sociology which had close ties with the Divinity School. In 1921 he received his B.Div., for which he submitted the thesis paper "The Psychology of Dogmas as Illustrated in the Period Ending with the Council of Nicea." With supervision from Ellsworth Faris, he submitted the work "The Social Nature of Knowledge," for which he received his Ph.D. in 1922, the same year he accepted an appointment to teach at McGill.

The qualifications Dawson brought to McGill were largely a product of a personal conceptual reorientation, aided in its formulation by the formal training he received while at

Chicago. Originally attracted to the theological offerings of the Divinity School, Dawson quickly expanded his interests to include the Chicago programme and its concern with understanding the social disorganisation that was so apparent in the city at the time. Marlene Shore (1987:78) has provided a detailed account of Dawson's biography, including a strong argument that he entered the Divinity School because he found there a concordant theological perspective, namely, a mutually complementary Baptist orientation with an interest in "practical Christianity." Characteristic of the sociology department as well, this Chicago direction towards social improvement (albeit in many ways implicit) through the development of a science of society, viz. the use of research, investigation, and an understanding of human behaviour, undoubtedly left its mark on Carl Dawson and his subsequent pursuits. A clear example of the lasting effects of this Chicago influence on Dawson's writing may be drawn from his first publication in the CJEPS, "Sociology as a Specialized Science" (1940).

If this were to be the only work ever published by Dawson, it would read as a brief summary of a *Who's Who* of prominent Chicagoans and their conceptual contributions, simply by noting the names and concepts he employs in support of his argument. He outlines the discipline's origins through the scientism and organicism employed by Comte, Spencer, and Durkheim, and the objective and systematic thinking that emerged from this naturalistic approach following the industrial revolution. He briefly retraces the ameliorative characteristic of early social work, yet proceeds to indicate that apart from contributing a useful technique of social surveying and bringing attention to "the community as a unit of sociological study," these interests involved merely "casual speculations" in need of sociological "systematic research" for more "precise analysis" and understanding.

Following criticism of the lingering social philosophical (i.e., British) viewpoint that "sociology is a synoptic science" and therefore has no place as an independent "specialism," Dawson argues that specialisation within the social sciences does not imply stagnation, but rather a natural development of an interdependence among allied fields, it being the task of the scientists

to make "significant discoveries....integral parts of their own specialized disciplines." He proceeds to demonstrate how sociology has developed into a specialised science through its use of research findings borrowed from related disciplines such as history, economics, political science, cultural anthropology, and psychology (particularly social psychology).

At one point he strikes out against university administrators who "naively" set out to co-ordinate the sciences (social and physical) based on general "notions of what education ought to be even if it is not." Although Dawson does not spell it out specifically, the impression is that the M.S.S.R.P. was one of these failed efforts at "integration of the social sciences"; he seems to envy the "malleable" feature of university organisation as it pertains to sociological study in the United States and most probably at the University of Chicago. The point put forward is not so much that methodological eclecticism is detrimental to social research, but rather that superficial or artificial eclecticism achieves little and may even temporarily mask that which is inevitable anyway, that is, a *natural* interdependence among the social sciences. Hence, specialisation does not imply "segmentation."

References to such names as Everett Hughes, Robert Park, William I. Thomas, Florian Znaniecki, Horace Miner, and R.E.L. Faris, certainly add the kind of support Dawson is seeking in advancing his argument, as well as a rather clear picture of from where his thinking has been derived. Further evidence can be found in a list of those "areas of life" that he sees as falling within the scope of sociological study: the family, ethnic groups, communities, regions, and social institutions. He presents a general definition of sociology as the "Science of Collective Behaviour" and, in a Parkian manner, asserts that sociology "studies institutions which constitute the more formal aspects of group life, but it also studies the social movements out of which institutions emerge as the final stage in their natural history." Furthermore, sociological explanations result as the analysis proceeds "from graphic history to history in the abstract or from general history to natural history, i.e. the history of a typical group or a typical institution."

Dawson makes reference to Simmel's social processes of subordination and

superordination, competition, conflict and accommodation (also adopted by Park in his four-stage processual system and by Dawson in his "life-cycle of immigrant adjustment," but both add "assimilation" as a final stage) and indicates that "it is the task of sociologists to concentrate on their discovery and explanation." This acts as a springboard for his ensuing argument regarding a city's "physiographic regions," including a brief account of a *metropolis-hinterland* comparison, and how "the natural expansion of the city" results from population movements into "natural areas" due to a "series of invasions." Undeniably, the "life-cycle of development" that Dawson addresses was characteristic of Burgess and his concentric zone, or "natural areas," approach to the study of social disorganisation. He concludes with a brief mention of statistics and how it "must be related to sociological concepts; otherwise, statistics in this field is just so much irresponsible commensuration."

With a focus on urban congestion and social disintegration (i.e., the movement from rural to urban centres), Dawson succeeded in transplanting a characteristically Chicagoan "ecological" tradition into the Canadian setting. Using the teachings of Robert Park's "human ecology" approach, Dawson undertook an examination of a number of Canadian ethnic groups and the *typical* stages they passed through (depending on social circumstance) in the course of their natural histories. Among the groups studied were "the collectivistic farm villages of the Doukhobors, Mennonites, and Mormons, and the more individualistic German-Catholic and French-Canadian communities" (Hurd, 1936:574).

Beginning his research on Canada's west in the early 1930s under the auspices of the Canadian Pioneer Problems Committee, Dawson's work culminated in the publication of three volumes in the *Canadian Frontiers of Settlement* series: with the assistance of Robert Welch Murchie (1883-1937), The Settlement of the Peace River Country: A Study of a Pioneer Area (Vol.6, 1934); Group Settlement: Ethnic Communities in Western Canada (Vol.7, 1936); and co-authored with Eva Ruder Younge, Pioneering in the Prairie Provinces: The Social Side of the Settlement Process (Vol.8, 1940).³⁰ The nine volume series involved an examination of the

settlement processes and conditions in Western Canada with one basic goal on the agenda -- "the development of economic and social planning."

At the May 24, 1943 annual C.P.S.A. meeting, Carl Dawson delivered the customary Presidential Address at the completion of his one-year term in that office. The paper "Canada in Perspective" was presented and later published in the August issue of CJEPS for that year. His speech focused on three specific areas of concern -- immigration, ethnic relations and the institutionalisation of social science research in Canada.

The *myth* of Canada's "under-population" is the first topic of discussion. A seemingly preferred argument that "Canada is a country of boundless resources, meagerly developed and offering great opportunities for population expansion," is, according to Dawson, a "highly emotionalized state of mind" in need of correction. Canadian immigration practices have apparently relied on manipulated statistics of population densities based on a relationship of Canada's *overall* land surface area and population, rather than a truer measurement of density based on an "arable land index." Once recognised that Canada is largely comprised of the "Canadian Shield and other non-arable mountainous areas," what remains of the nearly four million square miles of total area "is roughly 1,000,000 square miles, of which approximately 550,000 square miles is available for potential agricultural settlement, much of it very problematical." Dawson goes on to indicate that, although "[l]ess than one half of this is now occupied....the increase of occupied and improved land has about come to a standstill in the eastern and central provinces of Canada."

In terms of the situation in Quebec and the prairies, Quebec may be able to sustain "only a very small fraction of its natural increase," whereas in the prairies -- "the chief area of increases in occupied and improved land" -- expansion rates had been on the decrease. In fact, Dawson had observed that the prairie provinces were experiencing "emigration rather than immigration" over the previous two decades, which seemed to be in keeping with the overall Canadian trend in terms of population growth, namely, the "urban phenomenon." Any further "immigration or

land-settlement schemes" for Canada's west was in all likelihood going to add to emigration movements of this sort, placing an even greater strain on the country's ability to provide "chances for livelihood" to its people. Everett Hughes (1959:402) would comment on this some years later in a somewhat anecdotal aside: "Canada's problem seems always to be that her immigrants will not stay where they are put."

The point in brief is that Canada's resources are limited; not only is it unlikely that Canada will be able to absorb population surpluses from abroad, but also that its ability to accommodate "natural increases" in the population within its own boundaries is restricted. And with additional support from past and projected population figures, Dawson proceeds with a recommendation that Canada should be looking to achieve a "stationary population" of no more than 18-20 million by the beginning of the 1970s.

The prognosis does not appear to be a favourable one for Canada's growth potential and population balance, yet it represents the sort of picture Dawson is attempting to (re)create in the minds of Canadians, as well as in those belonging to what he refers to as the "predatory nations" (i.e., indicating specifically, Germany, Italy, Japan, and Britain) that may be looking towards Canada with plans of transferring surplus populations. Particular attention appears to be directed to *the British immigrant* who had also been the centre of much concern some eight years before.

In the "Introduction" to Lloyd G. Reynolds' The British Immigrant (1935), Carl Dawson strongly asserted that "the saturation point seems to have been reached" in terms of significant immigration to Canada. He points out that economic conditions in the country had forced many Canadian-born agriculturalists to seek out new occupational opportunities in the urban centres, hence creating a situation in which: (1) employment opportunities in the urban areas had become markedly restricted; and (2) Canada's surplus rural population was not being given a satisfactory opportunity to remain in a commercially advantageous agricultural setting. By allowing skilled industrial and clerical workers to immigrate from Britain or even elsewhere, Canadian immigration policy would be placing native-born Canadians, who otherwise would be "seeking every opportunity

to climb the occupational and social ladder in their native land," in a "competitive" disadvantage. Dawson makes reference to historical evidence that "waves of migration from outside have speeded up population mobility in Canada to the point where it has produced far more social and personal disorganization than most people realize." Thus in seeking "greater social and economic stability," and in light of the "far-reaching effects [of migration] on the lives of immigrants and in the natural development of the areas to which they come," Dawson suggests that "it seems in the main unwise to encourage British immigrants, with or without money, to settle on the land in Canada."

Dawson's approach is characteristic of a human ecological interest in the concept of *competition*, "as a determinant shaping the territorial distribution of human groups and institutions" (Wilcox-Magill, 1983:8), with a clearly nationalist thrust fueling the overall attempt to provide a better understanding of how impinging external forces could possibly upset the country's ecological order. This leads into a classic discussion on ecological processes that he and Warner Ensign Gettys³¹ (1891-1973) had advanced in their 1929 text An Introduction to Sociology, as well as into Dawson's research observations on Canada's pioneer belts and *successive stages of settlement* processes.

Continuing with his Presidential Address and the issue of ethnic and racial minorities, Dawson puts forth a picture of a new Canada which appears to be on its way towards a "cultural fusion." Referring to the prairie region as "[o]ne of the great laboratories in which to observe the trends from ethnic heterogeneity to homogeneity,"³² Dawson cites the research findings that he and some of his McGill students had recorded for the *Frontiers of Settlement Series* in the thirties. Contrary to what some specialists may have believed, there was "no divisive European situation" to speak of, but rather a process in which "these peoples are coming to share the institutional techniques" that makes for "A Canadian Way of Life."

Although this process is slower for some (i.e., those whose racial diversity is more noticeable), Dawson is confident that initial cultural barriers shall be overcome (*accommodation*)

and the move forward to ethnic group *assimilation* should be realised by the majority of successive generations of native-born Canadians. Yet there is also a certain amount of skepticism put forth in his discussion of the "high physical visibility" of the "negro and oriental." Historical evidence seems to suggest that these races of people will remain "permanently marginal in Canadian society," however, he legitimates this phenomenon by also indicating that "[i]t is a **natural** and inevitable defence reaction in certain social situations" (*emphasis added*). Dawson's outlook suggests a continuing race problem in Canada; the distribution seems to be consistent with the ecological processes of *competition* and *conflict*, yet, extension into the *accommodation* and *assimilation* phases is slowed (although not completely unattainable) due in part to "the attitudes of the native-born" (i.e., "on the degree of conscious or 'symbiotic' communication") and the disillusionment of the immigrant groups themselves (Shore, 1987:246).

Shifting to the situation in Quebec, Dawson retraces the social processes leading up to the population distribution of the early forties. Historically, French Canadians as a culture remained separated (*segregation*) from English Canada, due in part to the framing of the country's constitution (*conflict*), and to a geographic location (*concentration*) "that limited the contacts that would have modified their culture in the general direction of English-speaking North America." Dawson turns to Horace Miner's study of ethnic relations in Quebec, St. Denis: A French-Canadian Parish (1939), for support on this stage of development in French-Canadian culture. He goes on to say, although "[t]he rapid urbanization of Quebec....has changed the competitive and social relations of these two peoples" (*invasion*), future English-French relations will depend on both groups "accommodating" the other's "ways of life." Here Dawson mentions the work of Everett Hughes' French Canada in Transition (1943) which, along with Miner's study, is representative of the type of research advocated by Dawson for all social scientists and both culture groups to consider.

Prior to concluding his speech with a look at the institutionalisation of the social sciences, Dawson briefly extends his discussion on social differentiation by addressing the issue of "class"

in Canada. What is immediately apparent in this commentary is that nowhere does he mention a leftist conceptualisation of *inequality* as such. Instead he uses such terms as "social differentiation," "social hierarchy," "social flexibility and shifts in social status," all of which identify "just another one of those social inevitabilities" found in society. However, this should not be seen to imply that he was incognizant of concepts such as "exploitation" and "oppression," nor should it suggest a functionalist orientation towards "equilibrium" and "order," but rather, it is a characteristically Chicagoan approach employing a culturally- and environmentally-based examination of group relations. The key term *social inevitabilities* seems to say it best by indicating that societies are tied to a **natural history**, which in turn "suggests how little informal social relations as well as formal social institutions are controllable by rational prevision." His final section flows from this point quite well.

The main thrust of Dawson's closing argument is one in which he calls out for some sense of autonomy in the social sciences. In recognising that government and big business have both been increasing their penetration and control over all aspects of social life (legitimated as it were under "smoke screens of protective rationalization"), Dawson attempts to raise awareness among his colleagues in hopes of realising a *value-free* association. In a somewhat tactful tone he observes that social scientists should not be redefining their original goals to make them consistent with institutional imperatives, but instead be ready to study these "institutions in action wherein the concepts of social scientists can receive authentic demonstration." He goes on to say moreover that, "social scientists are under obligation to see things as they are and present them fairly and without indignation."

The year was 1943, however, and Dawson may have been responding to a number of recent events in his commentary. He mentions the Sirois Report (1939) and its "admirable" documentation of economic policy, but he goes on to say that "it gives little attention to political party functioning in its significant alignment with other social institutions in the actual conduct of Canadian affairs." Recognising that this submission was put forth by the government-appointed

Rowell-Sirois Royal Commission, he further states: "Perhaps this is too much to expect in a report of this kind."

Moreover, McGill University had only one year previously exhausted its generous Rockefeller funding for the Social Science Research Project, which undoubtedly left its administrators in a somewhat wanting position. It also placed a strain on the participating researchers to secure funding elsewhere and consequently exchange a sense of autonomous integrity for higher academic status, increasing economic reward, and some financial security in being able to continue their scientific practice. A second price was being paid, however, within their own scientific collegueship, which was made apparent by Dawson in the following comment: "Maybe only those scientists who withstand an ulterior determination of their terms of reference can be expected to present the really significant content of actual political performance in Canada." To this end, Dawson mentions three such scientists who seem to have proceeded along similar lines to his own (at least in this respect): University of Chicago political scientist, Charles E. Merriam; a former McGill graduate student of his, S.D. Clark (referring specifically to his M.A. thesis paper); and economist Harold A. Innis, head of the University of Toronto's Department of Political Economy (who was also incidentally a holder of a Chicago Ph.D. (1920)).

In concluding his speech, Dawson once again advances a characteristically Parkian postulate that calls for social scientists to refocus their research agenda back onto "the field of fact and action." Apparently, there had been an overemphasis in the social sciences that stressed the importance of drawing theoretical formulations from what had seemingly come to be interpreted as impersonal human relations. This would indicate that such high-level generality was bringing the validity of social science research into question, and therefore what was needed was a return to the study of individuals as active human beings within their particular environment. Although he does not cite any names directly, Dawson succeeds in relaying to the reader (or the listener as it were) an implicit observation that a competing theoretical product had emerged from the Harvard sociology department. Undoubtedly, Talcott Parsons' 1937 publication The Structure of

Social Action, along with other Harvard rumblings on large-scale social structures and institutions,³³ had ample time to make their influence known to the sociological community by the time of Dawson's Presidential Address. Even so, Dawson continued in promulgating the importance of employing a "descriptive analysis" in social science research, for which he would offer a vivid example in his third and final CJEPS article.

A six-part series, titled the *Arctic Survey*, appeared in the 1945 volume. The building of the Alaska Highway between 1942-44 along with the discovery of a variety of rich mineral and oil deposits in the Northwest Territories and Yukon over many years, had led to the establishment of a number of scattered communities across this vast domain and subsequently a research interest arose in the territory's potential for sustaining further settlement. The investigations covered factors such as: health conditions and medical services, education, geographical characteristics, transportation, and a combination of all of the above in an examination of the social development of these settlements. Carl Dawson's paper covered this latter factor and was listed as Part VI of the survey under the title of "The New North-West."³⁴

The establishment of the Arctic Institute of North America on the campus of McGill University in 1945,³⁵ made Dawson's participation in the survey all the more significant as a representative of his resident university. Whereas the Arctic Institute was initially described as being "completely independent" of the university, it quickly came to develop "a close liaison with the Department of Geography and other University departments."³⁶ By the 1950/51 academic session, an arctic research programme had started at McGill, "for which the University has received a generous five-year grant from the Carnegie Corporation,....[that] embraces a series of coordinated investigations in fields as diverse as botany, zoology, human ecology and climatology."³⁷ This in turn led to the establishment of the McGill Sub-Arctic Research Laboratories at Knob Lake, Labrador,³⁸ in 1954; by 1959, the operations had expanded into the high arctic region.³⁹ Although there does not appear to be any indication of a causal effect, it seems to follow that Dawson's timely participation in the *Arctic Survey* could not have (at the very

least) hampered McGill's case in successfully securing funding for this sort of research.

This should not necessarily imply that Dawson's investigation and interest in this region was stimulated by the prospect of developing an arctic research programme at McGill. In fact, he opens the article by stating quite clearly:

"My research interest in the settlement of the new North-West dates back to the summer of 1929 when I was asked to make a preliminary study of the Peace River Country which was one of the *Frontiers of Settlement* studies published during the first half of the nineteen-thirties."

A comparison between this article and his 1934 publication The Settlement of the Peace River Country: A Study of a Pioneer Area, reveals little variation in methodology employed and the subject matter being investigated. And for that matter, a further look at his two other studies in the *Canadian Frontiers of Settlement Series* leaves little doubt in the reviewer's mind that Carl Dawson carried the tradition of social ecology well into the 1940s.

Relying in part on past information provided by preliminary field surveys (undertaken by other investigators), government records, and his own previous data along with newly recorded observations, Dawson presents a detailed description (albeit restricted by the conventional length of a journal article) of a number of northern communities spanning an area of approximately one million square miles. Using a sampling technique in which established settlements are compared with those that are less-established, he proceeds to identify differences between, first, permanent centres in the U.S. (i.e., Alaska), the Soviet Union and northern Canadian communities, and second, the various *stages* of settlement across this northern Canadian territory. Each district becomes historically representative of some point across a social developmental scale; *typical* pioneer regions are identified in terms of having passed through a series of successive stages of settlement: the small outpost; the isolated farmstead or mine; the integrated agricultural community or expanding mining town; and finally a stage in which a "centre of permanent importance" is initiated as a result of concentrated industrial growth within a region. In dealing with the process of social change, Dawson again returns to the concept of **natural history** in

presenting a characteristic ecological interpretation of his *life-cycle theory* and human interaction with the environment.

Most evident in this descriptive analysis is an emphasis on population distribution and the economic and social conditions of each region. Drawing in part from census records, population data are provided on the number of persons and families living and working in a community or region, their gender, age, and ethnic composition (especially Native Indian), as well as future projections based on comparative settlement growth. Yet population expansion and eventual adaptation does not appear to be solely dependent on the individual's proclivity for overcoming the rough features of this domain, but also on the "warrantable development" of an economic and social organisation.

Information is included on the size, number, cost, production, and location of farms, mines, and oil wells, while particular attention is given to the importance of being situated near an older established community, or more so, a road, rail, water, or air transportation route. This latter factor seems to be at the very heart of further settlement expansion in the North: for on the one hand, the development of transportation lines into the area provides greater access for receiving machinery, food, and other supplies, as well as opening the way for new settlers and industry (such as tourism), while on the other, the improvement of out-going transportation links suggests higher efficiency and competitive freight rates for the shipping of various raw materials to both northern and external markets, which in turn implies continued industrial development particularly in mineral and oil processing.

Systematic surveys on communication facilities and other northern-related issues were as yet few and far between and Dawson calls on the government to develop an appropriate planning strategy. Meanwhile, Dawson undertakes an examination of the complexities associated with transportation by actually travelling across some of the routes himself and collecting information on significant invasive factors through the use of "first hand observation." In fact the use of this research technique does not only suggest the influence of Dawson's Chicago training, but also his

own research preference in guiding what will or will not be discussed. This point becomes evident when considering a footnote in his investigation of native populations: "Eskimos deserve equal attention, but they did not come within the writer's observation."

Throughout his survey of individual settlements, Dawson outlines the various social institutions and services available to the community. In this way the stage of development for any given community may be determined by way of the type and number of services provided, along with a comparative look at the social conditions of other settlements. By recognising that certain basic institutional facilities, such as schools, hospitals, and churches were absent in some of the more isolated areas, and that such services were necessary for a reasonable standard of living, Dawson argued that connections between these fringe areas and established settlements were not only essential but inevitable as well (especially with the improvement of transportation routes). Hence, Dawson directs his analysis through the life cycle of a region (much as he did some fifteen years earlier in his investigation of the Peace River Country) and describes the final stage in the process of social organisation in terms of the principles of metropolitanism inherent in a human ecological approach.

There are a few further observations which require some mention. In her discussion of Dawson's investigation of the Peace River area, Shore (1987:182) points out that he was not content with merely describing or identifying what stage the area was in. Realising that certain problems accompanied development he set out to write "a guidebook for settlement...in which the earlier, more difficult phases could be shortened -- or skipped entirely -- and stable, productive settlement hastened." Whereas this approach would seem to deviate from an organic argument consistent with an ecological framework, there is a suggestion that Dawson may not have totally abandoned an earlier social reformist postulate derived from the work of Thomas and Znaniecki, who emphasised the disorganising condition accompanying migration adjustment and reorientation within a new environment. Interestingly, in his 1945 article, Dawson's unrelenting lobby for more detailed comparative studies of northern settlements represents the same sort of claim for

discussing social disorganisation in this region: "Such is the value of the experience of others, if we have the wisdom to profit from it." It may also be that he had not forgotten the agenda set out during the *Frontiers of Settlement* project -- i.e., "the development of economic and social planning."

Although his work in the *Canadian Frontiers of Settlement Series* generally received positive comment,⁴⁰ Dawson was not totally exempt from some criticism, for which he seems to provide an implicit response in his 1945 article. In a negative review of Dawson's third publication in the series (co-authored with Eva R. Younge),⁴¹ S.D. Clark poignantly criticises the use of a "rigid ecological framework," arguing that the authors "describe what happened but fail to show how such developments came about." Dawson's 1945 article contains an extensive discussion of the economic and political factors behind the development of the Alaska Highway, indicating rather succinctly that its construction came as a result of a war strategy between the U.S. and Canada, in order to ensure land access to Alaska for the former and future security for both. The financial expenditures for the project are outlined, as are the potential commercial and industrial benefits to Canada, setting the stage for Dawson's further analysis on the social development of this north-west area. Remaining true once again to another Chicago tenet, Dawson discusses other external factors (i.e., to the individual) influencing regional economic development: the war fostered an active interest in the mining of pitch-blende (an ore that is the chief source of uranium and radium, i.e., important elements in the generation of atomic energy); the discovery of precious minerals, the expansion of agriculture, fishing, logging, and fur trapping; government participation in projects involving agriculture, oil drilling and processing, transportation improvement, in addition to providing economic and social services, also played a major role. Indeed, Dawson even responded to a personal criticism that he made in his 1940 publication (picked up and also criticised by another reviewer),⁴² in which, having recognised the flexibility of world markets, he "suggests that longer intervals, such as 5, 10 or more years must be used to estimate the degrees of success or failure in pioneer farming."⁴³ The survey presented in the

1945 article could in this case be seen as having satisfied part of that longitudinal study he foresaw. Short of undertaking a detailed historical or economic analysis, Dawson remains committed to investigating the social significance of all these factors, with a clear agenda for understanding the social side of settlement in one of Canada's relatively unexplored frontiers.

The contextual analysis of these first three sociology articles has been presented in an extended form for the following four reasons: (1) to show how the various Chicago research techniques and theoretical formulations came to be adopted into a social research programme in a Canadian context; (2) to investigate the manner by which Dawson developed a characteristically Chicagoan framework for what came to be known as his own research approach in the study of Canadian society (i.e., manifest congruences); (3) to identify some of the historically relevant factors directing the course of study; and (4) to establish a base point from which further investigation may be conducted into the subsequent influence Dawson exerted on the curriculum, faculty, and graduate students as a long-time chairman of the McGill sociology department.

Undeniably, C.A. Dawson established himself as a key figure in the development of a Canadian sociology. His research interest was national in character as was his professional interest in building the discipline.⁴⁴ Fellow social scientists recognised this and honoured his contribution in one of the most prestigious national organisations of its time. Along with holding the Presidency in 1942, Dawson had been an elected member of the Executive Council of the C.P.S.A. in 1938, Vice-President between 1939-41 and a member of the Editorial Advisory Board for the CJEPS between 1938-43 (holding the chair during his presidential year); he chaired a number of sessions during the annual business meetings of the C.P.S.A. (1943, 44, 46, 51, and 52), was appointed C.P.S.A. representative at the founding I.S.A. conference at Oslo, Norway in 1949, and was nominated to the I.S.A. Council (along with S.D. Clark) in 1950.

He retired from the sociology chair at McGill in 1951 (replaced by Oswald Hall), and from the university one year later in accordance with the age limit regulation there (65 years). He continued to lecture at McMaster University, University of Texas, and Tulane University, and on

14 August 1956, he received an Honourary Doctorate of Civil Law (to add to his LL.D. and F.R.S.C.) from his alma mater Acadia University. He resided in the small P.E.I. community of Victoria in 1957, from where he submitted a book review to the CJEPS (only his second review in that journal since 1941). Carl Dawson died in Whitby, Ontario on Thursday 16 January 1964, survived by his spouse Mary Alice (Dixon),⁴⁵ yet curiously he received no obituary in either CJEPS or the McGill Annual Report. That task fell to former student and colleague Oswald Hall, who, in volume one of the C.R.S.A. (1964), wrote that the passing of Dawson "can be viewed as ending a chapter in Canadian sociology."

Everett Cherrington Hughes

Everett C. Hughes was born in Beaver, Ohio (near the Pike-Jackson County border) in 1897, although he grew up just north of there in Ross County. He graduated with a B.A. after four years at the Ohio Wesleyan (Methodist) College, thereafter travelling to Chicago at the age of twenty where he organised English classes for immigrant workers in a steel mill (Hughes, 1970: 13). In the fall of 1923 he enrolled as a graduate student in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at the University of Chicago. Two years later he was introduced to Helen MacGill,⁴⁶ whom he went on to marry in the summer of 1927. In January 1927, at the American Sociological Society meetings in St. Louis, E.C. Hughes was introduced to Carl Dawson by Robert Park as "one of his favourite and most promising students" (Ostow, 1984:12). Although Hughes was in the process of completing his doctoral thesis ("A Study of a Secular Institution: The Chicago Real Estate Board" (1928)), he accepted Dawson's offer to join him in October of that year at McGill University as an assistant professor. For the next eleven years, he and Dawson proceeded to build a department and a discipline that could rightly be called **Canadian Sociology**.

Like Dawson, Hughes evolved from a human ecology tradition under the tutelage of Robert Park with whom he had developed a close and lasting friendship (Faris, 1979:109). "Those 11 years when I was away," he recalled later in his life, "I saw Professor Park at least once a year,

sometimes all summer, and I often visited the University of Chicago" (in Lofland, 1980:258). "As a matter of fact, I had a good deal more contact with Park after I went to teach at McGill University than before," Hughes (1971:vii) continues, and in "[t]he summer [of 1936] we travelled and camped together through the Quebec countryside and together looked for signs of the ecological relations of the French and English." During his tenure at McGill, Hughes amplified his interest in the study of social organisation and the processes surrounding organised social relations (first evident in his doctoral work). Whereas Dawson was more interested in the regional development, adaptation and adjustment of settlements in Western Canada, Hughes expanded on his fascination with ethnic relations in an industrial setting in French Canada (Shore, 1987:xvi). Robin Ostow (1984:13) has characterised this relationship rather succinctly with the following comparison: "Dawson described the settlement of the natural frontier to the West, and Hughes analysed the ethnic frontier, the meeting of French and English Canadians in Quebec's growing cities and towns."

As a recipient of research funding from the generous Rockefeller grant of 1930 (i.e., M.S.S.R.P.), Everett Hughes undertook an investigation of sixty-six counties covering most of the Province of Quebec south of the 53rd parallel. Relying in large part on census records for the majority of the vast area under study, existing research findings of selected regions, communities and related demographics (by other investigators), a comparative study he undertook of a similar system in Europe,⁴⁷ parish records, discussion with a notary public of one of the counties, and his own extensive field work in one particular community, he proceeds with a systematic and statistical investigation of the relationship between industrial development and population movements. Whereas his initial findings were first disclosed in the U.S. in 1933,⁴⁸ publication in CJEPS would have to wait until 1938 with the article "Industry and the Rural System in Quebec."

Hughes begins his discussion by differentiating between two general industrial settings and subsequent patterns of population movement: (1) original or developed (older) industrial centres,

controlled by native or local managers and employing a foreign or immigrating labour force; and (2) a region into which industry has spread, controlled by a small but culturally alien managerial class and employing a native and culturally homogeneous labour force. The former system is representative of the industrial-based north-eastern U.S., whereas the latter depicts a process of industrial invasion (i.e., a new system displacing an old one) in which, over the previous two decades, Quebec had become the representative case with its transition from a traditionally rural to a more urban system.

Drawing from Canada's census of 1931, Hughes utilises selected statistical findings⁴⁹ insofar as they provide support for his observation that there has generally been a downward trend (based on rates of "natural increase") of rural population, accompanied by continuous urban growth, in Quebec. The areas in which this trend does not appear to be consistent are those rural regions located on the outskirts of urban centres (offering farmers an opportunity to supplement their income by working in nearby industry), and those which are beginning to experience colonisation. Yet as industrial activity continues to expand, these regions as well will ultimately experience at least a stabilising effect (if not absorption) as they become more industry-dependent.

A downward trend, however, does not necessarily imply "a decline of agricultural production or of the number of people engaged in it." Paradoxical as it may seem, this does subscribe to what Hughes has called "the rule for the rural population." Reference is made to the farming family and in turn to the understanding of the deeply ingrained mores that identify the "familial character of farming" in Quebec. Typically, the Quebec farm has operated as a family enterprise, run by its owner with the help of his immediate family. An inheritance cycle has developed whereby the father (the owner), upon reaching the age of sixty (or thereabouts), turns over control of the farm to one of his sons (generally the eldest) as his father did before him. The remainder of the children (usually numerous) are provided for financially or supported in their education by the father, insofar as his capabilities may extend. Invariably, most children will have

to leave the farm, and in fact are urged to do so in accordance with the historic life cycle of a farm (influenced in great measure by culture and close ties to the Catholic Church), so as to actively search for employment elsewhere. Hence the implication is clear, in that, "[s]ince there is no increase in the number of farms, this means that in each generation large numbers of children sever themselves forever from the land."

Although depicted as an external source of conflict on the one hand, industrial expansion in Quebec has come to serve (no doubt unintentionally) a critical function in the successful continuation of the family system. Thus the rural population would evade the threat of congestion (capable of maintaining a traditional stability) as long as jobs became available through a continuous industrial growth. Inevitably, the invasive nature of such expansion will show an effect on "many of the features of the traditional order," but will also provide a means for continuing self-sufficiency and ultimately survival for a rural way of life. Hughes points to this as a "demographic contradiction," an underlying concern that has generally gone unnoticed, that is, "a functional relationship between the old system and the new." Some twenty years later, Robert K. Merton (1957) would introduce the term *latent function* to refer to this sort of unintended consequence.

In attempting to place the Quebec situation on some relative ground, Hughes refers to the 1931 census and compares certain aspects of farm life in Quebec with that in Ontario. The basic observation is that the Quebec farm is more family oriented and independently operated than the farm in Ontario. He draws further support from two contemporary studies: Horace Miner's investigation of Quebec's Kamouraska County,⁵⁰ and Léon Gérin's⁵¹ Le Type économique et social des Canadiens (1938). Characteristic of his continuing programme to assess the impact of industrial expansion in French Canada, he turns once again to the ecological tools inherent in his Chicago training and further presents a case study of a specific community that had undergone the general pattern of urbanisation, i.e., "a typical Quebec industrial centre."

The remainder of the article is devoted to his investigation of the industrial evolution of a small French-Canadian town called *Drummondville* (located some 65 miles north-east of Montreal).

Drummondville was literally raised from "the doldrums" when construction of a power dam brought new industries into the community. Over a span of roughly twenty years (1911-33), the town's population increased more than fivefold while the number of industrial workers increased by thirtyfold. Clearly the majority are French Canadian, having migrated into the centre (seeking employment) from a surrounding region that was generally unattached to any other major centre (e.g., Montreal, Trois-Riviere and Sherbrooke). Conversely the new managers and technical staff (none of whom were French Canadian), in addition to foremen, skilled operators, clerical workers, and their families, were all imported by industry from areas beyond the described region. This alien contingent of English-speaking people made up about one-twentieth of the population. Representative of the second type of industrial setting referred to earlier, Drummondville basically grew into a centre "in which labour [wa]s native and management foreign."

The resultant conflict was soon apparent as relations strained under an uneven class structure. Industrial workers made up the largest class which was mainly comprised of French Canadians and some of the poorer alien people. They generally inhabited the inner part of the town, which, common to any typical industrial town in North America, was the largest and poorest section. Uncommon was the finding that the inner town group was comprised of natives rather than immigrants, while the dominating immigrant managers and technicians had partially segregated themselves in "the more desirable outlying sections." Yet the outer areas were also occupied by many local French Canadians of the upper business and professional classes, which was largely comprised of the district's old residents. In fact, industrial expansion had fostered an auxiliary business and professional class within the community that became almost exclusively dominated by the local French Canadians.

While English dominance pervaded big industry and some of the professions, French Canadians seemed to a certain extent content with their churches, politics, smaller businesses, and employment in the more liberal professions such as law and medicine. Although it came to be recognised that "the greater prizes" were to be "competed for in industry" (that segment of the

local economy controlled by what the French Canadians saw as "a group far superior to them in both standard of living and authority"), the segregation appeared to be a mutually satisfying arrangement for both sides at the time. Hughes concluded on this point by indicating that, "French-Canadian survival is an heroic cultural miracle," but, the "tribute should not obscure the hard ecological fact that Quebec's closed rural system -- the basis of its culture -- could neither have developed nor have survived without an open and absorbent North America." This situation would, of course, change in the late-1950s/early-1960s with the emergence of a new white collar professional middle class and the agenda of a separatist Parti Quebecois.

As a sort of introduction to his ensuing description of the *mythical* town of "Cantonville" in his French Canada in Transition (1943), Hughes succeeds in many ways, through a conceptualisation of appropriate research methods, in revealing a strong affinity with the Chicago School paradigm. Whereas even an entire book (let alone a chapter) devoted to Hughes' work could not do justice to the magnitude of his contribution (both in Canada and the U.S.) over a long and prosperous career, an analysis offered by sociologist Jim Faught (1980) seems to summarise his research approach in a concise manner.

On the whole, Faught (1980:80) has concluded that almost all of the "presuppositions of the Chicago School's paradigm [that came under his study] hold prominent places in the writings of Everett Hughes." The one issue which he finds "does not appear to any extent in Hughes's published work is the idea of a natural history of institutions or events." Faught goes on in a footnote to qualify this observation by first referring to the concept of *natural history*, developed in the Park and Burgess text, as "a structural process applicable to the analysis of growth at the community or societal level." By employing "a significantly modified form" of the concept, Faught indicates that Hughes "uses the notion of natural processes of regulation and institutionalization[in h]is analysis of occupations and their professionalization."

In a subsequent account of his work while at McGill, E.C. Hughes (1959:402) recalls the programme of study which he had undertaken during the thirties:

" Eventually, I mounted a small attack on what I regarded as the most interesting feature of the part of Canada I was living in – *the changes in the structure* of French-Canadian society and in the relations between French and English institutions and people attendant upon the very great increase in industry of modern style and in urbanization" (*emphasis added*).

Hughes' analysis of the class structure of Drummondville (i.e., Cantonville) directs the reader through a classic discussion of a "typical industrial town" and its *natural areas*, in much the same manner that E.W. Burgess had applied the *zonal hypothesis* in discussing the city of Chicago. The use of a natural history approach in describing the social circumstances of French Canadians in Drummondville, first becomes apparent in his discussion of the life cycle of a farm family, but more so in a suggestion that the French Canadians may simply be lagging behind the English by some period of time, after which they would do what the English had already done: "Before many years skilled work, in addition to unskilled, will probably be performed by French alone." This point would also become apparent to social historian Arthur R.M. Lower (1944:100), who, as a reviewer of French Canada in Transition, would pose the following question: "are the French simply repeating English experience, with a time-lag of a generation or so? A good many phenomena suggest this." What is not suggested is that French Canadians would assimilate with the English way of life; the indication is that French Canadians were reacting to their relation with the English and subsequently would continue to develop in accordance with what could be called their own ethnically distinct natural history. Thus it would seem that Hughes did not neglect the idea of a natural history and did indeed live up to the label given him by Jim Faught (1980:72) in his opening statement: "Everett C. Hughes, one of Park's students and a major figure in the continuity of the Chicago School."

Although only one of his articles appeared in CJEPS while at McGill, Hughes went on to publish four more in the journal following his return to Chicago, still as an assistant professor, in 1938.⁵² These would fall under three topical categories as indicated by Hughes (1971): the first under "The Meeting of Races and Cultures"; the second and fourth under "Work and Self"; and the third under "The Study of Society." He reviewed two books for CJEPS while at McGill (1938),

and five more thereafter from Chicago (1939, 43, 47, 49, 61). Although Hughes did not hold any office or post in the C.P.S.A. or for the journal,⁵³ he did participate at the annual meetings by chairing a joint session between the C.P.S.A. and the Society for Applied Anthropology (1951), a sociology session (1952), and a sociology round-table (1956). As well, he read his paper "Mistakes at Work" at a sociology session (1951), and "The Dual Mandate of Social Sciences" in an address at a general session (1959).

Robin Ostow (1985), a former student of E.C. Hughes, provides a good summary of Hughes' academic appointments subsequent to his departure from McGill. Hughes taught at Chicago from 1938-61, holding the chairmanship of the Department of Sociology from 1952-56. During this time he was invited to a number of institutions to teach as a Visiting Professor: Laval University (1942-43), Universitat Frankfurt/Main (1948, 1953, 1958), Columbia University (summer of 1951), Radcliffe College (1957-58), and the University of Kansas (1959, 1961).

The invitation to Laval was sent by Jean-Charles Falardeau, a former Chicago graduate student, who had requested Hughes' assistance with the creation of a research programme for the School of Social Sciences there (opened under the directorship of Father Georges-Henri Lévesque in 1938). Hughes' advice that "research should be oriented to ecological studies of urban and rural communities (using the parish as the focus), plus investigation into the French Canadian family" (Nock, 1974:21), assisted in the writing of a *Program for Social Research in Quebec*, and the establishment of the School of Social Sciences as an "autonomous" (Hiller, 1982: 12) and full faculty in 1943. Hughes (1971:540) has claimed that he "certainly did not create this group, nor did [he] design their research," but the subsequent programme at Laval gradually shifted (as per Hughes' original design) to the study of social organisation and structural systems, with emphasis on the problem of the ethnic division of labour accompanying industrialisation in Quebec (Nock, 1974:21-2).

What should not be overlooked is that Hughes' perspective on society and the study of sociology expressed an approach which was not unique to the Chicago tradition; it resembled the

work of the "pioneer of French Canadian sociology," Léon Gérin, as well as the earlier influence of Frederick Le Play (who taught Gérin) on Robert Park (who taught Hughes); as S.D. Clark (1975: 229) had further observed: "It was a sociology truly French Canadian that became established in French Canada." Yet a logical extension could suggest that Chicago sociology was synonymous with French-Canadian sociology, for "[t]he theory and the methodology of the Chicago school remained a significant influence...for anglophones as well as francophones" (Hiller, 1982:19).

In 1960, at the age of sixty-three, (in a move to avoid mandatory retirement at Chicago) Hughes accepted an appointment to teach at Brandeis University, in Waltham, Massachusetts, commencing the following year (Ostow, 1985:10). His timely arrival in 1961 proved to be a very important addition to the newly formed Department of Sociology (in that same year), as he proceeded to assist in organising a graduate programme and the setting up and administration of a field work training programme. Hughes returned to Montreal for the academic session 1964-65, as a Visiting Professor of the McGill French Canada Studies Programme (established in November 1963), where he directed an awareness-raising research project geared towards informing English Canada of the social realities in French Canada.⁵⁴ Moreover, he conducted graduate seminars at both McGill and the University of Montreal and witnessed the completion of the new Stephen Leacock Building at McGill. He left Brandeis in 1968 to go to Boston College and assist with the development of graduate programmes in the social sciences which had begun in the late sixties.

It would seem, therefore, that one of Hughes' fortes was going to fledgling sociology departments and helping them build a strong research programme. At McGill, Dawson's influence on the development of sociological work in Canada, viz. the Chicago School's human ecological framework, remained limited until Hughes conducted his work on French Canada and produced a book in 1943 that, as Leo Zakuta (1968:69) wrote some twenty-five years ago (and still holds true today), "remains without challenge the definitive work in its field and a fresh source of pleasure and illumination every time it is re-read." But to say that his departure from McGill did anything to lessen the development of Canadian Sociology, would have to consider the large

number of successful Canadian sociologists who passed under his guidance at Chicago and returned to teach his basic concept of understanding human behaviour and human society, and relaying that understanding in a descriptive and informative manner (which in itself "strengthened the hegemonic influences of the University of Chicago in Canadian sociology" (Ostow, 1984:15)), to the next generation of sociologists.⁵⁵

Whereas he spent a comparatively brief period of time during his long academic career teaching in Canada, the influence left by E.C. Hughes may be to some extent measured by the fact that he was made Honourary Life President of the Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association (quite a distinction for an American sociologist). Hughes received two honorary degrees in 1970: one from Sir George Williams University, and in June, an honorary Doctor of Laws from McGill. He would also receive an honorary degree from the University of Montreal in 1978. Professor Emeritus Everett C. Hughes died in 1983, leaving behind a legacy that continues to inspire the study of Canadian society.

Robert E. Lee Faris

Robert Faris was born in Texas in 1907, to Ellsworth Faris and Elizabeth Homan. Faris' strong southern roots first become apparent when recognising that he shares his name with Robert Edward Lee (1807-1870), commander of the Confederate forces in the American Civil War. Moreover, knowing of the house where Faris grew up, Oswald Hall (1989) indicates that "the grandfather clock on the wall still had the marks the northern bayonets made in it when the Northerners invaded the South during the Civil War." During Robert's childhood, his family moved to Chicago where his father, Ellsworth, completed his Ph.D. in psychology (1914). Following four more moves back and forth between Iowa and Chicago, the Faris family settled in Chicago when Ellsworth accepted an appointment to teach sociology (following the departure of W.I. Thomas) at the University of Chicago (1919).

Robert Faris first enrolled in the University of Chicago in 1924. One year later his father

became chairman of the Department of Sociology, and in 1926, editor of the *American Journal of Sociology*. Robert received his B.A. in 1928 and entered his graduate studies in sociology as "the younger Faris." He completed his M.A. in 1930 with "The Development of the Philosophy Underlying the Durkheim School of Social Theory," and one year later his Ph.D. with his work "An Ecological Study of Insanity in the City."⁵⁶

In 1938, he received an invitation to teach at McGill following the return to Chicago by E.C. Hughes.⁵⁷ While teaching at Brown University, he accepted a three-year appointment as assistant professor of sociology at McGill to begin on 01 September 1939. There he would join Dawson, making the sociology programme a *two-man enterprise* again, and help preserve the mandate for studying society through an appropriate research plan. It would not take long for Faris to conjoin his name to that of McGill's, and his social thought to that of Chicago's general framework, as became clear in his first and only article appearing in the CJEPS, "Interrelated Problems of the Expanding Metropolis."

Both content and method are vintage Chicago sociology. The industrial city is once again the topic of inquiry, with a particular focus on "the typical forms of disorganization" resulting from a "natural history" based on economic growth. The discussion begins on a general level indicating that, as a model, "the large expanding city has a natural form....a basic pattern which no city escapes," that may in turn be applied "with caution...to other large cities of the world." The economic forces which shape the city seem to do so in a complementary manner, between those migrating to urban centres in hopes of evading rural congestion and those in managerial positions who need unskilled labour (in large measure) to make the industry go. "The population, for the most part, is selected by the economic demands of the system."

Accompanying migration in the process of urbanisation is a period in which conflict occurs. New populations entering the city tend to be streamed into "the spatial bottom of the city...the slum zone....[which] is itself created by the expansion process." Located on the outskirts of the expanding industrial district, this inner city area is characterised by culturally and racially

heterogeneous "*stranger relationships*" which invariably lead to "prejudice and hostility between divisions of the urban populations." Included here are the hobo areas, the immigrant slums, the rooming-house areas, the most disorganised areas of the city where it seems that both informal and formal means of control have broken down. Yet also living in this district are the older residents who have come to adapt to life in a city and interacting with other people. The conflict which arises between these population classes, however, is not attributable to some biological predisposition to deterioration (an argument based on eugenics which was popular in the twenties and thirties), but rather is a consequence of the rapid expansion. Hence, forms of personal disorganisation such as crime and delinquency, suicide, divorce, desertion, and some types of mental disorders common to the conditions observed in the deteriorated fraction of the inner city population, are effects of "the expansion itself, rather than the size or any other characteristics of the city, which is chiefly responsible for this disorganization."

This area is certainly noticeable and not uncommon to the typical industrial city. Faris refers to it as a "*natural area* because it is an unplanned product of natural forces." It is, moreover, one in a set of natural areas, each with its own discernible characteristics, that make up the pattern of any city: "Each city has its hobo areas, its rooming-house areas, its first- and second-settlement immigrant slum areas, its residential and suburban areas." Populations may come and populations may go, yet the areas retain their basic characteristics irrespective of population type.

But how does Faris arrive at such a hypothesis? "It has been established," he writes, "with entirely adequate scientific methods, that these populations get these characteristics from the ecological processes of the city." At this point he cites the now classic works of some of his Chicago contemporaries: Clifford R. Shaw and Henry D. McKay,⁵⁸ Walter C. Reckless,⁵⁹ Ruth S. Cavan,⁶⁰ Ernest R. Mowrer,⁶¹ E. Franklin Frazier,⁶² his own work with H. Warren Dunham on mental disorders,⁶³ and further on, the works of John Landesco⁶⁴ and Frederic M. Thrasher.⁶⁵ Even though the names of Robert Park, Ernest Burgess, and Ellsworth Faris do not

appear directly, their inspiration too has been woven into the discussion throughout.⁶⁶ The Parkian framework of human ecology, Burgess' zonal hypothesis and concept of social disorganisation-reorganisation, and the senior Faris' social psychological interpretations, both implicitly and explicitly guide the argument from beginning to end.

The latter influence becomes readily apparent in Robert Faris' subsequent discussion on the political organisation and governing of the city, its blatant corruptibility, and a rationalisation process that seems endemic to the immigrant constituency. Intimidation tactics of physical force and even murder are used against the electorate by powerful candidates in order to secure government positions. This may, to some extent, be racially or culturally motivated, but overall it seems that the desire for money and power underlies the process. Organised crime is certainly involved, and the immigrant population seems to be quite aware of this, yet as long as some of their immediate needs are addressed and perhaps even met by this criminal element, the "lower half of the population" will continue to vote them into power. It is after all a survival situation for these newcomers, who recognise that some of their basic services may be performed by this group rather than having to rely on minimal assistance from authorised social work agencies. Faris again stresses that it is incorrect to assume "that crime is the result of bad political organization, or of ineffective police systems. It is actually the other way around -- the inefficiency of the police and the corruption of politics are due to the same conditions of social disorganization which produce the crime."

For the first time in his discussion, Faris indicates that he is studying the city of Chicago. He employs the findings of his own field work (as a student participant at a polling station in one of the worst wards of the city), John Landesco's study of organised crime, Frederic Thrasher's work on juvenile delinquency, and a number of "reform crusades" attempting to combat the social problems across the city, to indicate that social stabilisation does not seem to be an immediate possibility. Thus, what is needed are more studies of the city "using adequate scientific methods" (like those of Landesco and Thrasher) and fewer attempts at implementing old and often rigid

political reforms which "are not based on scientific knowledge." Statistical trends may be able to show that "the entire population will be criminal, insane, or dead from suicide" if the same conditions were to persist, but "our scientific knowledge of the causes of these problems" remains in the preliminary stages and thus needs further information for an educated assessment.

Faris does not conclude the article on a fatalistic note, but rather with hope that many consequences tied to the *rapid* expansion of a city will begin to diminish as the process of growth begins to slow. He points to immigration policies of the day⁶⁷ which had slowed the influx of populations from abroad, as well as a considerable reduction in rural-urban movement and even a return to rural areas by some, as two indicators that a stabilisation process may have been underway. But should the effects of the depression years pass relatively quickly (i.e., "industrial recovery"), and the farm continue to develop new machinery, then farm labour would once again be displaced to the urban centres, consequently permitting further growth. The key to attaining something which approximates social stabilisation in the city, therefore, appears to lie in the ability to recognise certain types of disorganising factors for what they are (i.e., by using scientific methods of inquiry), and to use successful reform projects from other major cities as models and in a comparative way.

Robert E.L. Faris did not stay at McGill for the full three-year term. He resigned after one year in 1940 to accept a position at Bryn Mawr college in Pennsylvania, later going to Syracuse University and the University of Washington by 1952. During his one year at McGill, Faris managed to read a paper at a C.P.S.A. general session on sociology and subsequently published an article in the CJEPS. Although his name is probably best known through its affiliation with the University of Chicago's sociology department, and particularly so following his publication of Chicago Sociology, 1920-1932 (1967), Robert Faris' attachment to the Department of Sociology at McGill, as publicised in the 1939 volume of the CJEPS, must have undoubtedly reasserted the claims of at least some social scientists that the sociology programme at McGill was continuing to be built around a Chicago framework.

Forrest Emmanuel LaViolette

Forrest E. LaViolette was born of French and Scottish parentage in 1904. He took the opportunity at the age of sixteen to apply his interest in radio telegraphy when he joined a ship's crew as a radio officer and travelled to such places as Mexico, Alaska, China and Japan.⁶⁸ His marriage to Vera McCabe in 1926 seemed to settle him down somewhat: he proceeded to complete his high school accreditation; his B.A. following three years at Reed College in Portland, Oregon; his M.A. in 1934 ("Some Problems Relating to the Concept of Culture") at the University of Chicago; and, at the same university, his Ph.D. under the guidance of Herbert Blumer and Everett C. Hughes.⁶⁹ He joined the sociology faculty at the University of Washington at Seattle in 1936, and four years later accepted a two-year term appointment as an assistant professor in sociology at McGill (replacing R.E.L. Faris), commencing on 1 September 1940. At the end of that first academic year, F.E. LaViolette attended the annual C.P.S.A. meeting at Queen's University and shared his thoughts on a long-time interest of his during a round table on sociology. He read a paper entitled "The Japanese Family in America," which he subsequently published in the *CJEPS* that year under the title "The American-Born Japanese and the World Crisis."

The general theme of this paper is ethnic relations, cultural assimilation, and the problems associated with physiognomic and psychosocial diversity, both between and within groups. During the early part of this century, Japanese immigration to the U.S. fostered a flourishing fear that America's future as a white country (particularly on the west coast) was being threatened by what was referred to as the "Japanese invasion." Restrictive legislation followed (e.g., *National Immigration Act* of 1924) in an attempt to drastically reduce the number of Japanese immigrants, and, for that first generation of Japanese already residing in the U.S. (i.e., the *issei*), a registration area was established for the reporting of births (by 1936, all states belonged to the registration area). The advent of a second generation of Japanese Americans (i.e., the first generation born in the U.S., or the *nisei*⁷⁰) sparked a new set of problems, in which the *nisei* found themselves involved in a generational conflict between loyalty to a deeply-rooted cultural tradition and

attachment to an American way of life.

LaViolette outlines and discusses a number of interrelated factors which in some way contributed to an inferior status for the Japanese immigrant. The most blatant is that of race and the discrimination that accompanies dissimilarity. Added to this is a strong ethnic heritage which favours a large and highly integrated family unit. Although co-operation among family members may be seen as a desirable trait by American standards, concern arose over socialisation practices which saw the *issei* transmitting their Japanese cultural heritage to the *nisei* (and thus "developing Japanese citizens out of American-born children"), as well as for economic reasons tied to developing segregated communities, the institutional functioning of these communities, their strategic location especially in times of war (i.e., near oil fields and naval stations), and the supposed threat of a growing competitive element. This in turn led to more conflict as "the Japanese language schools were regulated so as to frustrate any effort to transmit Japanese nationalism to American citizens." In other words, whereas "[i]t was generally thought that the Japanese could not and did not wish to be assimilated" into American society, regulatory measures were being taken in a seemingly accommodative manner for both parties involved; a possible alien invasion was being checked against a looming "white hostility."

Although the Japanese bombing of a U.S. naval base at Pearl Harbor occurred one month after the publication of his article (i.e., 7 December 1941), LaViolette seems to anticipate such an attack (in fact he states near the end of the article that: "This preliminary analysis has sketched merely the main outline of an extended crisis which has not yet run its course") by pointing to various international events and trends which suggested Japan's push for national expansion. This also came through in his observations of an American behaviour characterised by fear, anxiety, and an antagonistic attitude towards what was developing both without and within U.S. borders. American propaganda became evident as it competed with propaganda from both China and Japan, with the two main channels being those of the American press and the school system. Added to this was a national drive for material donations to the war effort and a proposal which

aimed at an all-out economic boycott of Japanese goods.

It is within this framework – this crisis – that LaViolette identifies the *nisei* as the most affected group of those involved. In outlining some of the more apparent dimensions of social and personal control, he places the *nisei* in an imperiling "in-between situation" that calls for some kind of compromise between familial ties with an Old-World culture and a commitment to being American. In the end, it appeared as though the American-born Japanese had at the same time succumbed and adapted to their immediate environment, accepting their place of birth and American citizenship as a means for improving their socio-economic status.

The move towards assimilation did not come automatically (and in light of a persisting discriminatory element perhaps not totally voluntary either), but rather gradually in response to certain accommodating efforts on the part of the federal government and the American press. Within a period of four months two new Acts were passed by the American Congress, both of which served to recognise the American status of the *nisei*: the *Selective Service and Training Act* (14 September 1940) and the *Nationality Act* (12 January 1941). The former conscription measure was seen as a "policy of equal treatment" by allowing for the drafting and military training of the *nisei* as well by U.S. armed forces, while the latter requested the return of all American citizens who had become twenty-one years of age while abroad so as to declare their citizenship intentions. Both pieces of legislation were followed by favourable responses from both the *nisei* draftees as well as those who had returned to Japan in search of economic opportunities.

Moreover, even though Tokyo had aligned itself with the Rome-Berlin axis (Tripartite Axis Pact of 27 September 1940) and Japan was beginning to make headway in its sweeping military programme over the Indo-China peninsula, no direct attack on the U.S. had yet been realised and thus no action in terms of internment and the confiscation of property of resident aliens had been proposed (e.g., a government statement was issued denying the likelihood of such action). Yet a national sentiment arose in which Japan was seen as "a potential enemy, and each American [was] expected to maintain unquestioned loyalty." More directly, what this provided for the *nisei*

was an opportunity to develop "a well-defined social orientation" -- i.e., a goal-directedness -- by which they could commence the process of readjusting to the American social system. With a collective self-consciousness emerging, along with support from well-articulated associations such as the Japanese American Citizens' League and the newspapers which were now publishing declarations in support of all American-born persons, anxieties and fears were somewhat abated to make room for an increased level of excitement for what lay ahead.

LaViolette makes repeated reference to "the American press" and suggests that it plays a significant role as an instrument of political influence and social control. Indeed, a large part of the information he provides in this article has been taken from various American and Japanese newspapers found on the west coast and from magazines. Other sources of information included: government reports such as the census and a yearbook; law reports containing references to particular court cases; numerous interviews and personal conversations with friends and informants; discussion with a steamship agent; personal letters; rumours; Japanese novels; proceedings from community meetings; a corporation notice that was distributed to its workers; and a number of research reports found in periodicals and books. That is, the techniques used by LaViolette in his search for facts carried a heavy imprint of an eclectic Chicago-style research approach.

Further, the manner in which he structures his argument is also characteristic of a Chicago-like *natural history* approach: the idea of *stages of development* is portrayed through a scheme in which developmental "phases" are traced over the life history of one generation of American Japanese; continual reference to a social process and such ideas as competition, conflict, accommodation, and assimilation, cannot help but revive a Parkian conceptualisation of the four-stage *interaction cycle* of race relations; and a specific concern with the individual actor in relation to the processes of social differentiation and the movement from phases of disorganisation to reorganisation through periods of (re)adjustment, seems to extend the trail leading back to Ernest W. Burgess and William I. Thomas. As well, LaViolette presents a social

psychological interpretation of American and Japanese mental processes resulting from contact with a threatening societal element (i.e., the interrelationships of individual thought and action), which is certainly indicative of a Meadian conceptualisation as transmitted through the symbolic interactionist teachings of Herbert Blumer (one member of LaViolette's doctoral committee).

In 1942, at the end of his two-year term, he was reappointed as assistant professor of sociology at McGill. His acquaintance with and continuing interest in the Orient and in Canadian-Oriental relations made LaViolette somewhat of a resident authority on the topic area.⁷¹ Following his first publication in the *CJEPS*, LaViolette proceeded to review a number of books for the journal pertaining to the issue of Canadian-Oriental relations: one in 1942; five in 1943; and two in 1945. He was promoted to the rank of associate professor in 1944, and during that summer (from April to end of September) he travelled across Western Canada, spending time in Winnipeg and Calgary, but finally arriving in British Columbia where he undertook to gather data for a book on Canada's Japanese (Tomovic, 1975:245).⁷² His field work in the Pacific coast area coincided with Carl Dawson's in the Canadian north-west and for that one summer in 1944 McGill's sociology department was locked up and vacant. In 1945 LaViolette chaired a sociology round-table at the C.P.S.A. meetings, the same year he published part of his findings in his second and final article in the *CJEPS* entitled "Social Psychological Characteristics of Evacuated Japanese."

The scene has shifted northward from the U.S. to the Canadian west coast, yet LaViolette's discussion of "the so-called Japanese problem" continues where his previous article had left off. He once again adopts a descriptive approach in the study of the Japanese situation, but the methodology goes well beyond a basic ethnography to include a detailed analysis of the connection between the mental organisation of Japanese Canadians (as disclosed by the article's title) and the social process within which they define themselves. There is a greater emphasis in this article (as compared to the previous one) on the action and interaction taking place in Japanese group life, and (following Canada's declaration that it was at war with Japan) the conflict

experienced during evacuation and subsequent internment.

This is not to say that LaViolette omits any reference to a Parkian concept of a stepping processual system, for he integrates this idea by depicting a framework within which individuals react relative to the processes of social differentiation. He discusses three phases of change which ran across a time span from roughly 1937 to the end of 1942: (1) the years leading up to 14 January 1942 have been identified as the "period of precautionary measures," the events and actions of which had been generally covered in his previous article, although with the bombing of Pearl Harbor levels of fear and racial discrimination had escalated within "the dominant community" to the point where government-directed confiscation of Japanese property had commenced; (2) the "period of moderate action" began on 14 January 1942, with the announcement of a plan of partial evacuation from the more sensitive defence areas, resulting in the splitting of families, increased unemployment, and a state of confusion which translated into "feelings of persecution" on the part of the Japanese; and (3) following the announcement of complete evacuation to relocation settlements on 26 February 1942,⁷³ the course of a deteriorating cultural, community, and mental organisation had hastened to the point where self-conception was characterised by conflict and confusion, while "the future appeared uncertain and unknown." But it appears that more weight has been given to a symbolic interactionist orientation in the study of social life, particularly when considering his statement that changes in the social process "are based on developmental changes in the attitudes and demands of the local population."

In approaching his research on the Japanese and in an attempt to ascertain their reaction to the situation before them, it seems somewhat apparent that LaViolette turns not only to direct or participant observation methods, but also to a more serious endeavour of placing himself within the "frame of mind" of the people under study. Reminiscent of the research method of *sympathetic introspection* put forth by Charles H. Cooley and later advanced by Herbert Blumer, LaViolette leaves little doubt in the reader's mind of just where his "sympathetic appreciation"

might lie. Yet in his attempt to develop a clearer understanding of this particular ethnic group's distinctive point of view, he descends to a much more microscopically oriented level of analysis than might be expected from a Blumerian approach (i.e., a concern with the immediate situation through the study of action and interaction), towards a more Meadian orientation and similar interest in the consciousness of individual actors in relation to their action and interaction.

Hence, numerous references may be found throughout the article to psychological factors, such as desires, needs, hopes, motives; to emotions (feelings), such as shame, confusion, disgrace, fear, anxiety, persecution, frustration, hostility, resentment, inferiority, pain; and related behaviours, including apathy, distrust, suspicion, discrimination, jealousy, inability, uncertainty, bewilderment, resistance, repression, etc.. There is a persistent reminder of the living person, of individual and group motivations, and of interactions with other living persons within a particular social situation which he had earlier identified as "an extremely dynamic interactional system of national states" (LaViolette, 1942:315).

Whereas Carl Dawson looked at Canada's west as a frontier for settlement expansion and Everett Hughes explored the ethnic frontier in terms of developing systematic investigations into French-English relations in Quebec, it may be said that Forrest LaViolette had in a provocative manner succeeded in bringing attention to one of Canada's (and earlier one of the U.S.'s) racial frontiers. In Marlene Shore's (1987:154-5) examination of these sorts of discussions she has found that "Canada's initial status as a frontier...reflected a major concern of Chicago sociology." She goes on to discuss the Parkian theory of group relations -- i.e., the idea behind the interaction cycle and its four stages or phases of group relations -- but quite correctly expands on the theory by identifying the following concession:

"that the fact of colour and feature could serve as impediments to assimilation [the final stage], but equally responsible were the attitudes of the native-born. Immigrants came to the new land...with hopeful and expectant attitudes, but when rebuffed by its native-born citizens they became disillusioned and cynical, and those feelings caused them to turn in upon themselves and slow down the assimilation process" (p.246).

Whereas it certainly seems as though she might be discussing the findings of the above LaViolette

investigation, Shore is in fact recounting the observations contained in the Dawson and Gettys Introduction to Sociology text, which appeared some sixteen years prior to LaViolette's article.

Interestingly, only two years earlier on May 24, 1943, during his Presidential Address at the annual meeting of the C.P.S.A., Carl Dawson spoke on the issue of Canada's racial and ethnic minorities in terms of their assimilability into Canadian society.⁷⁴ The general assertion was that European immigrants were likely to assimilate rather "swiftly...in the direction of A Canadian Way of Life" (p.294). The situation involving the Oriental immigrant was quite different, in that, high racial or physical visibility destined these groups to "likely remain permanently marginal in Canadian society" (p.296). There is no doubt that the concept of permanent marginality differs from that of delayed or eventual assimilation which was discussed in the 1929 text. But Dawson does proceed to fit this observation into an ecological assessment of social processes when he says that "the normal and natural reactions of racial antipathy....is a natural and inevitable defence reaction in certain social situations." He goes on to end this part of his discussion with, "social differentiation....is just another one of those social inevitabilities which we seek to evangelize as best we can by means of our moral ideologies."

LaViolette, however, does not steer his discussion of the Japanese situation towards some sort of similar inevitableness. He does identify the concept of marginality, and he does claim that "the Japanese are unassimilable" (at least in British Columbia), but he proceeds to discuss "a very complex development" involving a psychological process of identity-building. It seems that as long as Japanese Canadians are permitted to maintain a sense of property ownership, job stability, and ties to family and community, there is the capacity for a self-conception of having security and a feeling of worthwhileness. Even though there is the recognition that they may reside in a marginal position relative to others in this New World, the Old-World traditions regarding property, employment, family and community serve to counteract such a disadvantage. This was certainly not unique to the Japanese Canadian at the time, as Carl Dawson's earlier studies of the Doukhobors, Mennonites, Mormons, Germans, and French Canadians in Canada's west attested

to the "necessary" early phase of segregation, during which "the immigrant found in his own nationality the reference points that made him comfortable until he got a foothold in the new land" (Shore, 1987:248).

But the circumstances were such that this sense of "stability and prestige" was abruptly interrupted following the outbreak of war and the government decision for evacuation. Where LaViolette seems to expand on (but not necessarily part camp with) Dawson's natural history approach and treatment of one ecological process, is in the extended use of the very techniques that characterize his work. Whereas Dawson's outlook is one of a dismal (and for him understandably so) outcome, LaViolette turns to a comparative view of what was being done in the U.S. in terms of improving a similar situation and how this was being perceived by Japanese Canadians. He readily draws on information from personal accounts, from books, articles, government reports, and newspapers, and adds this to previously collected observations, interview results, reports from informants, and even rumours in an attempt to best assess the situation. What he had witnessed was a culturally defined passion for survival; the condition of segregation had led to a sense of isolation, separateness, and to an element of cultural revival as a sort of psychological refuge from the effects of acculturation and racial discrimination.

Near the end of the discussion, LaViolette seems to link up with an earlier assessment put forth by Dawson in concluding that the Japanese-Canadian reaction to their situation is "ego-defensive." Unfortunately, he fails to make an explicit connection with what Dawson referred to as a "normal and natural reaction," opting to present the concept using a psychoanalytic approach to discussing defense mechanisms; and even here he does not elaborate on the psychoanalytic explanation of how (from among about a dozen different ways) anxiety diversion was achieved by this group of individuals, but leaves the reader hanging on a solitary footnote for further information. There is no doubt that had LaViolette waited a few months before submitting this article -- i.e., following the atomic bomb offensive over Hiroshima on 06 August 1945 -- he would have had even more direction for developing a fuller assessment of what was in effect to become

a most embarrassing epoch in Canadian history.

It is interesting to note that at about the time of his departure from the McGill sociology department, LaViolette shifts interests and begins investigating the Native situation in British Columbia. This shift of interest from one struggle to another should not necessarily imply that he lost all concern for what was happening to the Japanese Canadians; evacuation, relocation, and repatriation programmes continued well beyond the end of World War II into the early fifties. Perhaps it is speculation, but there is at least a suggestion that the topic may have been too sensitive for the time and the nation to warrant continued exposition. In a book review of LaViolette's The Canadian Japanese and World War II (1948),⁷⁵ University of British Columbia anthropologist Harry B. Hawthorn wrote: "It is an awe-inspiring task to write of [a] nation's sore spot. The writer is likely to end up by having alienated everybody, and with his conclusions rejected." Even LaViolette (1961:ix-x) was most diplomatic about the circumstances when he wrote some ten years later:

"It had become clear to me during the years spent in gathering and preparing materials for *Americans of Japanese Ancestry* and for *Canadian Japanese and World War II* that British Columbia had been, and apparently would continue to be for some decades, a region in which the creative processes of social organization had some historical depth but still not so much but that they could be observed easily in contemporary actions."

Another possibility for the shift may have involved a personal and inward reflection of a social researcher, who may have become so enthralled with and affected by the social injustices encountered within his field of study, that his own sense of discipline in detaching himself from what he was investigating came into question. This too is speculation, but it again recalls the words of Carl Dawson during his 1943 Presidential Address, when he asserted that "social scientists are under obligation to see things as they are and present them fairly and without indignation." This was undoubtedly a principle which he, LaViolette, and scores of others who passed through the University of Chicago became most accustomed to.

There is, however, a further possibility. During the academic year 1947-48, Professor LaViolette received two grants from the McGill University Research Fund: one "for the study of

repatriation of Japanese from Canada" and a second "for further expenses in connection with study of the Caughnawaga Indians"⁷⁶ (situated on the Iroquois Reserve near Montreal). Although the amounts were not disclosed, further evidence indicates that the latter project was likely receiving much better support. With President Harold A. Innis at the helm, the Canadian Social Science Research Council had appointed a Committee on Indian Research during the mid-forties which, under the chairmanship of Carl Dawson, undertook to develop a research programme on contemporary Indian life in Canada.⁷⁷ LaViolette (1961:ix-x) recalls that funding for the project was at times limited, but he managed to receive a C.S.S.R.C. grant for the summer of 1946 when he succeeded Dawson as committee chairman. He would again receive a grant for this sort of research from the University Research Council of Tulane University for the summer of 1950, one year following his appointment as professor and chairman of the sociology department at the New Orleans institution. During his first two years at Tulane (1949-50), he served as an elected member of the Executive Council of the C.P.S.A. and member of the Editorial Advisory Board for the *CJEPS*. He reviewed two more books for the journal, one in 1952 and the last in 1962.

Professor LaViolette remained at Tulane University until his retirement in 1969, capping a most memorable thirty-three year career, during which he assured his place in the annals of a developing Canadian sociology. There is little doubt that his early experience at the University of Chicago under Herbert Blumer and Everett Hughes determined his life-long direction in the study of race relations; a bearing which he would hone while working alongside Carl Dawson at McGill. He returned to Portland, Oregon in the company of his spouse Vera and for the last twelve years of their life together resided in the small town of Gresham (just east of Portland) near Mount Hood. On 28 September 1989, at the age of 85, Forrest LaViolette died peacefully in his sleep.

Oswald Hall

Both students and teachers of the history of sociology will find the name Oswald Hall permanently inscribed on one of the main pillars this discipline has known, as a maker and major supporter of a distinctively Canadian product. The next few pages will in no way provide the sort of account deserving of this individual's contribution to the development of the discipline in this country; the parameters will allow for an anecdotal record of but one scholarly link in the life of this academic.

Oswald Hall was born in Prince Albert, Saskatchewan in 1907. He left his farm in the late 1920s and headed east to Kingston, Ontario. He entered undergraduate study at Queen's University at the age of 21, wherefrom he graduated with a B.A. in economics and philosophy in 1935. As times were financially tough in the mid-1930s, word of a well-funded sociology research programme at McGill University was well received and Hall proceeded to use his Queen's fellowship to gain him entry there.

Under the tutelage of Carl Dawson and Everett Hughes, Hall received a Special Research Assistantship in the Social Sciences post-graduate award in 1935. This helped him in completing an M.A. paper titled "A Study of the Size and Composition of the Canadian Family" (a comparison of selected Ontario and Quebec communities, much like Hughes' comparisons which came together in French Canada in Transition), that led to his graduating in 1937. That same year, Hall received a University of Chicago fellowship and, "as was expected of McGill sociology graduates in those days, he dutifully undertook a pilgrimage to Chicago" (McCrorie, 1986:138) commencing his doctoral studies in sociology.

Robert Park had already retired from the department (although only in body) in 1933, but Hall was met by such other sociologists as Ernest Burgess, Louis Wirth, William Ogburn, and Ellsworth Faris (to name a few). Hall soon "became very close to the older Faris,"⁷⁴ having appreciated his missionary work in Africa and particularly the subsequent courses he developed on the social organisation of the peoples he studied. But this connection recalls the four-stage

model of group development espoused by Nicholas Mullins (1973) (see chapter one), and the observation that Oswald Hall had entered into what Mullins called the second or "network" stage in this progressive process. Ellsworth Faris was Carl Dawson's doctoral supervisor while at Chicago. Carl Dawson was Hall's supervisor at McGill. It is certainly easy to see how the Hall-Faris connection came about – i.e., "the creation of student-teacher links" – as a result of what Mullins (1973:21) identified as "a *thickening* of the scientific communication network" and undoubtedly following a Dawson referral. Indeed, one gets the impression that Hall (1988:16) soon came to appreciate much of the work that was being produced within "an impressive department of sociology" at Chicago; references to some of the more popular names and studies seemed to roll off his tongue effortlessly, and he no doubt went on to become a classic example of the type of social scientist Mullins spoke of in his transitional process, and, as David A. Nock (1987:3) has indicated, "the model Chicago product."

Although Hall missed Talcott Parsons' 1936 lecture at Chicago by one year, he did get to exchange some ideas with him on a few occasions while visiting him at Harvard. It seems that the economic difficulties of the time had pushed Hall into accepting a teaching position at Brown University in 1939, which, because it was situated some 50 miles from Harvard, proved beneficial in terms of networking. Parsons had, of course, begun to make a name for himself following the appearance of his The Structure of Social Action in 1937, but Hall was interested in Parsons' work in the sociology of medicine field. As Hall (1989) recounts:

" [Parsons would] put on a white coat, he went to hospitals, and he observed what was going on....I would go out there and talk to him. He would talk most knowingly at a really conceptual level about what went on in the framework of the hospital[but] it had to be translated into his grand theory....[Soon after,] Parsons had moved out into other kinds of things he was interested in. He shed that kind of interest, so he didn't turn up to the Eastern Sociological Association, to their meetings, and they used to have sessions there that dealt with health matters."

He remained at Brown University until 1944, putting the final touches on his study of the social organisation of medicine in Providence, Rhode Island, following which he returned to Chicago and, under the supervision of Everett C. Hughes, submitted his thesis paper titled "The Informal

Organization of Medical Practice in an American City." The paper was accepted and he received his Ph.D. in 1944.

Hall returned to Canada and went to work at the Department of Labour in Ottawa (1944-46). In 1945, he participated at a sociology round table during the C.P.S.A. meetings held at his alma mater Queen's University, by reading a paper titled "The Informal Organization of the Medical Profession"; obviously a result of his doctoral studies. The paper appeared in the CJEPS the following year under the same title (his first publication in the journal)⁷⁹ bearing an Ottawa address. But the return of war veterans had begun; McGill opened its doors to them as of 08 January 1945,⁸⁰ and soon after there were some 800 registrants taking sociology courses⁸¹ under the guidance of two associate professors and two lecturers (one of whom was part-time). Oswald Hall joined the department in 1946 with a rank of associate professor.⁸² However, it should be noted that Hall's appointment did not come easily, and it seems likely that Carl Dawson was again instrumental in the hiring of another Chicago Ph.D.. Only one year earlier, in his annual report,⁸³ McGill's Principal and Vice-Chancellor F. Cyril James indicated that,

"It must also be remembered that in certain fields of study, such as the social sciences, the climate of opinion in Canada is subtly different from that found in Great Britain, France or the United States, so that a student pursuing all his post-graduate work outside our borders is likely to be less well qualified for a university post, less easily able to appreciate the nuances of the Canadian scene, than one who has been able to carry on his studies at a Canadian institution."

Yet the mounting pressure of increasing enrolments must have most certainly tempered Principal James' conviction for homegrown talent.

By the end of his first year of teaching at McGill, Hall had reviewed his first book for the CJEPS.⁸⁴ In a positive review of Industry and Society (1946), a report on the work of the Committee on Human Relations in Industry at the University of Chicago edited by William Foote Whyte, Hall writes:

"Students of industrial relations will find here an extremely able presentation of the methods and results of a kind of research which seems able to throw light on some of the knottier problems in their field."

He goes on to indicate that Whyte (who had done his doctoral work at Chicago while Hall too was

registered there),⁸⁵ "an authority on social organization, provides a classic example of ingenious research in his study of the restaurant industry." Hence it does not take Hall very long to begin establishing his interest in and position on industrial and occupational studies within the social scientific community of the day in Canada.

By the end of the academic year 1947-48, Hall had sat as an elected member of the Executive Council of the C.P.S.A. (first of a two-year term), as a member of the Editorial Advisory Board for CJEPS (first of a two-year term), had reviewed a second book for CJEPS (1948), published an article in the AJS,⁸⁶ and had received two grants from the McGill University Research Fund – one for travels to Ottawa and consultation with the Bureau of Statistics on the Caughnawaga Indian steelworkers, and a second "for a study on invalids visiting the shrine at Ste. Anne de Beaupre."⁸⁷ At the 1948 C.P.S.A. meetings, Hall participated at a sociology session through the reading of a paper titled "Some Methodological Considerations in the Study of Social Structures," which he went on to publish in the CJEPS as "The Use of Sampling Procedures and Role Theory in Sociological Research" in 1949.

As revealed by its title, the paper provides a discussion on research methods. Perhaps less apparent was that it presented a very important notice that the discipline had been experiencing competing methodological shifts. Hall pointed to what was being done by the loosely formed alliance of operationalists and structuralists, and compared this with the research approach of (what was in effect) the Chicago-trained (read also as McGill-trained) investigator. But rather than enter into a heated debate with or criticism of the former approaches, he looks to the possibility of bridging the gap between interests with a view to a more complete analysis of social organisation.

Hall succeeds in guiding the reader through an ordered and very understandable explanation concerning the applicability of the two (or three) methods for doing social research. Sampling or statistical procedures may be very useful when interpreting public opinion polls, surveys, and population distributions, but are more or less limited to an accumulation of raw data,

its mathematical manipulation, and subsequent appropriateness in searching for patterns of distribution of certain cases. "They are the facts...", Hall claims, "which are easy to count."

There are research situations, however, where the simple counting of heads may be wholly inadequate. Hall differentiates between what he identifies as a "universe of attributes" and a "system of social action." The former relates to sampling procedures and a consideration that the units of study and their attributes may be clearly defined, and hence readily lend themselves to the various means of mensuration. The latter refers to a complex social world in which individuals behave and interrelate in a much more ambiguous manner, and hence the unit of study may not be as amenable to conventional statistical manipulation. This is not to say that a system of action may never be transformed into a system of attributes -- as is the case with public opinion polls and the determination of types of action falling within the attributes of, for example, being Republican or Democrat -- for this is no doubt achievable whenever action can be reduced to comparable categories of, for example, qualities or tendencies. But although this sort of snapshot of society may hold some value for the researcher, administrator, or media personnel who are interested in speedy and inexpensive factual data, its utility must be considered against its inefficacy in providing an explicit assessment of, what Hall identifies as, "the organized human machinery" underlying individual behaviour.

Utilising the modest space of a journal article quite effectively, Oswald Hall succeeds in presenting a rather vivid representation of what it means to do sociological research in a distinctly Chicago manner. He relies in large part on the case study approach to take him through a discussion on exploratory research and associated investigative techniques. His choice of a contemporary problematic situation such as "the organization of abortion in urban areas," immediately evokes a mental image of *The Polish Peasant* (for one) and the study of a contemporary situation involving high levels of immigration. In fact the key word here is not so much *abortion* -- i.e., as an issue and unit of study it had received attention over many years, although findings had been restricted to a basically "conventional and statistical orientation" -- but

rather the concept suggesting the activity was somehow *socially organised*. As Hall writes, "[t]o speak of 'the organization of abortion' implies that urban communities develop specific social machinery to make abortion available."

Yet this sort of implication seems to conjure images of a behavioristic viewpoint advocating the importance of environmental factors as determinants of behaviour. It also suggests a mechanistic analogy of society in terms of the "social machinery" conceptualisation, and by extension an organic analogy by way of discussing a "system of social action." As well, Hall's reference to and comparative use of examples derived from the fields of "medical pathology" (the statistical case) and "social pathology" (the exploratory case), may also imply a biological analogy and the presence of some sort of *diseased* condition within these urban areas. Meanwhile, the discipline had reached a stage in its development whereby references to society as a *system of social action* -- i.e., as an organic and relatively unified system of human beings -- would perforce intimate the user with a structural-functional approach of the sort that had been steadily gaining attention following the end of the Second World War. But these strokes, although not totally off mark, are somewhat broad and do require further explanation.

In discussing society in terms of an organic entity, Hall attests to one of the underlying tenets of the theory of human ecology. Whereas this connection has been more fully elucidated in chapter three (and with particular reference to the use of an organic analogy by Herbert Spencer), suffice it to say at this point that a major difference between employing a biological analogy in this manner as compared to a Parsonsian approach, is that the former concerns itself with the understanding of a naturally evolving (read as changing) society and the latter with a formal (highly abstract) analysis of some relatively unified (read in effect as stable) social system. Although both approaches look at social relations and the particular environment within which such relations are contained (i.e., environmental factors are not the sole determinants of behaviour), the human ecologists (and particularly the Chicago-trained sociologist) considered not only the functional characteristics of human relations but also the dysfunctional ones.

Commonplace discussions on various social ailments found in the Chicago publications of the twenties and thirties, are no less familiar in Hall's presentation over a decade later. Neither is his discussion on the *roles* people play within a particular social structure. Indeed, his commentary on abortion and the "functionaries" who might be involved in this activity, provides a good picture of how a network of individuals who are generally associated with positions of prominent social status when looking at one social structure, may come to be interconnected within a rather disreputable and illegal social process under another. The pharmacist, the clinician, the doctor, the police, and even the politician may be found (i.e., through investigative research) to be implicated in "the organization of abortion." The objective, of course, is to better understand society through a detective-like sociological investigation of the actors, their position in a particular system of social action, and the manner in which individual roles come to be influenced by or do in turn affect the structure of society.

The approach is certainly reminiscent of Georg Simmel's interpretive analyses of interaction and *web of group affiliations*, George Mead's synthesis of mind, self, and society, and concept of role-taking, Robert Park's linking of role, status, and social structure, and the related work of Everett Hughes in his study of French Canada. "The appropriate method of conceiving this system of action", writes Hall, "seems to be in terms of a theory of roles." Hence the (appropriately, or Chicago-) trained social researcher would readily recognise "that any causal interpretation of abortion as a social system is not traceable to the attributes of the persons securing abortions" -- i.e., the simple reduction of attributes to units which can be easily counted and statistically manipulated -- and would proceed to identify the interrelatedness of individual roles both within and between an extremely complex social structure. This is not to say that sampling procedures are any less useful as research techniques; they have their utility in providing the researcher with best estimates of certain social attributes. The task is to recognise that both techniques can be used in a complementary fashion when doing sociological research and Hall ends with an attempt at bringing them together.

Employing the case study approach once again, as well as focusing on the problems of a minority cultural group, Hall directs the reader to the findings of the C.S.S.R.C.-funded Committee on Indian Research⁸⁸ (of which he was a member under the chairmanship of Forrest E. LaViolette) and in particular the field work done on the Caughnawaga Reserve near Montreal. Having only recently consulted with the Bureau of Statistics in Ottawa on the Caughnawaga Indian steelworkers, Hall seems quite familiar with the extent to which research techniques involving sampling procedures will reveal a basic profile of the reserve population. He refers to "a wide range of attributes...such as age, sex, conjugal condition, and the other conventional categories" (e.g., legal boundaries and a count of legal residents) for providing the researcher with a best estimate of how these attributes are distributed and located geographically across the reserve. In fact, he distinguishes between "geographical space" and "social space" in discussing social organisation, with the latter term indicative of a much more complex system of action for the researcher to investigate.

Hall calls upon the "sampling expert...[to] exploit to the full the facts provided by the attributes which can be enumerated." This information will provide the researcher with an appropriate direction for further exploration, which, according to Hall, implies use of the interview technique "within the framework of role theory." For example, ascriptive information will ultimately assist with the construction of relevant questions for the interview, what subjects will be selected for interviewing, as well as with "the potential roles that specified subjects may be acting." For the sake of brevity, Hall decides not to discuss interviewing techniques, but he does point to the spatio-temporal importance of repeated interviewing as a requisite for identifying roles. The process calls for a comparison in terms of contrasting the presumed identical roles played by persons within their own social space, within a similar but other social space, as well as over time. This will continue, with much refining, modification, and extensive verification, until a stage is reached where the social scientist may report with analogous reliance that an *ideal typical* role has been constructed, which in turn will serve as a reference point for further comparisons and

reformulation as new interview materials become available.

This is certainly a critical element in Hall's discussion and attempt to achieve, at the very least, recognition (if not support) for role theory as a valid line of inquiry for studying social organisation. There had been considerable discussion developing around issues concerning scientific research and an appropriate methodology for laying claim to the discovery of scientific fact. While the operationalists continued advocating close methodological ties with the physical sciences, and structural functionalists worked at developing conceptualisations around an increasingly popular theme of the total and relatively unified social system, Hall looked to extend the ideas of role theory (and, in effect, a Chicago approach) through a rather convincing multilateral strategy.

Catering, on the one hand, to the statistician, Hall discusses the use of role theory in terms of a research technique which is subject to tests of scientific validity, reliability, verifiability, and significance in determining the probability of chance observations. Hall asserts that constructing roles through "a series of successive approximations...can be the basis for predicting the actions of the members of a social system. Such prediction is the goal of role theory. Estimation is the comparable goal of sampling procedures." In a somewhat similar way, yet perhaps not as directly, Hall seems to respond to the interests of an evidently growing group of structural functionalists as well. The reader (and earlier the listener) is unquestionably presented with moments of characteristically functionalist terms and apparent conceptualisations (touched on previously) in Hall's discussion on social systems. However, it is not difficult to recognise Hall's loyalty in discussing the "orderly study of social organisation," particularly when he indicates that "Everett Hughes, formerly of McGill and now at the University of Chicago, has provided the most penetrating and readable analysis of the structure and function of social institutions."

The implication is that Hall is being rather deliberate in his attempt to persuade the support of the two camps. He had correctly recognised that the discipline was entering a pivotal time in the history of its development and that competing forces could very well provoke a Chicago

abscission. Remaining true to form, however, Hall succeeds in reconfirming the scientific value of Chicago methodology and its disciplinary merit as a truly eclectic process in the study of social organisation. The underlying idea depicts a strategy for co-operation -- a team effort -- wherein the strengths of each technique are interwoven to form "a step toward more significant contributions to sociological research."

Oswald Hall continued to build on his principal interest in the sociology of work and the medical profession. His next publication in the *American Journal of Sociology* appeared in November 1949 under the title "Types of Medical Careers."⁸⁹ During the 1950-51 academic year, Hall, along with E.F. Beach (Economics) and David M. MacFarlane (Agricultural Economics), received the first appointments as Senior Research Fellows for 1951, including a \$4,000 fellowship each.⁹⁰ Hall also received a grant from the McGill University Research Fund to employ a research assistant for four months; the \$500 grant represented the highest amount issued through the Fund that year.⁹¹

In 1951, after twenty-six years of having held the position of chair of sociology and one year prior to his retirement, Carl Dawson relayed the title to Oswald Hall -- only its second holder in department history. Hall reviewed two books for the CJEPS in that year and published an article in the *American Sociological Review* in October titled "Sociological Research in the Field of Medicine: Progress and Prospects".⁹² He reviewed his fifth book for the CJEPS the following year and participated on a four-member C.P.S.A. committee (as its director and with S.D. Clark, J.-C. Falardeau, and N. Keyfitz) that had been established to arrange Canadian participation at the International Sociological Association's Second World Congress of Sociology to be held in 1953.

From April 1 to August 31, 1953, Hall was granted a leave of absence from McGill, having accepted an appointment as visiting associate professor at the University of Chicago. Following his return to McGill, he was appointed Chairman of the Committee on Psychological Studies, Chairman of the Defence Research Board Committee on Resources, and Chairman of the

American Sociological Association's Committee on Ethics in Research. That same year he was promoted to a full professorship. At the 1954 C.P.S.A. meetings in Winnipeg, Hall read a paper at a sociology round table titled "Current Trends in the Organization of Medical Services", which he went on to publish in the *CJEPS* that year as "Some Problems in the Provision of Medical Services."

Appearing some ten years following the completion of his Ph.D. thesis, this paper looks to extend Hall's investigation of the medical (as a social) institution and the specialised health occupations located therein. It is a study in the sociology of work, providing a report on the formal (bureaucratic) and informal (work relational) organisation of a hospital setting. There is very little in this paper which would warrant setting it apart from the kind of sociological research on work and occupations that had been produced over the previous two and a half decades, first at the University of Chicago and then at McGill. Hall seems very much at home in his use of the case study method, as most probably did many of his colleagues and students who undertook similar investigations into a variety of specific occupations, including: real estate agents, the nursemaid, nurses, dentists, doctors, psychiatrists, the police, funeral directors, steelworkers, taxi drivers, professional horse riders, and life insurance agents. In fact, the influence which he had on his students while at McGill becomes rather clear when considering that out of the ten M.A. theses he supervised, eight involved a study of occupations in some respect.⁹³ Of course, a number of these students pursued teaching careers in sociology and continued the Chicago tradition at Canadian universities.

Hence it may be said that this examination fits into the classic Chicago mould of data gathering and organisation in terms of analysing a particular case. The topic is timely, inasmuch as it focuses on an immediate (read as present-oriented) problematic situation requiring attention. Much as with the issue of abortion discussed earlier, Hall presents a detailed look at the key functionaries interacting within this particular hospital situation. He relies on characteristic research techniques such as description and interviewing, a natural history approach in terms of

developing structures and professions, and a comparative methodology both historically and across occupational roles and institutions. The ultimate goal is a familiar one -- develop a compendium of detailed information about a specific occupation, examine it, refine it, and bring out the "common characteristics" (ideal type) for further examination and refinement. It is an ongoing investigation of, as Hall indicates,

"a process of restless change in which not only are there no final patterns, but the degree of change possible for any one such specialty is something on which we can only speculate, lacking, as we do, definite information."

Finally, Hall advocates for the development of this sort of conceptual model as a "necessary step in permitting us to understand medical care, and the problems of providing medical services." In a more general sense, the call is for the development of a "theory which manages a bridge across" the study of institutional structures and that of specialised occupations. Certainly, an essential prerequisite for analysing changes in institutional structure and the subsequent effects on the status of occupations, is the accumulation of descriptive-empirical facts in a manner which (few would argue) falls well within the research rule of Chicago sociology.

By the end of 1954, Oswald Hall (1989) believed that he had seen "the handwriting on the wall and thought that McGill would disappear." Only one year earlier, Principal James had reported that "there was no prospect that McGill University would be permitted to receive grants from the Government of Canada....[and there was] no provision for salary increases."⁹⁴ Principal James was reporting on the consequences of a constitutional struggle in Quebec, initiated by Premier Maurice Duplessis against the Canadian Government following the recommendations made in the Report of the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences (1951) -- more commonly known as the Massey Report.⁹⁵

With Vincent Massey as chair and Father Georges-Henri Lévesque as vice-chair, the Commission recommended recognising Canadian biculturalism and the provision of federal grants to universities. Premier Duplessis held steadfastly to the constitutional powers given to the provinces over education, seemingly concerned over a potential federal threat to French-Canadian

culture in light of providing financial support. Up until Duplessis' death on September 7, 1959, McGill relied on provincial funding and limited federal resources (whereas other Canadian universities had been receiving their fair share). The newly appointed (and short lived) Premier Paul Sauvé (who died on January 7, 1960) ultimately worked out an agreeable formula with the federal government.

Yet Hall had been receiving an associate professor's salary of some \$3,500 in 1953⁹⁶ (about \$1,000 above the poverty level) and only slightly higher in 1954 following his promotion to full professor. He accepted an invitation to start up an Institute of Industrial Relations at Tulane University in New Orleans, having done some work at McGill's Industrial Relations Centre,⁹⁷ and for the academic year 1955-56 he received a leave of absence from McGill to sit as the Favrot Distinguished Service Chair in Human Relations at Tulane,⁹⁸ in the Department of Sociology. Prior to departing for New Orleans, Hall chaired a sociology round table at the 1955 C.P.S.A. meetings held in Toronto. He resigned from McGill and was replaced as chair of the department by William A. Westley. He reviewed a book for the CJEPS in 1956 while at Tulane. Although the Tulane people extended his invitation beyond the appointment, Hall (1989) felt that the great distance between himself and his family and friends did not warrant his acceptance and "so we thought that domestically it was sort of attractive to come to Toronto." He was appointed professor of sociology in the Department of Political Economy at the University of Toronto in 1956, with a starting salary of some \$6,000.

Hall was appointed as an alternate member to represent the C.P.S.A. on the I.S.A. Council in 1956 and as the C.P.S.A. representative at the Fourth World Congress of Sociology in 1959, where he also read a paper. He continued to participate at the C.P.S.A. meetings, chairing sociology round tables in 1958, 1962, and 1963. He reviewed four more books for the CJEPS, two in 1957 and two in 1961, bringing the total to ten books reviewed for the journal (all of them positive reviews). He sat as the editor of CJEPS from 1954 to 1963, and in 1964 (with the establishment of the CRSA) he resigned as the sociology representative on the Board of Editors.

For the period 1964-66, he served as the Research Supervisor of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. Hall officially retired in 1974 and was named as the first Professor Emeritus in the Department of Sociology at the U of T in 1975.

Oswald Hall maintains an office within the department, where he pursues his interests in Canadian society, work and occupations, and providing inspiration to the occasional inquisitive student.

Aileen Dansken Ross

Aileen Ross was born in Montreal on June 03, 1902. She was the fourth of six children born to John Wardrope Ross and Gertrude Emma (Holland) Ross. She pursued studies in economics at the London School of Economics, with, according to Susan Hoecker-Drysdale (1990: 164), sociology as a complementary field, and received her Bachelor of Science in 1939 (four years after enrolling). It was Karl Mannheim (1893-1947), continues Hoecker-Drysdale, who influenced Ross to pursue sociology, and it was his excitement for the type of sociology being done at the University of Chicago that prompted his advice to Ross for her to go there. She did and, under the guidance of Louis Wirth, Herbert Blumer, and Everett Hughes, received her M.A. degree in 1941 following the submission of her paper titled "The French and English Social Elites of Montreal" (i.e., a subject area which was connected with her own experience of having come from an established Montreal family).

One year later, Ross was appointed to the staff in sociology within the Department of Political Economy at the University of Toronto as an instructor, where she remained in that capacity between 1942-45.⁹⁹ While at Toronto she published one article in the CJEPS titled "The Cultural Effects of Population Changes in the Eastern Townships."¹⁰⁰ In 1945, she was appointed to the sociology staff at McGill University (the same year as Oswald Hall) with the rank of lecturer. She was promoted to the rank of assistant professor in 1948. Ross received her Ph.D. from Chicago in 1951, following submission of her thesis done under the supervision of

Everett Hughes and titled "Ethnic Relations and Social Structure: A Study of the Invasion of French-Speaking Canadians into an English-Canadian District." She reviewed her first book for the CJEPS in 1952 and published her second article therein the same year under the title "Organized Philanthropy in an Urban Community."

This study uses an approach that is very much in line with that used by Oswald Hall in his last discussed article. Although the names of the key functionaries have changed to a variety of philanthropic campaign workers, and the institutional setting varies from an elementary school to big corporations, the underlying examination focuses on a developing organised effort within a particular (generic) community called Wellsville, which could be an eastern Canadian city. There is a heavy reliance on the interview technique for uncovering information, as evidenced by the numerous quoted passages throughout the study. Other information is drawn from campaign records, annual reports, newspaper accounts, letters, and participant observation. Use of terminology such as "the common experience", "the new philanthropic pattern", "the stage has been reached", and "the development of philanthropy", address the issue of organisational change specifically and suggest the method of the natural history more generally. The case study is the method of choice, relying on a comparative approach both historically and across philanthropic roles and institutions, to study seven types of fundraising campaigns. The basic concern for Ross involves a process of social change and its description through a detailed account of the social actors and structures at play.

In 1953, Aileen Ross was elected as a member of the Executive Council of the C.P.S.A. and as a member of the Editorial Advisory Board of the CJEPS, for one year. She was granted a leave of absence from McGill for the year 1954-55, to travel to India and study changes in the social position of women in that country. In August of 1954, Ross published her third and final article in the CJEPS, titled "French and English Canadian Contacts and Institutional Change."

This study is proclaimed to be an extension of Ross' doctoral work. Even if the reader were not aware of the fact that Everett Hughes was Ross' thesis supervisor while at Chicago,

there would be no doubt that he was a direct influence on the development of the argument in some manner. Suffice it to say that the article serves as a reminder of the French-English relations in Quebec and all the natural urban influences that follow industrial development, that was so eloquently put to print by Hughes some eleven years earlier. Ross does take the opportunity to update the analysis slightly, using some statistical support and a few newer publications on related issues, however, the effort comes across as no more than a summary of French Canada in Transition, using perhaps a locale other than Hughes' Cantonville.

Aileen Ross went on to make a more significant name for herself through her work on The Hindu Family in Its Urban Setting and Becoming a Nurse, both of which were published in 1961. She remained committed to the usefulness of the case study, interviewing, participant observation, and amassing large amounts of descriptive facts about her target populations. Susan Hoecker-Drysdale (1990) discusses Ross' continued friendship with the Hugheses, membership in a variety of councils or institutes, and, in a characteristic Chicago tradition, her ongoing interest in the effects of industrial and technological change as well as with the structure and dynamics of the nursing profession.

Aileen Ross was promoted to the rank of associate professor at McGill in 1960, she held the chair of the department during 1963-64, and was promoted to full professor the following year. She was again elected to the Executive Council of the C.P.S.A. and the Editorial Advisory Board of CJEPS, for a two-year term from 1961 to 1962. She reviewed three more books for the CJEPS (1957, 59, and 63) and later received an emeritus appointment following her retirement (from the faculty only) in 1970. She prospers somewhere in Montreal.

William A. Westley

William Westley was born in Chester, Pennsylvania on May 17, 1920. The son of William Eyde Westley and Grace (Meilkejohn) Westley, he attended at Cornell University between 1938-40 and entered the University of Chicago in 1940. His studies were interrupted in 1942 when he

joined U.S. Army Intelligence as a 1st Lieutenant, seeing service in India and Burma until 1945. He married Margaret Frances on February 13, 1943, and together they raised three children, David Neil, Frances Rae, and Margaret Grace. He returned to the University of Chicago in 1946, where he attained a B.A. in 1947 and an M.A. in sociology in 1948. He lectured in sociology at Indiana University between 1948-50. He received a sociology Ph.D. from the University of Chicago in 1951, following the acceptance of his dissertation titled "The Police: A Sociological Study of Law, Custom, and Morality."

In 1951, Westley joined the sociology faculty at McGill University with the rank of associate professor. He published an article titled "Violence and the Police" in the *AJS* in 1953,¹⁰¹ and another titled "Secrecy and the Police" in 1956,¹⁰² both of which were, in effect, excerpts from his dissertation. He replaced Oswald Hall as chair of the department in 1955, upon Hall's departure from McGill. Westley began displaying a great deal of publishing activity in 1956, reviewing a book for *CJEPS* and seeing five articles go into print.¹⁰³ Included here was a study made under contract with the Defence Research Board in Ottawa titled The Formation, Nature, and Control of Crowds,¹⁰⁴ which he presented at the C.P.S.A. meetings in June and later published in February 1957 in the *CJEPS* under the title "The Nature and Control of Hostile Crowds."

Westley is looking for the natural processes at work when individuals come together in crowds, when these individuals interact with police, and for a general pattern or "archetype" (ideal type) of the interactions. His research approach is characteristic of the natural history method and a heavy reliance on descriptive-empirical facts. He does not provide as many examples of interviewed material (case studies) as, for example, Aileen Ross did in her article on the organisation of philanthropy; instead Westley relies on much lengthier accounts for describing the phenomenon and in the development of his argument. Here too he utilises the comparative method for drawing out similarities and differences in patterns of behaviour; he does this historically in terms of already established "traditional *textbook* methods," as well as across five

metropolitan police departments and across varied levels of police experience for dealing with hostile crowds.

The Chicago connection leads back to Robert Park's original interest in crowd and mass behaviour, and his doctoral dissertation while at Heidelberg titled "Masse und Publikum" (1904). Park, of course, was long gone by the time Westley arrived at the University of Chicago, having retired in 1933 and meeting his death in 1944. Yet this does not imply that Park's work was absent, and Westley does not neglect to cite it along with a Chicago M.A. thesis on "Nature and Manipulation of Crowds" (1938) produced by Ethel Shanas. Westley also mentions the name of Herbert Blumer and cites his work on "Collective Behaviour" originally published as Chapter 19 in Robert Park's An Outline of the Principles of Sociology (1939).¹⁰⁵ Certainly, when it is considered that Westley's opportunity for direct observation of the phenomenon was not readily obtainable, the heavy reliance on interviews and a detailed development of a pattern of crowd behaviour seemingly satisfied the immediate task at hand.

In 1958, Westley was named a Fellow, Behavioral Sciences Research Conference, Albuquerque, New Mexico.¹⁰⁶ In 1960, he was elected a Fellow of the Royal Society of Arts (London).¹⁰⁷ He was promoted to the rank of professor in 1961, named a member of the Scientific Research Committee with the Canadian Mental Health Association in 1962, and went on to review his second and final book in CJEPS in 1963. He was appointed Director of the Industrial Relations Centre at McGill in 1966. William Westley is believed to be enjoying an undisturbed retirement in Ayer's Cliff, Quebec.

Howard Ernest Roseborough

Howard Roseborough was born in Toronto on April 22, 1919. He obtained his B.A. (1942) in Economics and his M.A. (1946) in sociology both at the University of Toronto, with the latter degree received while under the supervision of S.D. Clark. He was appointed instructor in sociology at the University of Saskatchewan in 1947. In 1950 he travelled to Harvard University,

where he worked as a resident tutor while in pursuit of his doctoral degree.¹⁰⁸ He taught sociology at Union College in Schenectady, New York between 1956-1958. His Harvard Ph.D. was completed in 1958, having submitted a thesis titled "The Sociology of Consumer Spending." Roseborough was appointed to the McGill faculty in 1958 with the rank of assistant professor. He reviewed a book for the CJEPS in 1959 and presented a paper at the annual C.P.S.A. meetings in Saskatoon, which he went on to publish in the CJEPS the following year under the title "Some Sociological Dimensions of Consumer Spending."

This paper represents the first and only sociology article bearing a McGill address in the CJEPS, which is rife with functionalist explanations of structural organisation and social systems. A check of the references cited reveals the name of Talcott Parsons more than once, and indeed Roseborough writes that "[t]he present analysis of roles and the subsequent analysis of collectivities are based on theoretical considerations being developed by Professor Parsons." Considering that he spent some eight years at Harvard (1950-58) during a period of massive methodological upheavals in sociology, the connection seems inevitable.

There is very little in this article by way of a Chicago influence (there is no indication that Roseborough spent any time at Chicago), although perhaps something of a McGill rub may be suggested by the following: "[d]espite the generality of the theory it is possible to use it in certain kinds of empirical research." Having spent a year, or so, with William Westley, Frederick Elkin, Aileen Ross, and David N. Solomon at McGill might have had some influencing effect, although this may be stretching the Chicago circle to sharp elliptical proportions.

Roseborough was promoted to the rank of associate professor in 1963 and to professor in 1968. The McGill University Annual Report for 1969-70 reported that the Department of Sociology and Anthropology split up into two independent departments, with Roseborough appointed as the chair of the newly-formed Department of Sociology. Tragically, Howard E. Roseborough died on August 9, 1969 at the age of 50.

Notes to Chapter 4

1. D.F. Campbell (1983:45) has indicated that Wesley College in Winnipeg was the first Canadian institution of higher learning to offer a sociology course in 1906. V.A. Tomovic (1975:20) asserts that the first sociology course appearing in an English-speaking university in Canada, was at Acadia in 1908. M. Shore (1987:50-51) indicates that theoretical sociology was being taught at McGill through four affiliated Protestant theological colleges as early as 1912; by 1917, William Caldwell, a philosopher, was teaching a course entitled "Studies in the Principles of Sociology." This seems to provide some justification at least for the inclusion of Margaret Chase Going and her 1913 M.A. thesis under the "Department of Sociology" in Spitzer and Silvester (1976), making her, and not Duncan H. McFarlane (M.A.1926), the first recipient of a Master's degree in sociology in Canada (see Jones, 1977:171n).

2. There is basically no comparative difference in meaning between the terms *autonomy* and *independence*; the condition of being *separate* or *distinct* does not bear the same quality of self-governance or self-determination however (e.g., Campbell, 1983:145; Hall, 1988:12; Hiller, 1982:14; Wilcox-Magill, 1983:5).

3. Drawing from information in the McGill University Directory of Graduates: 1890-1965, social work students were identified as those in possession of Diplomas in Social Work (Dip.S.W.) prior to receiving their M.A. in sociology. These students are as follows (all degrees awarded at McGill unless otherwise indicated):

Heaton, Phyllis	DipSW(1927), BA(1930), MA(1932)
Israel, Wilfred E.	BA(?) Acadia; DipSW(1928), MA(1928)
LePage, Inez Marguerite	BA(?) Manitoba; DipSW(1930), MA(1932)
McCall, Muriel B.	BA(?) Manitoba; DipSW(1928), MA(1928)
Smith, Gladys L.	BA(?) Alberta; DipSW(1930), MA(1930)
Wade, Margaret Millicent	BA(?) Manitoba; DipSW(1931), MA(1931)

Drawing from the same directory, theology students were determined as those who were in possession of the title of "Reverend" in 1965:

Brown, Wilfred H.	BA(1925), MA(1927)
Garland, Sidney G.	BA(1928), MA(1929)
McFarlane, Duncan H.	BA(1924), MA(1926)
Ross, Herman Russell	BA(?) Princeton; MA(1932)
Tuttle, Harry G.	BA(1930), MA(1931)

As well, one social work and one theology student (respectively) have been identified by Marlene Shore (1987:143,145) as follows:

Rutman, Robin L.	BA(?)?; MA(1927)
Davis, Richard E.G.	BA(?) Toronto; MA(1927)

4. "Report of the Social Science Research Committee," in the McGill University Annual Report for 1935-36, p.45.

5. For example, Lloyd George Reynolds had his B.A.(1931) in economics from the University of Alberta, Oswald Hall had completed his B.A.(1935) in economics and philosophy at Queen's University, and Stuart Marshall Jamieson held a B.A. in economics and history from the University

of British Columbia. Reynolds and Jamieson returned to the study of economics following their M.A.s in sociology at McGill, whereas Oswald Hall remained in sociology.

6. Samuel Delbert Clark held a B.A. (1930) in history and political science and an M.A. (1931) in history from the University of Saskatchewan.

7. For example, Phyllis Heaton, Dip.S.W.(1927); Esther W. Kerry, Dip.S.W.(1930); and Inez M. LePage, Dip.S.W.(1930).

8. There were 26 M.A. thesis papers produced in the 1930s, compared to 9 in the 1920s and 10 in the 1940s.

9. "Registration in the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research," in the McGill University Annual Report for the years 1936-37, 1937-38, 1938-39.

10. McGill University Annual Report for 1939-40, p.17.

11. Nathan Keyfitz, while working with the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, accepted a part-time lecturing position in sociology at McGill in 1944, and for the next two years statistics was taught internally once a week.

12. McGill University Annual Report for the two years 1937-38 and 1945-46.

13. McGill University Annual Report for 1945-46, pp.12-13.

14. "Registration in the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research," in the McGill University Annual Report for the years 1945-46, 1946-47, 1947-48, 1948-49, and 1949-50.

15. McGill Annual Report for the year 1946-47, p.74. Aileen Ross (1984:4) had perhaps mistakenly recalled that William Kelly had become "our first anthropologist" in 1948. V.A. Tomovic (1975:247) placed the name "Kelly" within the sociology faculty in "the latter part of the 1940's," but was not more specific. And Frank Jones (1990:35) remembers the time when "William Kelly came as McGill's first appointment in anthropology," yet does not provide a year.

16. During the time of these three appointments, the McGill Annual Report was somewhat unclear in identifying the appointments as falling under the Department of Sociology. In fact, Kelly was identified as the first appointment in the "Department of Anthropology", which, according to later information, would appear as a sub-heading under the Department of Sociology during the 1953-54 session. The Annual Report for 1947-48 listed Kelly's resignation from the faculty and identified him as an "Associate Professor of Anthropology" (p.79), with no connection to the Department of Sociology. In the very same report, Fred Voget was identified under the heading of "New Appointments to rank of Assistant Professor" as an appointment to the Department of Sociology (p.75). Upon his resignation, the Annual Report for 1951-52 listed him as an "Assistant Professor of Sociology" (p.95), and had identified Jacob Fried's appointment to the faculty as an "Assistant Professor of Sociology" (p.92).

17. "Registration in the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research," in the McGill University Annual Report for the years 1950-51, 1951-52, 1952-53, 1953-54, 1954-55, 1955-56, and 1956-57.

18. "Report of the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research," in the McGill University Annual Report for 1951-52, p.52.

19. "Table IV: Doctoral Degrees Awarded in Canada, 1956-1961," in the McGill University Annual Report for 1961-62, p.14.

20. Ibid., p.17.

21. McGill University Annual Report for 1954-55, p.44.

22. This too remains inconsistent with Aileen Ross' (1984) recollection that the Department of Sociology became the Department of Sociology and Anthropology in 1948.

23. From 1960-69, student registration in the M.A. programme for each academic year numbered 10, 15, 18, 18, 19, 23, 30, 33, and 36, respectively. "Registration in the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research," in the McGill University Annual Report for the years 1960-61, 1961-62, 1962-63, 1963-64, 1964-65, 1965-66, 1966-67, 1967-68, and 1968-69.

24. From 1961-69, student registration in the Ph.D. programme for each academic year numbered 2, 2, 4, 5, 11, 12, 19, and 22, respectively. "Registration in the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research," in the McGill University Annual Report for the years 1961-62, 1962-63, 1963-64, 1964-65, 1965-66, 1966-67, 1967-68, and 1968-69.

25. There were in fact two sociology Ph.D.s conferred in the "Fall 1972": John Douglas House (M.A., Memorial) "The Social Organization of Residential Real Estate," and William Shaffir (B.A., M.A., McGill) "Life in an Urban Chassidic Community: Insulation and Proselytization" (Spitzer and Silvester, 1978).

Yet there is some discrepancy between this listing and that of the McGill University Annual Report. The latter identifies Rochelle S. Romalis (B.A., Brooklyn; M.A., New York) as the first recipient of a sociology Ph.D. in 1968, with a dissertation title of "The Rural Community and the Total Society During Economic Change in St. Lucia: A Case Study." In the Spitzer and Silvester (1978) thesis directory, the Romalis Ph.D. is listed under the Department of Anthropology (with supervisor Richard Frank Salisbury) and was conferred in the "Spring 1968". A further check of this directory reveals that there was a second Ph.D. conferred in the "Spring 1968" under the Department of Anthropology -- Saul E. Arbess (B.A., M.A., McGill) "Values and Socio-economic Change: The George River Case" (with supervisor N. Chance). But there was also a Ph.D. awarded in the "Fall 1968" to Gillian E. Sankoff (B.A., M.A., McGill) "Social Aspects of Multilingualism in New Guinea" (with supervisor Richard Salisbury), appearing under the Department of Anthropology.

There are a number of discrepancies here. According to the Annual Report, the Department of Sociology was renamed the Department of Sociology and Anthropology during the 1958-59 session, and remained a joint department until 1969-70 when it was separated into the "new departments" of Anthropology and Sociology. It would follow, therefore, that the Romalis, Arbess, and Sankoff Ph.D.s should have been listed under the joint Department of Sociology and Anthropology, with a further qualifier that they were works in anthropology. By turning to the Spitzer and Silvester (1978) directory, there is even more confusion cast on this differentiation. Among the listings found in this directory is a list of degree recipients arranged alphabetically by department. There are thus listings under the headings of the Department of Anthropology, the Department of Sociology, and the Department of Sociology and Anthropology. The directory lists the senior degrees awarded under the Department of Anthropology, with the earliest being an M.A. conferred in the "Fall 1964" and the latest being two M.A.s awarded in the "Spring 1973", two Ph.D.s awarded in the "Spring 1973", and two Ph.D.s awarded in the "Fall 1973". The problem here is twofold. First, and in accordance with the Annual Report, the Department of Anthropology became a separate entity in 1969-70. Second is the problem of what came first, the spring or the fall session for the particular year and is the year an academic or calendar year?

For the year 1964, the fall degrees are listed prior to the spring degrees (in numerical then alphabetical order), suggesting that it is an academic year. This is also the case for the year 1968, which would suggest that the Sankoff Ph.D. awarded in the fall preceded both the Arbess and Romalis Ph.D.s awarded in the spring. Conversely, for the year 1973, the degrees awarded in the spring were listed (numerically then alphabetically) prior to those awarded in the fall, suggesting that this was a calendar year listing. Fortunately, the House and Shaffir Ph.D.s were both conferred in the "Fall 1972" and thus may be regarded as the first two sociology Ph.D.s falling under the Department of Sociology at McGill. There were no Ph.D.s listed as being awarded under the Department of Sociology and Anthropology during this directory's period of coverage (i.e., 1960-73).

These sorts of discrepancies certainly make the task more difficult for the researcher interested in the finer details of the history of sociology in this country and more should be done in tracing and correcting such records.

26. See Richard Frank Salisbury (b.Chelsea, England: B.A.,M.A. (Cantab.); A.M. (Harvard); Ph.D. (Australian National)), in Anthropology Newsletter, Vol.30, No.9, December 1989:4.

27. See Prof. Howard E. Roseborough (b. Toronto, 1919-1969: B.A., M.A. (Toronto); Ph.D. (Harvard)), in The McGill News, Vol.50, No.5, September 1969.

Carl Addington Dawson

28. Everett Hughes (1961:555) has placed the honour of "Canada's (not merely French Canada's) first major sociologist" next to the name of Léon Gérin. M. Shore (1987:69) discusses Dawson's many contributions to building sociology and redirecting the work in social service while at McGill, and thus refers to him as "more than the founder of modern sociology at McGill."

29. Carl represents the fifth generation of the Dawson family in Canada, which began with his great-great-grandfather Colonel Thomas Dawson (1762-1804), who was depicted as a staunch methodist preacher with the Wesleyan Methodist Episcopal Church on P.E.I., and his wife Frances Tait (or Tate) (1766-1849). Col. Thomas arrived in Charlottetown, P.E.I. on 06 June 1801, accompanied by his wife and six children, leaving behind a farm they commonly referred to as "Dawson's Grove" which was located in the County of Monaghan, near Cootehill, Ireland. Whereas Col. Thomas and Frances Dawson went on to have two more children while in P.E.I., the youngest of his Irish-born Richard Dawson (1799-1897) and his eventual first (of two) spouse Elizabeth Howatt (1803-1848), were Carl's great-grand-parents. Their third child Henry Dawson (1830-1912) and his wife Elizabeth Keough (1831-1919) were Carl's grandparents. Carl's father John -- a farmer by trade and manager of the Fox Ranch at Central Bedeque, P.E.I. -- was their fourth child. Carl's mother Eliza came from a strong Baptist family -- the Wood family -- which, it has been noted, was despised by Col. Thomas during his patriarchy. Carl's parents were second cousins, once removed, and were married on 29 May 1886. It might also be of general interest to note that Col. Thomas' third child Samuel Edward Dawson (1791-1873) and spouse Jane Lord (1795-1870) gave birth to Lydia Dawson (1837-1909) (the last of eleven children), who went on to marry Charles Stanfield in 1857. Their grandson, former leader of the Progressive Conservative Party of Canada, Robert Stanfield, was Carl Dawson's third cousin.

For more on the Dawson family tree and related genealogical references, refer to the eleven-volume collection compiled by Clara E. Dawson, Leaves From Dawson's Grove: A Tree That Became a Forest (1982). A fuller discussion of Carl's maternal line may be found in the private publication of Carl's first cousin Brent Wood, Family History (April 1976). There is also a chapter on the Dawson family (the author's maternal relations) in Lorne C. Callbeck, My Island, My People (Charlottetown: The Prince Edward Island Heritage Foundation, 1979). A few pages

on the history of the Dawson family may also be found in Orlo Jones and Doris Haslam (eds). An Island Refuge: Loyalists and Disbanded Troops on the Island of Saint John (Abegweit Branch of the United Empire Loyalist Association of Canada, 1983:90-94). These references may be found in the University of P.E.I.'s Robertson Library in a special P.E.I. Collection.

30. W.A. Mackintosh and W.L.G. Joerg (eds). (Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada).

31. W.E. Gettys was an American-born sociologist who studied sociology at the University of Chicago for three summers, yet attained a Ph.D. at Ohio State University. He joined C.A. Dawson at McGill in 1925 as an associate professor, teaching courses in "Child Welfare" and "The Family." He left McGill in 1926 to accept a position at the University of Texas.

32. This is a clear parallel to Dawson's emphasis on the city as a sociological laboratory; a concept derived from Robert Park who in turn had echoed the phrase first put forth by Albion Small, i.e., Chicago as a "vast sociological laboratory" (Smith, 1988:119).

33. Pitirim Sorokin (1889-1968), Harvard's first head of its sociology department (1930-44), published a four-volume collection of his work, Social and Cultural Dynamics (New York: American Book Co., 1937-41). As well, notable Harvard graduates had begun to spread the word of a structural-functional theory at other universities: Robert K. Merton (Ph.D. 1936), who originally taught at Harvard, followed by a chairmanship appointment in the sociology department at Tulane University, established a prominent career "and soon became a major theorist and the heart of Parsonsian-style theorizing at Columbia University" (Ritzer, 1988:54) beginning in 1941; Kingsley Davis (Ph.D. 1936), who chaired the sociology department at Pennsylvania State College, followed by an appointment at Princeton University, went on to publish, along with his Princeton colleague Wilbert E. Moore (Ph.D. 1940 Harvard), "the most noted and most debated theory of social stratification....[which] has come to be known simply as the Davis and Moore theory of social stratification" in 1945 (Kerbo, 1984:129).

34. The article led Dawson to edit a book by the same title two years later, The New North-West (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1947).

35. McGill University Annual Report for the year 1944-45, p.26. Principal and Vice-Chancellor Frank Cyril James makes it clear that the Arctic Institute is controlled largely by American interests and its connection with McGill resides in the fact that it occupies a physical space on the campus. Yet he goes on to say that the arctic region is important to Canada, "and it is hoped that the new Arctic Institute will co-ordinate our knowledge of this vast area, as well as encourage further exploration and research."

36. McGill University Annual Report for the year 1945-46, p.27. In this respect, the establishment of a Department of Geography in 1943 under the chairmanship of Professor G.H. Kimble (B.A., M.A., London; A.K.C. in Divinity), proved to be a timely addition for advancing research at McGill.

37. McGill University Annual Report for the year 1950-51, p.16.

38. McGill University Annual Report for the year 1955-56, p.22. The research station was located approximately 700 miles northeast of Montreal, with living and research accommodations for 12 students.

39. McGill University Annual Report for the year 1959-60, p.25.

40. See for example, C.R. Fay and L. Tarshis, Review of C.A. Dawson *The Settlement of the Peace River Country: A Study of a Pioneer Area* (1934), in CJEPS, Vol.1, No.1, February 1935: 110-16; and W.B. Hurd, Review of C.A. Dawson *Group Settlement: Ethnic Communities in Western Canada* (1936), in CJEPS, Vol.2, No.4, November 1936: 574-76.

41. Review of C.A. Dawson and Eva R. Younge *Pioneering in the Prairie Provinces: The Social Side of the Settlement Process*, in CHR, Vol.21, 1940: 336-38.

42. C.R. Fay, Review of C.A. Dawson and Eva R. Younge *Pioneering in the Prairie Provinces: The Social Side of the Settlement Process* (1940), in CJEPS, Vol.7, No.1, February 1941: 120-22.

43. Page 112; quoted in *Ibid*.

44. For an excellent overview of Dawson's publications, see Marlene Shore's (1987) endnotes section.

45. (1892-1973). Their children consisted of: Helen Margaret Dawson (b.1914) who married A.L. Strachan; Frances Elizabeth Tait (b.1921) who married J.K. Burrows; John Addington (b.1923) who married Eunice Hutcheson; and William Dixon (b.1926) who married Gail Hamilton.

Everett Cherrington Hughes

46. Helen Elizabeth Gregory MacGill was born in Vancouver in 1903. She completed her undergraduate degree, receiving a B.A. in German and Economics, at the University of British Columbia in 1925. While there she took two sociology courses, one of which was taught by S.E. Beckett (main interest in the area of social service) who had taken some summer courses at the University of Chicago under Robert Park (Hughes, 1974). This was in the early-20s, and whereas Carl Dawson was just beginning his programme at McGill, the suggestion appears to be that a Parkian-style of sociology was being taught at the University of British Columbia during this early period as well. Interestingly, McGill University had established two colleges in Western Canada near the turn of this century -- Alberta College in Edmonton and the McGill University College of British Columbia in Vancouver. The former went on to become the University of Alberta and the latter the University of British Columbia (McGill University Annual Report for the year 1946-47, p.26). Further study on these connections seems to be warrantable, particularly when tracing the Chicago influence in Canadian sociology as a whole.

Helen MacGill was persuaded to enrol in the sociology programme at the University of Chicago by Robert Park, following a guest lecture he and his research assistant Winifred Raushenbush (his eventual biographer) held at the University of British Columbia (Hughes, 1974). MacGill turned down an Economics fellowship from the Carola Woerischer School of Economics at Bryn Mawr and accepted a Laura Spelman Rockefeller Fund's Local Community Research fellowship so as to study sociology at Chicago beginning in 1925 (*Ibid*; Lofland, 1980:257). She received her M.A. in 1927, following the writing of "Land Values: An Ecological Factor in the Community of South Chicago," and her Ph.D. in 1937 with "News and the Human Interest Story" (published in 1940 under the same title). In 1927, she and Everett moved to Montreal where they resided in a downtown flat on Sherbrooke Rue, east of De Bleury Rue (Ostow, 1984:12). There, she found herself giving tutorials in sociology at McGill University (Hughes, 1974) as a teaching fellow between 1927-30 and as an assistant in sociology between 1929-37. Following their return to Chicago in 1938, H.M. Hughes reviewed one book in 1939 and published an article in 1945 ("Newspapers and the Moral World") in CJEPS. For more on Helen Hughes' career see Susan Hoecker-Drysdale (1990).

47. For the academic year 1931-32, Hughes took leave to travel to Germany in order to study "the history of the Catholic labour movement in the Rhineland, where a similar process of industrialisation initiated by Protestant *entrepreneurs* in a Catholic area had occurred in the nineteenth century" (Ostow, 1984: 13). He went on to publish his findings in an article entitled "The Industrial Revolution and the Catholic Movement in Germany." *Social Forces*, Vol.14, No.2, December 1935:286-92.

48. "The French-English Margin in Canada." *AJS*, Vol.39, No.1, July 1933:1-11.

49. Some of Hughes' former students had recalled the following: "We have been struck by Everett's unwillingness to be dogmatic about methodology, his conviction that there are many ways of learning about social reality. While he himself represents a tradition of firsthand observation, handed down from Park, he uses demographic data as well, and insists that his students be literate in statistics. (He once taught statistics himself.)" (in Howard S. Becker, et al. (1968), p.vii). This would seem to be in keeping with what E.W. Burgess, the methodological *universalist*, had professed at Chicago and indeed E.C. Hughes (1971:ix) himself would comment on this as follows: "Certainly I have never sat down to write systematically about how to study society. I am suspicious of any method said to be the one and only. But among the methods I would recommend is the intensive, penetrating look with an imagination as lively and as sociological as it can be made."

50. "St. Denis: A French-Canadian Parish." (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1937). Published as a book under the same title in 1939 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).

51. In a book review that covered "Gerin's one technique, that of first-hand observation of rural families and communities," Hughes (1961:555) indicates that: "There is also much to be learnt from him in the matter of respecting close observation and of putting facts together into meaningful wholes."

52. (with research assistant Margaret L. McDonald) "French and English in the Economic Structure of Montreal." Vol.7, No.4, November 1941:493-505; "Mistakes at Work." Vol.17, No.3, August 1951: 320-27; "The Dual Mandate of Social Science: Remarks on the Academic Division of Labour." Vol.25, No.4, November 1959:401-10; "The Professions in Society." Vol.26, No.1, February 1960: 54-61. These four papers make up part of the collection in Hughes' *The Sociological Eye* (1971), whereas his first article in *CJEPS* (under study here) does not appear therein. For a review of these selected papers see "Symposium Review on E.C. Hughes." *TSQ*, Vol.13, Fall 1972:547-65. A bibliography of Hughes' work extending up to the late 1960s is provided in Howard S. Becker, et al. (1968), pp.368-72.

53. Although Hughes would serve as editor of the *American Journal of Sociology* for a period of eight years while at Chicago (Ostow, 1985:8).

54. McGill University *Annual Report* for the year 1964-65, p.54.

55. In his foreword to Robert Faris' (1979) book on Chicago Sociology, Morris Janowitz had indicated that the whole "faculty was concerned, if not almost consumed, with training new generations of sociologists" (p.ix). This too was important for Hughes (1961:555), who recognised that having students, "always one's best critics," helped a teacher to develop a "greater repertoire of methods."

Robert E. Lee Faris

56. Later, An Ecological Study of Insanity in the City. Privately printed in Chicago, April 1939 (45pp.).

57. Marlene Shore (1987:267) has indicated that Faris' appointment to McGill came as a result of Carl Dawson's strong insistence for another experienced scholar to replace Hughes. Neither McGill Principal Lewis Williams Douglas, nor Charles Hendel, the dean of Arts, wanted to hire another Chicago graduate, but in the end they acquiesced to Dawson's demands.

58. Report on the Causes of Crime (Washington, 1931).

59. Vice in Chicago (Chicago, 1934).

60. Suicide (Chicago, 1928).

61. Family Disorganization (Chicago, 1927).

62. The Negro Family in Chicago (Chicago, 1932).

63. Mental Disorders in Urban Areas (Chicago, 1939).

64. Organized Crime in Chicago (Chicago, 1929).

65. "The Boys' Club and Juvenile Delinquency" (AJS, Vol.42, July 1936:66-80).

66. It appears that Faris draws much more support from the work of some of his contemporaries in the third-generation of Chicago sociologists than the previous generation of teachers. This becomes more apparent when looking at the name index of his 1948 publication Social Disorganization (New York: The Ronald Press Company). For example, Ruth S. Cavan and Edwin H. Sutherland are cited the most on 20 pages each, H.W. Dunham on 9 pages, W.C. Reckless and C.R. Shaw on 7 pages each, while E. Faris and R.E. Park receive mention on 2 pages each, W.I. Thomas and W.F. Ogburn on 6 pages each, and E.W. Burgess with the most on 8 pages. The pattern remained generally consistent in the book's second edition in 1955, although citations to Burgess increased to 12 pages. It is also interesting to note that C.A. Dawson and W.E. Gettys each get cited on 6 pages, although this is generally in relation to their collaborative work in their 1929 text.

67. What Faris does not indicate, however, is that the U.S. immigration law of 1924 (*National Immigration Act*; also referred to as the "Exclusion Act"), was passed on the basis of eugenics standards, i.e., a notion of biological inferiority, which Faris earlier in the article claimed had been eliminated as a reasonable cause of social disorganisation.

Forrest Emmanuel LaViolette

68. Frank Miyamoto, University of Washington, wrote LaViolette's obituary in the American Sociological Association Footnotes, V.17, No.10, December 1989:13.

69. His dissertation would later be published under the title of Americans of Japanese Ancestry: A Study of Assimilation in the American Community (Toronto: Canadian Institute of International Affairs, 1945).

70. The next generation of American- or Canadian-born Japanese (i.e., born to the *nisei*) are referred to as the *sansei*, to be followed by their offspring referred to as the *yonsei*.

71. For example, he published the article "Two years of Japanese Evacuation in Canada" in the Far Eastern Survey, Vol.13, No.11, May 31, 1944. He also published "War and the Japanese in Canada," Public Affairs, Spring 1945 and "The Japanese Canadians," Behind the Headlines Pamphlet, Vol.6, No.2, 1945:19.

72. The Canadian Japanese and World War II: A Sociological and Psychological Account (Issued under the auspices of the Canadian Institute of International Affairs and the Institute of Pacific Relations. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1948). He also published "The Canadian Japanese," Far Eastern Survey, Vol.17, No.8, April 1948:92-95. Refer to Vladislav Tomovic's doctoral dissertation, and specifically Appendix F (pp.242-56), for an account of the author's interview with Professor LaViolette.

73. The actual order-in-council using the powers contained in the *War Measures Act* (a questionable piece of legislation which remained on the books until 21 July 1988, when it was replaced by the *Emergencies Act*) came on 24 February 1942 (see e.g., Brian Nolan King's War: Mackenzie King and the Politics of War, 1939-1945. Toronto: Random House, 1988:66).

74. That is, Dawson's "Canada in Perspective" article appearing in the CJEPS and discussed earlier in this chapter.

75. In CJEPS, Vol.15, No.1, February 1949:99-101.

76. McGill University Annual Report for the year 1947-48, p.128.

77. Other members of the committee as reported by LaViolette (1961:ix): Professor of Anthropology Alfred G. Bailey (Ph.D., Toronto, 1933) of the University of New Brunswick, "Jean-Charles Falardeau of Laval University, [George Williams] Brown [(Ph.D., Chicago, 1924)] and [T.F.] McIlwraith of the University of Toronto, [Harry B.] Hawthorn of the University of British Columbia, and [Oswald] Hall, [Nathan] Keyfitz, and [LaViolette] of McGill University."

Oswald Hall

78. Oswald Hall recounted some of his Chicago experiences during an interview in April 1989.

79. Vol.12, No.1, 1946:30-44.

80. McGill University Annual Report for 1945-46, p.10.

81. *Ibid.*, p.12.

82. Hall (1988:22) recounts how the situation involving appointments to the sociology staff at McGill was much different than, for example, at the U of T. Dawson had been adamant in his insistence to hire senior sociologists rather than junior personnel. This differed from the situation at U of T where staff were expected to work their way up a hierarchical system of rankings. Thus Hall's appointment came at a senior level, fitting quite well within "an egalitarian colleague framework."

83. McGill University Annual Report for 1944-45, p.21.

84. Vol.13,No.2, May 1947:318-19.

85. Hall (1989) pointed to the fact that Whyte had begun his research for his famous Street Corner Society (1955) while attending Harvard University. Whyte went on to complete the work at Chicago by 1943.

86. "The Stages of a Medical Career," AJS, Vol.54,No.5, March 1948:327-36.

87. McGill University Annual Report for 1947-48, p.128.

88. Refer to endnote #77 for the committee membership.

89. Vol.55,No.3, pp.243-53. Much as in the discussion presented in his previous AJS article, "The Stages of a Medical Career", Hall again relies on the natural history approach in this paper.

90. McGill University Annual Report for 1950-51, p.18.

91. Ibid., p.156.

92. Vol.16,No.5.

93. A look at Spitzer and Silvester (1976) identifies the following: Harold H. Potter, "Occupations of Negroes in Montreal" (1949); Frank E. Jones, "Work organization in the structural steel industry: a study of industrial organization and of ethnic relations among structural steelworkers" (1950); Rex A. Lucas, "Occupational orientation of high school entrants in a bi-ethnic railroad town" (1950); Huntly W. McKay, "Sociological analysis of a group practice: its effects upon the doctor and the hospital" (1950); Joseph E. Brazeau, "The French-Canadian doctor in Montreal: a study of careers in a profession" (1951); Douglas L. Rennie, "The ethnic division of labour in Montreal, 1931-1951" (1953); Patricia G. Robinson, "A case study of psychiatry in relation to other medical specialities in a hospital" (1953); and Audrey J. Wipper, "The occupation of the professional rider" (1955).

94. McGill University Annual Report for 1953-54, p.7.

95. A brief summary of the events appears in Mason Wade's The French Canadians (Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, [1968] 1983), pp.1116-17.

96. It is not clear whether the figure Hall recalls represents net earnings or some other. A salary scale for full-time members of the academic staff appearing some ten years earlier in the McGill University Annual Report for 1943-44, lists an associate professor's salary as ranging between \$3,500-\$4,500 and a professor's range of between \$5,000-\$7,000 (p.10).

97. Created in 1948. McGill University Annual Report for 1951-52, p.23.

98. McGill University Annual Report for 1954-55, p.109.

Aileen Dansken Ross

99. Hoecker-Drysdale notes the position as lecturer, however, Richard Helmes-Hayes (1988:58) lists the position as that of instructor.

100. Vol.9,No.4, November 1943:447-62.

William A. Westley

101. Vol.59,No.1, July, pp.34-41.

102. Social Forces, Vol.34,No.3, March, pp.254-57.

103. Accompanying the article above, "The Human Effects of Automation." Health and Industrial Safety, November 1956:4-7; "Automation and Society." Chemistry in Canada, Vol.8,No.11, 1956: 48; (with Maurice Leznoff) "The Homosexual Community." Social Problems, Vol.3,No.4, 1956:257-64.

104. For the Civil Defence Co-ordinator (Ottawa: Defence Research Board, Directorate of Atomic Research, 1956).

105. (New York: Barnes and Noble, inc., 1939), pp.221-80. Cited in R.E.L. Faris (1979:106).

106. McGill University Annual Report for 1957-58, p.123.

107. McGill University Annual Report for 1960-61, p.152.

Howard Ernest Roseborough

108. Personal correspondence from his sister Dr. Mary Salisbury, dated January 5, 1991.

Concluding Remarks

The research approach expounded by those doing sociology at Chicago was very eclectic; "[n]o individual study relied on a single method" (Bulmer, 1984:100). Retracing the subject's intellectual history at Chicago reveals a variety of substantive, methodological, and theoretical influences which seem to contribute directly to the multi-sided process of urban study there. Emphasis was placed on ethnographic field studies and a subjective point of view in the description and analysis of particular subcultures. The use of informal and unstructured research techniques and methods was quite characteristic, with no real restriction on what constituted a possible information source.

The life-history technique was used extensively in the 1920s (although its popularity would dissipate in the 1940s with the advent of Parsonsian structural functionalism), with information being gathered from personal documents, autobiographical accounts, family and institutional letters, and through formal and informal interviews. The human ecology approach was assumed through the study of the relationships among groups of individuals and their environment, and these relationships themselves. Henrika Kuklick (1973) has referred to this as "the Chicago ecological-interactionist paradigm," also picked up by Dennis Smith (1988:136) who uses the term "ecological-interactionism." The concept of natural areas emerged -- identified through mapping procedures, the Burgess concentric zones pattern and the social disorganisation-reorganisation

process – along with the natural history approach that viewed the occurrence of events as typical steps or stages depending on the social circumstances or situations. An urban sociology was realised with an interest in ethnic and racial groups, their collective behaviour, and their impact on various social institutions which together made up the city.

Retracing the Chicago heritage at McGill University is rather straightforward. The influence is observable at every level and there seems little reason to speculate that the type of sociology produced there was anything but a distinctly Chicago product. It is certain that the heavy imprint of Chicago went well beyond the conceptual and entered -- indeed pervaded -- the daily lives of those who ventured into an unexplored domain in Canada. That is what was being produced in the only major journal of the day in Canada and that is what was being heard by the social scientific community. Undeniably, the popularity of the approach waned during the beginning of the 1950s, as competition so often seems to accomplish, however, it did enjoy an encore -- a reprise -- in Canadian sociology and it does not want to lay down just yet. Of course, a fuller examination of sociology articles appearing in the CJEPS may be the next logical step, and who knows, the champagne may continue to pour.

APPENDIX A: McGill University, List of Sociology Staff by Year, 1922-1967.

1922-25	C.A. Dawson	Assistant Professor of Social Science		
1925-26*	C.A. Dawson	Associate Professor (Chair)		
	W.E. Gettys	Associate Professor		
	[* From 1925-26 all appointments are in sociology]			
1926-27	C.A. Dawson	Associate Professor (Chair)	1948-49	C.A. Dawson Associate Professor (Chair)
				O. Hall Associate Professor
				F.E. LaViolette Associate Professor
				B.N. Meltzer Assistant Professor
				A.D. Ross Assistant Professor
1927-31	C.A. Dawson	Associate Professor (Chair)	1949-50	C.A. Dawson Associate Professor (Chair)
	E.C. Hughes	Assistant Professor		O. Hall Associate Professor
				B.N. Meltzer Assistant Professor
				A.D. Ross Assistant Professor
1931-32	C.A. Dawson	Associate Professor (Chair)	1950-51	C.A. Dawson Associate Professor (Chair)
	E.C. Hughes	Assistant Professor (on leave)		O. Hall Associate Professor
				A.D. Ross Assistant Professor
1932-38	C.A. Dawson	Associate Professor (Chair)	1950-51	C.A. Dawson Associate Professor (Chair)
	E.C. Hughes	Assistant Professor		O. Hall Associate Professor
				A.D. Ross Assistant Professor
1938-39	C.A. Dawson	Associate Professor (Chair)	1951-52	C.A. Dawson Professor
				O. Hall Associate Professor (Chair)
				W.A. Westley Associate Professor
				F. Elkin Assistant Professor
				A.D. Ross Assistant Professor
1939-40	C.A. Dawson	Associate Professor (Chair)	1952-53	O. Hall Associate Professor (Chair)
	R.E.L. Faris	Assistant Professor		W.A. Westley Associate Professor
				F. Elkin Assistant Professor
				A.D. Ross Assistant Professor
1940-44	C.A. Dawson	Associate Professor (Chair)	1953-54	O. Hall Professor (Chair)
	F.E. LaViolette	Assistant Professor		W.A. Westley Associate Professor
				F. Elkin Assistant Professor
				A.D. Ross Assistant Professor
1944-45	C.A. Dawson	Associate Professor (Chair)	1953-54	O. Hall Professor (Chair)
	F.E. LaViolette	Associate Professor		W.A. Westley Associate Professor
	N. Keyfitz	Lecturer (Part-Time)		F. Elkin Assistant Professor
				A.D. Ross Assistant Professor
1945-46	C.A. Dawson	Associate Professor (Chair)	1954-55	O. Hall Professor (Chair)
	F.E. LaViolette	Associate Professor		W.A. Westley Associate Professor
	A.D. Ross	Lecturer		F. Elkin Assistant Professor
	N. Keyfitz	Lecturer (Part-Time)		A.D. Ross Assistant Professor
				D.N. Solomon Assistant Professor
1946-48	C.A. Dawson	Associate Professor (Chair)		
	O. Hall	Associate Professor		
	F.E. LaViolette	Associate Professor		
	A.D. Ross	Lecturer		

1955-56			1963-64		
O. Hall	Professor (on leave)		H.E. Roseborough	Professor (on leave)	
W.A. Westley	Associate Professor (Chair)		W.A. Westley	Professor	
F. Elkin	Assistant Professor		A.D. Ross	Associate Professor (Chair)	
A.D. Ross	Assistant Professor		D.N. Solomon	Associate Professor	
D.N. Solomon	Assistant Professor		R. Breton	Assistant Professor	
			P.C. Dodd	Assistant Professor	
			M. Pinard	Assistant Professor	
1956-57			1964-65		
W.A. Westley	Associate Professor (Chair)		E.C. Hughes	Professor (Visiting)	
F. Elkin	Assistant Professor		A.D. Ross	Professor	
A.D. Ross	Assistant Professor		W.A. Westley	Professor (Chair)	
D.N. Solomon	Assistant Professor		H.E. Roseborough	Professor	
			D.N. Solomon	Associate Professor	
1957-60			P.C. Dodd	Assistant Professor	
W.A. Westley	Associate Professor (Chair)		R.G. Krohn	Assistant Professor	
F. Elkin	Assistant Professor		J.W. Lella	Assistant Professor	
H.E. Roseborough	Assistant Professor		M. Pinard	Assistant Professor	
A.D. Ross	Assistant Professor				
D.N. Solomon	Assistant Professor				
			1965-66		
1960-61			F.E. Jones	Professor (Visiting)	
W.A. Westley	Professor (Chair)		A.D. Ross	Professor	
F. Elkin	Associate Professor		W.A. Westley	Professor (Chair)	
A.D. Ross	Associate Professor		H.E. Roseborough	Professor	
D.N. Solomon	Associate Professor		D.N. Solomon	Associate Professor	
R. Breton	Assistant Professor		P.C. Dodd	Assistant Professor (on leave)	
H.E. Roseborough	Assistant Professor		R.G. Krohn	Assistant Professor	
			J.W. Lella	Assistant Professor	
1961-62			M. Pinard	Assistant Professor	
W.A. Westley	Professor (Chair)				
F. Elkin	Associate Professor		1966-67		
A.D. Ross	Associate Professor (on leave)		A.D. Ross	Professor	
D.N. Solomon	Associate Professor		W.A. Westley	Professor (Chair)	
R. Breton	Assistant Professor		H.E. Roseborough	Professor (on leave)	
H.E. Roseborough	Assistant Professor		D.N. Solomon	Associate Professor	
			R.G. Krohn	Assistant Professor	
1962-63			J.W. Lella	Assistant Professor	
W.A. Westley	Professor (Chair)		M. Pinard	Assistant Professor	
H.E. Roseborough	Associate Professor				
A.D. Ross	Associate Professor				
D.N. Solomon	Associate Professor				
R. Breton	Assistant Professor				
P.C. Dodd	Assistant Professor				
M. Pinard	Assistant Professor				

SOURCE: McGill University Annual Report, for the years 1924-57.

APPENDIX B: McGill University Sociology Staff in the CJEPS, not included in this study.

MARSH, LEONARD CHARLES (1906-1982; B.Sc.(1928; Eco.) London School of Economics; M.A.(1933), Ph.D. (1940 McGill) arrived at McGill in 1930 to commence his appointment as the director of the McGill Social Science Research Project (1930-40). During the co-ordination of this programme, he also taught courses in the Department of Economics and Political Science, and supervised three M.A.s (two in 1931 and one in 1938) and one M.Com. (1934) in economics and political science. His connection with McGill sociology was largely through his guidance of this inter-disciplinary project which, as the first social science research programme of its kind in Canada was instrumental in producing reputable social science research pertaining to the highly visible social problem of unemployment during the Depression years. A number of sociology M.A. theses, concerned with immigration policy and immigrant groups, resulted during this period, and one in particular fell into the centre of some controversy following its publication – Lloyd G. Reynolds' The British Immigrant (1935). Following the dismissal of Marsh from McGill (1941), he went on as research director for the federal Advisory Committee on Post-War Reconstruction in Ottawa (1941-44), which led to the publication of his well-known Report on Social Security for Canada (1943). Following a brief departure from Canada he returned to accept an appointment as an associate professor in the Department of Social Work at the University of British Columbia (1947), and later in the Faculty of Education (1965), where he stayed until his retirement in 1973. He published two articles in CJEPS: one while at McGill (with M. Findlay, "The Arcand Act (and Notes on Similar Legislation in Ontario)." Vol. 2, No. 3, 1936:404-23), and the other while at British Columbia ("The Economics of Low-Rent Housing." Vol. 15, No. 1, 1949:14-33). He also wrote a short note (1939) and he reviewed four books (1935, 1930, 1939, 1940).

YOUNGE, EVA RUDER (B.A. Alberta; M.A. (1933) in sociology under C. Dawson, McGill -- "Social Organization on the Pioneer Fringe, with Special Reference to the Peace River Area.") was included on the University of Toronto teaching staff for one year as an instructor (1943-44). Although she did publish an article in the CJEPS ("Population Movements and the Assimilation of Alien Groups in Canada." Vol. 10, No. 3, 1944:372-80) with a Toronto address attached, she would not be considered as being a representative figure of Toronto sociology, but more so with the social work program at McGill. While at Toronto, she was an elected member of the Executive Council of the C.P.S.A. and the Editorial Advisory Board for CJEPS. She had previously received a Special Research Assistantship in the Social Sciences at McGill for the four years from 1933-35, 1936-37, and 1939-40. Her subsequent appointment came in 1944 as an assistant in the Department of Sociology, McGill. She was promoted to lecturer (1946), assistant professor (1947), and associate professor (1951) in the rejuvenated School of Social Work at McGill (opened in 1945). During the 1961-62 academic year, she was a member of the Committee on Health Needs of the Elderly with the Montreal Council of Social Agencies. She retired as an associate professor of social work and Director of Research for graduate students in the School of Social Work in 1964, in order to continue her work on the problems of elderly retired persons living in Montreal. In 1965, she was residing at 4-8680 Montcalm Street, Vancouver 14, B.C.. Perhaps her best known publication was a volume co-authored with Carl Dawson, Pioneering in the Prairie Provinces: The Social Side of the Settlement Process (1940), which in large part was derived from her master's work. She also co-authored a pamphlet with Irving Weissman (chairman) and Leonard C. Marsh (co-chairman), "Workshop Report on Research in Social Work, Toronto, 1951." American Association of Schools of Social Work, New York, publication no. 2137, mimeographed pamphlet (12pp.).

MELTZER, BERNARD N. (M.A. Wayne; Ph.D. Chicago) a symbolic interactionist, had been appointed to the staff as an assistant professor of sociology and anthropology in 1948. He resigned at the end of the 1949-50 academic year, and subsequently resumed his teaching at the Central Michigan College of Education, where he went on to publish one article in the CJEPS ("An Appraisal of the Primary Data Utilized in Canadian Penitentiary Statistics." Vol. 18, No. 1, 1952:27-40). During his stay at McGill, he published the article "The Productivity of Social Scientists." AJS, Vol. 55, No. 1, July 1949:25-29.

ELKIN, FREDERICK (United States: b. 1918; B.A. (1940), M.A. (1946), Ph.D. (1951) Chicago) appointed assistant professor of sociology in 1952 following one year of teaching at the University of Missouri (1951-52). He taught sociology for ten years at McGill, during which time he was promoted to the rank of associate professor (1961). He resigned in 1962 to accept a position as associate professor of sociology at the University of Montreal (1962-64). A chairmanship in the Department of Sociology was attained (1964-69) during his next appointment at York University, as well as the position of acting dean of graduate studies (1968-69). He is presently a professor emeritus at York, with areas of specialisation in family, socialisation and voluntary associations. Although he did not publish in the CJEPS, he did produce four book reviews (1957, 1958, 1960, 1963) for the journal, which

was around the same period as his Child and Society (1960) and The Family in Canada (1964) publications. Other publications during his early career at McGill include:

- "The Value Implications of Popular Films." SSR, May-June 1954.
"Popular Hero Symbols and Audience Gratifications." Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol.29, No.3, November 1955:97-107.
with D. Pullman, A. Wipper, and J. Hardman. A Survey of the Immediate Factors Leading to Enlistment in the Army, With Special Emphasis on Advertising. DRML Report No.201-1, Ottawa: Defence Research Board, December, 1955 (96pp.).
with William A. Westley. "The Myth of Adolescent Culture." AJS, Vol.61, No.6, December 1955:680-84.
"God, Radio and the Movies." Reprinted in B. Rosenberg and D.M. White (eds). Mass Culture: The Popular Arts in America. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1956:308-14.
"Television in Suburbia." Food for Thought, May-June 1957:378-82.
with William A. Westley. "The Protective Environment and Adolescent Socialization." Social Forces, Vol.35, 1957: 243-50.
"Canada." in Joseph S. Roucek (ed). Contemporary Sociology. New York, 1958:1101-23.
with Thelma McCormack and William A. Westley. "Anxiety and Persuasion." Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol.23, No.1, Spring 1959:127-33.
"Socialization and the Presentation of Self." Marriage and Family Living, Vol.20, 1958:320-25.
"Censorship and Pressure Groups." Phylon, Vol.5, No.21, 1960:71-80.
"A Study of Advertisements in Montreal Newspapers." Canadian Communications, Vol.1, 1961:15-22,30.
"Socialization of the Atypical Child." In J.S. Roucek (ed). The Unusual Child. New York: Philosophical Library, 1962.
with William A. Westley. "Der Mythos von der Teilkultur der Jugendlichen." In Ludwig von Friedeburg (ed). Jugend in der modernen Gesellschaft. Neue Wissenschaftliche Bibliothek – Sociologie. Berlin: Kippenheuer & Witsch, 1965:99-107.

GARIGUE, PHILIPPE (Belgium; B.Sc., Ph.D. (Econ.) London School of Economics; F.R.S.C.) joined the anthropology staff as assistant professor in 1954. In 1956, he became a Fellow of the British Association of Social Anthropologists. His contract, however, was not renewed for the 1959-60 year, among allegations of "uncollegiality" within the joint department of sociology and anthropology, and he resigned in 1958. He subsequently accepted the rank of dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences and professeur titulaire of sociology and anthropology at the University of Montreal (1959). While there he published two articles in CJEPS (1956 and 1962), one short note (1961), was a member of the Editorial Advisory Board for CJEPS (1962-1963), and during those same years held an appointment as Vice-President of the C.P.S.A.. During his stay at McGill, Garigue's publications included:

- "Colonial Students in London." In Colonial Students in London. London: P.E.P., 1955.
A Bibliographical Introduction to the Study of French Canada. McGill University, 1956 (136pp).
"Mythes et réalités dans l'étude du Canada français." Contributions à l'Étude des Sciences de l'Homme, Vol.3, 1956:123-32.
"St. Joseph's Oratory: An Essay in Interpretation." National Review of Canada, Vol.3, No.5, 1956:241-54.
"The Role of Voluntary Associations. A Report on Laquebec." Macdonald College, Laval University, 1956:14-17.
"St. Justin: A Case-Study in Rural French Canadian Social Organization." CJEPS, Vol.22, No.3, 1956:301-18.
"French Canadian Kinship and Urban Life." American Anthropologist, Vol.58, No.6, 1956:1090-1101.
"Kinship Organization of Italianates in London." in Raymond Firth (ed). Two Studies of Kinship in London. University of London: Athlone Press, 1956:67-93.
"The Social Organization of the Montagnais-Naskapi of Quebec Province." Anthropologica, Vol.4, 1957:107-36.

SOLOMON, DAVID N. (B.A.(1939), M.A.(1942) under F.E. LaViolette, McGill – "The Young Men's Hebrew Association of Montreal: A Study of the Formal and Informal in an Ethnic Institution."; Ph.D.(1952) Chicago – "Career Contingencies of Chicago Physicians.") was appointed to the Department of Sociology as an assistant professor in 1955, having arrived from Canada's Defence Research Board (established 1947). He held the position of Secretary-Treasurer of the Sociology Chapter, C.P.S.A. in 1956-57, and was a member of the Human Resources Research Advisory Committee, Defence Research Board at the same time. Shortly thereafter he was elected to the Executive Council of the C.P.S.A. and the Editorial Advisory Board of the CJEPS (1957-1958). He was promoted to the rank of associate professor in 1961. One year later, he was appointed member of the Committee on Aid to Publication, Social Science Research Council of Canada, and Statistics Committee of the C.P.S.A.. For the year 1962-63, he held the position of Chairman of the Statistics Committee, C.P.S.A., of the Conference Committee, and of Sessions on Occupational Sociology, for the 1964 Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association. For the same year, he was appointed research associate, Department of

Psychiatry, Jewish General Hospital of Montreal. During the following year in 1963-64, he was a member of the Technical Advisory Committee on Health, Education, and Welfare, Concerning Smoking and Health, for the Department of Health and Welfare, Ottawa. In that same year, he was a member of Queen Mary Veterans' Hospital Research Advisory Committee. In 1964-65, he was a member of the C.P.S.A. Committee on Occupational Classification. In 1965, he was residing at 664 Belmont Ave., in Montreal. The next year in 1965-66, he sat on the Editorial Board of the C.R.S.A.. He chaired the Defence Research Board's Subcommittee on Sociological and Social Psychological Research, of the Human Resources Research Advisory Committee, in 1966-67. The following year, 1967-68, he was a member of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Liaison Committee, for the C.S.A.A.. In that same year, he was granted one year's leave of absence by McGill in order to accept a Canada Council Fellowship for the preparation of a book manuscript. He was promoted to the rank of professor of sociology in 1969 and Chairman of the Department of Sociology in 1970. His only publication in CJEPS ("Sociological Research in a Military Organization." Vol.20, No.4, 1954:531-41), was an article submitted while he was located in Toronto, although he did review one book for CJEPS (1957) while at McGill. During his early career at McGill his publications included:

- "Professional Persons in Bureaucratic Organizations." Symposium of Preventative and Social Psychiatry, sponsored jointly by the Walter Reed Army Medical Center and the National Research Council, Washington, D.C., 1958:253-69.
- "The Sociology of Applied Science." The McGill News, Winter 1958:22-29.
- "Professional Persons in Bureaucratic Organizations." Public Aid in Illinois, Vol.27, February 1960:4-8.
- "Ethnic and Class Differences Among Hospitals as Contingencies in Medical Careers." AJS, Vol.66, 1961:463-71.
- "Functions Performed by Canadian Engineers and Scientists." IRE Transactions of the Professional Group on Engineering Management, Vol.EM-8, 1961:210-14.
- "The Professional School in the University." Canadian Nurse, Vol.58, 1962:50-56.
- "L'ecole professionnelle a l'universite...avantage ou prejudice?" L'Infirmiere canadienne, Vol.58, 1962:182-90, 199.
- with Agnes M. Fergusson "The Distribution and Functions of Canadian Engineers and Scientists" In E.F. Beach and J.C. Weldon (eds). Conference on Statistics, 1960: Papers. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1962:183-216.
- with S. Lamb. The Social Behaviour Surrounding Children's Health Problems. Toronto: Canadian Conference on Children, 1965 (145pp.).
- "Sociological Perspectives on Occupations." In Howard S. Becker, et al. (eds). Institutions and the Persons: Papers Presented to Everett C. Hughes. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1969:3-13.
- "The Soldierly Self and the Peace-Keeping Role: Canadian Officers in Peace-Keeping Forces." In J.A.A. Van Doom (ed). Military Profession and Military Regimes. The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1969:52-69.
- "Role and Self-Conception: Adaptation and Change in Occupations." In T. Shibusani (ed). Human Nature and Collective Behavior: Papers in Honor of Herbert Blumer. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1971:286-300.

BRETON, RAYMOND (B.A.(1952) Manitoba; M.A.(1958) Chicago; Ph.D.(1961) Johns Hopkins; F.R.S.C.) was appointed assistant professor of sociology during the year 1960-61. Prior to his arrival at McGill, he held an appointment as an assistant professor of sociology in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Montreal, from 1958. While at the University of Montreal, he published one article in the CJEPS ("Group Formation Among Immigrants: Criteria and Processes." Vol.26, No.3, 1960:465-77) which he co-authored with his colleague Maurice Pinard. He resigned from McGill in 1964, and subsequent teaching appointments followed at Johns Hopkins University and the University of Toronto, where he was appointed as associate professor of sociology in 1968. While at Toronto, he was promoted to the rank of professor in 1971, and has continued an academic career there up to the present. His interests include: Ethnicity, Language and Race in Canadian Society; Complex Organizations; and Public Policy. During his stay at McGill he published the following:

- with Albert Breton. "Le Separatisme ou le respect du statu quo." Cite Libre, Vol.13, April 1962:17-28.
- with Claude Flement, F. Fontaine, and M. Pinard (trans.) Application of Graph Theory to Group Structure. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963.
- "Challenge of a Technological Culture." Social Worker, January-February 1964:24-27.
- with A. Breton, C. Bruneau, P. Gauthier, M. Lalonde, M. Pinard, and P.E. Trudeau. "An Appeal for Realism in Politics." Canadian Forum, May 1964.

PINARD, MAURICE (Drummondville, Quebec: b.April 25, 1929; B.A.(College de St-Laurent; 1951), LL.L.(law; 1954), M.A. (law, under Maximilian Caron, Dean of the Faculty of Law; 1955) Montreal; Certificates of Sociology and Social Psychology (1956-1957) Universite de Paris; Ph.D.(sociology, under James S. Coleman and A. Stinchcomb; 1967) Johns Hopkins) appointed to the sociology staff as assistant professor in 1963. Prior to his arrival at McGill, he was part of The Social Research Group at the University of Montreal (Research Associate from 1957-60, Research Director from 1960-65), from where he submitted and published in CJEPS an article which he co-authored with Raymond Breton (1960). He taught as professeur adjoint for the year 1959-60 in the Department of Sociology, University of Montreal. For the year 1963-64, he was Chairman of the Employment Subcommittee, American Sociological Association, at their 1964 Annual Meetings. In 1967, he published his second article in CJEPS ("One-Party Dominance and Third Parties." Vol.33, No.3, 1967:358-73), as well as two book reviews (1966 and 1967). He was promoted to the rank of associate professor in 1967. During the years 1969-71, he sat as a member of the Editorial Board of the CRSA. He was granted a one year's leave of absence by McGill from September 1, 1970, in order to work on his research project on social movements in Quebec. He was promoted to the rank of professor in 1971. In 1973 he was elected Fellow of the Royal Society of Canada. He continues to teach at McGill, specialising in comparative ethnic relations, social and political movements and political sociology. Some of his earlier publications while teaching at McGill include:

- with A. Breton, C. Bruneau, Y. Gauthier, M. Lalonde, and P.E. Trudeau. "L'agriculture au Quebec." Cite Libre, No.15, 1965:9-16 (published in English in Canadian Forum, November 1965:182-84).
- with A. Breton, C. Bruneau, Y. Gauthier, and M. Lalonde. "Bizarre algebre: Commentaires sur le Rapport Preliminaire de la Commission sur le Bilinguisme et le Biculturalisme." Cite Libre, December 1965 (also in The Montreal Star, December 10, 1965).
- "Marriage and Divorce Decisions and the Larger Social System: A Case Study in Social Change." Social Forces, Vol.44, 1966:341-55.
- "La faiblesse des Conservateurs et la montee du Credit Social en 1962." Recherches Sociographiques, Vol.7, 1966:360-63.
- Translation. John Meisel and Richard Van Loon "Attitudes des canadiens envers les depenses electorales, 1965-1966." In Etude du Financement des Partis Politiques Canadiens. Comite des depenses electorales, Ottawa, 1966:23-155.
- "Poverty and Political Movements." Social Problems, Vol.15, 1967:250-63 (also in B. Blisshen et al. (eds). Canadian Society. Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1968:462-77).
- "Mass Society and Political Movements: A New Formulation." AJS, Vol.73, May 1968 (Reprinted in C.J. Larson and P.C. Wesburn (eds). Power, Participation and Ideology. New York: David McKay, 1969:306-15; also in H.P. Dritzal (ed). Recent Sociology, No.1, New York: Macmillan Company, 1969:99-114).
- "Classes sociales et comportement electoral." In Vincent Lemieux (ed). Quatre elections provinciales au Quebec, 1956-1966. Quebec: Les Presses de l'Universite Laval, 1969:141-78.
- "La rationalite de l'electorat: le cas de 1962." In Vincent Lemieux (ed). Quatre elections provinciales au Quebec, 1956-1966. Quebec: Les Presses de l'Universite Laval, 1969:179-95.
- with Jerome Kirk and Donald Von Eschen. "Processes of Recruitment in the Sit-In Movement." Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol.33, 1969:355-69 (also in J.A. Geschwender (ed). The Black Revolt. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1971:184-97).
- with J. Kirk and D. Von Eschen. "The Conditions of Direct Action in a Democratic Society." Western Political Quarterly, Vol.22, 1969:309-25 (also in Jack R. Van Der Slik (ed). Black Conflict with White America. Columbus: Charles Merrill Publishing Co., 1970:213-33).
- with J. Kirk and D. Von Eschen. "The Disintegration of the Negro Non-Violent Movement." Journal of Peace Research, Vol.6, No.3, 1969:215-34.
- "Working Class Politics: An Interpretation of the Quebec Case." CRSA, Vol.7, 1970:87-109.
- "One-Party Dominance and Third Parties." In Orest M. Kruhlak, R. Schultz and S. Pobihushchy (eds). Canadian Political Processes. Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970:165-79.
- "Structural Attachments and Political Support in Urban Politics." In M. Aiken and P.E. Mott (eds). The Structure of Community Power. New York: Random House, 1970:474-87.
- The Rise of a Third Party: A Study in Crisis Politics. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1971 (285pp.); Enlarged Edition, McGill-Queen's University Press, 1975.
- "Third Parties in Canada Revisited." CJPS, Vol.6, 1973:439-60.

SOURCE: Much of the biographical and bibliographical material was drawn from the McGill University Annual Report for the years between 1933-1971. Maurice Pinard's Curriculum Vitae helped with his inclusion. The remainder was drawn from the pages of CJEPS, and more specifically, from the sections on "Current Topics: University Appointments, Promotions, and Resignations" found throughout the volumes.

APPENDIX C: *Sociology articles in the CJEPS under study.*

1935-1949:

E.C.Hughes "Industry and the Rural System in Quebec." Vol.4,No.3, August 1938:341-349.

R.E.L.Faris "Interrelated Problems of the Expanding Metropolis." Vol.5,No.3, August 1939:341-347.

C.A.Dawson "Sociology as a Specialized Science." Vol.6,No.2, May 1940:153-169.

F.E.LaViolette "The American-Born Japanese and the World Crisis." Vol.7,No.4, November 1941:517-527.

C.A.Dawson "Canada in Perspective." Vol.9,No.3, August 1943:289-299.

F.E.LaViolette "Social Psychological Characteristics of Evacuated Japanese." Vol.11,No.3, August 1945:
420-431.

C.A.Dawson "Arctic Survey." Vol.11,No.4, November 1945:578-600.

O.Hall "The Use of Sampling Procedures and Role Theory in Sociological Research." Vol.15,No.1, February
1949:1-13.

1950-1964:

A.D.Ross "Organized Philanthropy in an Urban Community." Vol.18,No.4, November 1952:474-486.

A.D.Ross "French and English Canadian Contacts and Institutional Change." Vol.20,No.3, August 1954:
281-295.

O.Hall "Some Problems in the Provision of Medical Services." Vol.20,No.4, November 1954:456-466.

W.A.Westley "The Nature and Control of Hostile Crowds." Vol.23,No.1, February 1957:33-41.

H.E.Roseborough "Some Sociological Dimensions of Consumer Spending." Vol.26,No.3, August 1960:452-464.

APPENDIX D: *Statistical information reported in the CJEPS regarding publishing procedure (1953-66).*

Volume	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31
Year	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965
Books reviewed	[60]	54	64	65(57)	84	61	65	88	88	94	120	86	75
Reviewers	[35]	30	43	43	[57]	[45]	[53]	[69]	[62]	[52]	[87]	[64]	[77]
Notes Published	[11]	11	12	11(13)	13	8(7)	13(8)	8	16	9	8	15	10(9)
Articles Published	[28]	32	29	32(30)	27	33	29	33	29	30	24	29	28(23)
-Economics		17	20	16(14)	11	15	13	14	17	15(18)	17	19	17
-Political Science		12	7	10	12	10	12	14	7	11	5	10	11
-Soc. & Anthro.	[1]	3	2	6	4	8	4	5	1	1	2		
In year ending May 30 - June 1	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966
Manuscripts:													
Received (total)	122	130	124	96	104	106	113	117	109	134	126	120	135
-Economics		92	84	59	58	61	72	71	71	83			
-Political Science		30	29	27	27	34	32	37	27	37		34	48
-Soc. & Anthro.		8	11	10	9	11	9	9	11	14			
...from address in													
-Canada	55					49	52	70	45	63			
-United States						45	56	47	64	64			
-other						12	5	1	1	7			
Accepted (total)		40	35	[39]					37		29(a)	26	29
-Economics		25	22	24	26	19(7)	15(6)	27(10)					
-Political Science		10	7	11	12	15(2)	11(1)	11(3)				7	11
-Soc. & Anthro.		4	6	4	5	6(1)	4	3(1)					
-from Canada									26				
-from U.S.									11				
-from other									1				
Rejected (total)	61	70	70									79	93
-Economics		48											
-Political Science		19										25	35
-Soc. & Anthro.		3											
-from Canada	16					40%	60%	67%					
-from U.S.						80%	85%	62%					
-from other								1					
Withdrawn/being revised by author	5	3	5		3							1	
In process/under consideration	4	4	7		8	12	11	12	10		10	14	13

- (a) this total represents the number of manuscripts published or accepted.
 () round parentheses contain discrepant totals as reported the following year.
 [] brackets contain totals as counted by this author.
 { } parentheses contain the number of notes included in the sub-total.

Source: Published minutes of the annual meetings of the C.P.S.A. in CJEPS, Vols.20-32.

APPENDIX E: C.P.S.A. Meetings, Memberships, and CJEPS Particulars.

Year	Annual Meeting	Location of Meeting	Membership			Account (deficit)	CJEPS Volume	No. of Pages
			C.P.S.A.	O.C.(a)	A.S.C.(b)			
1913	1	Ottawa	250(c)					
1930	2	Ottawa	?					
1931	3	Ottawa	?					
1932	4	Toronto	?					
1933	5	Ottawa	?					
1934	6	McGill University	500					
1935	7	Queen's University	675			84.73	1	650
1936	8	Chateau Laurier, Ottawa	950			48.36	2	614
1937	9	McMaster University	850			(15.08)	3	626
1938	10	Chateau Laurier, Ottawa	900			43.24	4	618
1939	11	McGill University	925			(9.77)	5	576
1940	12	London, Ontario	?			(69.60)	6	644
1941	13	Queen's University	?			86.94	7	624
1942	14	Trinity College, U. of T.	900+			164.92	8	658
1943	15	McMaster University	?			217.60	9	628
1944	16	McGill University	?			1,018.45(d)	10(e)	554
1945	17	Queen's University	1,000			1,339.08	11	662
1946	18	University of Toronto	1,200			1,687.36	12	560
1947	19	Laval University	1,380			1,931.92	13	636
1948	20	University of British Columbia	1,430			846.70	14	566
1949	21	Dalhousie University	1,447			959.13(f)	15	592
1950	22	Royal Military College	1,421			1,210.45	16	576
1951	23	McGill University	1,410			1,502.13	17(g)	596
1952	24	Laval University	1,377			1,387.97	18	566
1953	25	University of Western Ontario	1,347			1,229.33(h)	19	552
1954	26	University of Manitoba	1,461	?		1,880.40	20	552(i)
1955	27	University of Toronto	1,504	123	12	2,154.79(j)	21	552
1956	28	University of Montreal	1,645	177	?	3,302.12	22	568
1957	29	University of Ottawa	1,700	196	50	4,831.43	23	600
1958	30	University of Alberta	1,723	196	50	6,517.00	24	600
1959	31	University of Saskatchewan	1,633	180	71	8,695.00	25	536
1960	32	Queen's University	1,926	200	?	8,652.00	26	654(k)
1961	33	University of Montreal	2,080	153	95	9,471.00	27	568
1962	34	McMaster University	2,351	103	97	9,261.00	28	648
1963	35	Laval University	2,427	?	101	11,546.00	29	600
1964	36	Prince of Wales College	2,514	?	106	12,775.00	30	648
1965	37	University of British Columbia	2,842	?	93	11,085.00	31	632
1966	38	University of Sherbrooke, Que.	2,711(l)	?	-	7,842.00	32	552
1967	39	Carleton University	?	?	-	2,462.00(m)	33	649

(a) Ottawa Chapter; (b) Anthropological and Sociological Chapter; (c) tentatively agreed to join proposed society; (d) includes \$500.00 insurance claim for loss of *Proceedings* file (pre-1934) to fire; (e) 20% more text per paper; (f) membership fee raised from \$3-\$4 and life membership from \$50-\$75 (summer 1948); (g) expensive type adopted -- from monotype to linotype; (h) fee raised to \$5, student \$2.50, and life to \$90 (June 1952); (i) pages excluding 8 pages of index and 16 pages of advertising (Vols.20-33); (j) motion to establish annual corporate membership of \$100 defeated, fee raised to \$6, joint fee (with Canadian Historical Association) raised to \$10, student to \$3, and life stays at \$90 (June 1954); (k) 25th anniversary issue in February; (l) decrease due to severing of Anthropology-Sociology Chapter, becoming the C.S.A.A.; (m) fee raised from \$6-\$10, student remains \$3, life memberships suspended.

Source: K.W. Taylor "The Foundation of the Canadian Political Science Association." *CJEPS*, Vol.33, No.4, 1967:581-85 (for 1913-33); *CJEPS*, Vols.1-33 (for 1934-67).

APPENDIX F: *The C.P.S.A. and the International Sociological Association (I.S.A.):
An early chronology.*

- 1949 - I.S.A. formed in September at a meeting of delegates convened by UNESCO in Oslo, Norway.
- C.P.S.A. representative at meeting was Carl A. Dawson.
- 1950 - C.A. Dawson and S.D. Clark nominated by the C.P.S.A. Executive to the I.S.A. Council.
- First World Congress of Sociology on September 4-9, in Zurich, Switzerland. General theme: "Sociological Research in Its Bearing on International Relations."
- Of the three world academic sessions held this year by the International Economics Association, the International Political Science Association, and the International Sociological Association, attendance at the I.S.A. Congress was by far the largest.
- Jean-Charles Falardeau appointed C.P.S.A. representative at the First Congress.
- Louis Wirth (1897-1952) appointed as first president of the I.S.A.
- 1951 - C.P.S.A. formally admitted to the I.S.A.
- C.P.S.A. Executive authorises a \$20 annual membership fee to the I.S.A. (as compared to the \$100 annual membership fee authorised for the International Economics Association).
- 1952 - A four-member C.P.S.A. committee was established to arrange the Canadian participation at the 1953 I.S.A. meeting: S.D. Clark, J.-C. Falardeau, O. Hall, and N. Keyfitz.
- 1953 - S.D. Clark elected as C.P.S.A. representative to the I.S.A. Council, with J.-C. Falardeau as alternate.
- Second World Congress of Sociology on August 24-September 1, in Liege, Belgium. General theme: "Social Stratification and Social Mobility, and Intergroup Mediation." Discussion section one: "Recent Developments in Sociological Research." Discussion section two: "Training and Professional Activities of Sociologists."
- 1954 - I.S.A. quarterly Current Sociology has completed its second volume.
- 1955 - S.D. Clark has been invited by the I.S.A. to present a paper at the next world congress.
- 1956 - J.-C. Falardeau appointed as C.P.S.A. representative to the I.S.A. Council, with O. Hall and S.D. Clark as alternates.
- Third World Congress of Sociology on August 22-29, at the Koninklijk Instituut voor de Tropen, Amsterdam, Netherlands. General theme: "Problems of Social Change in the 20th Century."
- S.D. Clark is C.P.S.A. representative at the I.S.A. Council meeting held during third congress in Amsterdam.
- S.D. Clark read a paper entitled "Education and Social Change in Canada" at third congress.
- 1959 - O. Hall appointed as C.P.S.A. representative to the I.S.A. Council, with J.-C. Falardeau as alternate.
- Fourth World Congress of Sociology on September 8-15, in Stresa.
- O. Hall and J.-C. Falardeau represented the C.P.S.A. at the fourth congress.
- O. Hall read a paper at the fourth congress.

SOURCE: Published minutes of the annual meetings of the C.P.S.A. in CJEPS, Vols.16-25.

APPENDIX G: Ottawa Chapter of the C.P.S.A.: Executive Council, 1956-1966.

1954	Chapter established.		
1954-56	No record.		
1956-57	<i>President:</i> Maurice Lamontagne <i>Vice-President:</i> F.H. Underhill <i>Past President:</i> K.W. Taylor <i>Secretary-Treasurer:</i> B.J. Drabble <i>Asst. Secretary-Treasurer:</i> Miss E.M. Whyte	<i>Executive:</i> Stewart Bates M. Hicks J.F. Parkinson J. Porter L. Rasminsky	L.E. Rowebottom Mrs. D.B. Sinclair M.F. Sprott D.H. Steinthorson
1957-58	<i>President:</i> F.H. Underhill <i>Vice-President:</i> R.B. Bryce <i>Past President:</i> Maurice Lamontagne <i>Secretary-Treasurer:</i> B.J. Drabble <i>Asst. Secretary-Treasurer:</i> Miss E.M. Whyte	<i>Executive:</i> Stewart Bates Rev. F. Brault D.J. Daly Muni Frumhartz Pauline Jewett	F.H. Leacey J.F. Parkinson M.F. Sprott K.W. Taylor
1958-59	<i>President:</i> R.B. Bryce <i>Vice-President:</i> W.E. Duffett <i>Past President:</i> F.H. Underhill <i>Secretary-Treasurer:</i> J.P. Francis <i>Asst. Secretary-Treasurer:</i> M. Spalding	<i>Directors:</i> Rev. F. Brault L.E. Couillard D.J. Daly B.J. Drabble Muni Frumhartz	D.H. Fullerton Pauline Jewett F.H. Leacey S.S. Reisman
1959-60	No record.		
1960-61	<i>President:</i> H. Scott Gordon <i>Vice-President:</i> W. Lawson <i>Past President:</i> W.E. Duffett <i>Secretary-Treasurer:</i> J.E. Gander	<i>Directors:</i> Rev. J.M. Belanger J.A. Dawson J.P. Francis S. Pollock	Marcel Rioux F.H. Underhill
1961-62	<i>President:</i> A.F.W. Plumtre <i>Vice-President:</i> Andrew Stewart <i>Secretary-Treasurer:</i> J.E. Gander	<i>Executive:</i> Eugene A. Forsey J.A. Macdonald Sylvia Ostry	
1962-63	<i>President:</i> Andrew Stewart <i>Vice-President:</i> W. Lawson <i>Secretary-Treasurer:</i> E.A. Oestrelcher	<i>Executive:</i> A. Andras J.E. Gander K.D. McRae	
1963-64	<i>President:</i> R.W. Lawson <i>Vice-President:</i> Jean Boucher <i>Secretary-Treasurer:</i> E.A. Oestreicher	<i>Executive:</i> Russel Bell E. Gallant K.D. McRae	
1964-65	No record.		
1965-66	<i>President:</i> A.J.R. Smith <i>Vice-President:</i> T. Brewis <i>Secretary-Treasurer:</i> W.A. McKay <i>Asst. Secretary-Treasurer:</i> D.W. Wilson	<i>Members:</i> B.J. Drabble A.W. Johnson A.R. Rubinoff Louis Sabourin	V.F. Valentine Miss D. Walters

SOURCE: Published minutes of the annual meetings of the C.P.S.A. in CJEPS, Vol. 22-32.

APPENDIX H: *Anthropology and Sociology Chapter of the C.P.S.A.: Executive Council, 1955-1966.*

1955-57	<i>Chairman:</i> Samuel Delbert Clark*	<i>Secretary-Treasurer:</i> David N. Solomon
1957-58	<i>Chairman:</i> Harry B. Hawthorn <i>Vice-Chairman:</i> Aileen D. Ross	<i>Secretary-Treasurer:</i> Kaspar D. Naegele
1958-59	<i>Honorary Chairman:</i> Marius Barbeau <i>Chairman:</i> Frank E. Jones <i>Vice-Chairman:</i> Norbert Lacoste <i>Secretary-Treasurer:</i> Frank G. Vallee	<i>Members:</i> Jean-Charles Falardeau David N. Solomon E. Jacques Brazeau Douglas R. Pullman
1959-60	<i>Honorary Chairmen:</i> Marius Barbeau Carl A. Dawson <i>Chairman:</i> John Porter <i>Vice-Chairman:</i> Henry Cooperstock <i>Secretary-Treasurer:</i> Marcel Rioux	<i>Two-year members:</i> Tom F.S. McFeat Robert L. James <i>One-year members:</i> Jean-Charles Falardeau David N. Solomon
1960-61	<i>Honorary Chairmen:</i> Marius Barbeau Carl A. Dawson <i>Chairman:</i> Nathan Keyfitz <i>Vice-Chairman:</i> Guy Rocher <i>Secretary-Treasurer:</i> Jean Burnet	<i>Two-year members:</i> Tom F.S. McFeat Henry Cooperstock <i>One-year members:</i> C.S. Belshaw Marc-Adelard Tremblay
1961-62	<i>Honorary Chairmen:</i> Marius Barbeau Carl A. Dawson <i>Chairmen:</i> Guy Rocher <i>Vice-Chairman:</i> R.W. Dunning <i>Secretary-Treasurer:</i> Jean Burnet	<i>Members-at-large:</i> <i>Two-year:</i> Donald E. Willmott John Meisel <i>One-year:</i> C.S. Belshaw Marc-Adelard Tremblay
1962-63	<i>Honorary Chairmen:</i> Marius Barbeau Carl A. Dawson <i>Chairman:</i> Robert L. James <i>Vice-Chairman:</i> Marc-Adelard Tremblay <i>Secretary-Treasurer:</i> Jean Burnet	<i>Members-at-large:</i> <i>Two-year:</i> Father Norbert Lacoste P.J. Giffen <i>One-year:</i> Donald E. Willmott John Meisel
1963-64	<i>Honorary Chairmen:</i> Marius Barbeau Carl A. Dawson <i>Chairman:</i> Frederick Elkin <i>Vice-Chairman:</i> Howard Roseborough <i>Secretary-Treasurer:</i> Jean Burnet	<i>Members-at-large:</i> <i>Two-year:</i> Charles Brant Zenon Sametz <i>One-year:</i> Father Norbert Lacoste P.J. Giffen
1964-65	<i>Honorary Chairman:</i> Marius Barbeau <i>Chairman:</i> David N. Solomon <i>Vice-Chairman:</i> Gerard Fortin <i>Secretary-Treasurer:</i> Leo Zakuta	<i>Members-at-large:</i> <i>Two-year:</i> Reginald A.H. Robson Desmond Connor <i>One-year:</i> Charles Brant Zenon Sametz
1965-66	<i>Honorary Chairmen:</i> Marius Barbeau Everett C. Hughes <i>Chairman:</i> Marc-Adelard Tremblay <i>Vice-Chairman:</i> R.W. Dunning <i>Secretary-Treasurer:</i> Rex Lucas <i>Managing Editor of the C.R.S.A.:</i> Jean Burnet	<i>Members-at-large:</i> <i>Two-year:</i> Richard Salisbury Charles Hobart <i>One-year:</i> Reginald A.H. Robson Desmond Connor

* Representative Chairman

SOURCE: Published minutes of the annual meetings of the C.P.S.A. in CJEPS, Vols.21-32.

APPENDIX I: *Presidents of the C.P.S.A. and Chairmen of the Anthropology and Sociology Chapter of the C.P.S.A..*

THE CANADIAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION

Presidents of the Association, 1913-1967

1913 Adam Shortt	1949 William Burton Hurd
1930 Oscar Douglas Skelton	1950 Clifford Austin Curtis
1931 Simon James McLean	1951 Georges-Henri Levesque
1932 Edward Johns Urwick	1952 Herbert Marshall
1933 Stephen Butler Leacock	1953 Alexander Brady
1934 Duncan Alexander MacGibbon	1954 J. Alex Corry
1935 Robert Hamilton Coats	1955 J. Douglas Gibson
1936 William Archibald Mackintosh	1956 George Edwin Britnell
1937 Harold Adams Innis	1957 George Alexander Elliott
1938 John Wesley Dafoe	1958 Samuel Delbert Clark
1939 Joseph Clarence Hemmeon	1959 Mabel F. Timlin
1940 William Clifford Clark	1960 C.A. Ashley
1941 Humfrey Michell	1961 Eugene A. Forsey
1942 Carl Addington Dawson	1962 W.J. Waines
1943 Robert Alexander MacKay	1963 Crawford Brough Macpherson
1944 Kenneth W. Taylor	1964 Jean-Charles Falardeau
1945 Robert MacGregor Dawson	1965 Harry G. Johnson
1946 F.A. Knox	1966 Anthony D. Scott
1947 Vincent Wheeler Bladen	1967 Henry B. Mayo
1948 Henry Forbes Angus	

THE ANTHROPOLOGY AND SOCIOLOGY CHAPTER OF THE C.P.S.A.

Chairmen of the Chapter, 1955-1965

1955 Samuel Delbert Clark*	1961 Guy A.A. Rocher
1956 Samuel Delbert Clark*	1962 Robert L. James
1957 Harry B. Hawthorn	1963 Frederick Elkin
1958 Frank Edward Jones	1964 David N. Solomon
1959 John A. Porter	1965 Marc-Adelard Tremblay
1960 Nathan Keyfitz	

* Representative Chairman

References

JOURNAL ABBREVIATIONS

ABS	<i>American Behavioral Scientist</i>
AJS	<i>American Journal of Sociology</i>
ASR	<i>American Sociological Review</i>
CES	<i>Canadian Ethnic Studies</i>
CHR	<i>Canadian Historical Review</i>
CJEPS	<i>Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science</i>
CJPS	<i>Canadian Journal of Political Science</i>
CJS	<i>Canadian Journal of Sociology</i>
CRSA	<i>Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology</i>
CS	<i>Current Sociology</i>
IS	<i>Insurgent Sociologist</i>
JCS	<i>Journal of Canadian Studies</i>
JHBS	<i>Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences</i>
JHS	<i>Journal of the History of Sociology</i>
S-S	<i>Society-Société</i>
SI	<i>Sociological Inquiry</i>
SSR	<i>Sociology and Social Research</i>
TAS	<i>The American Sociologist</i>
TSQ	<i>The Sociological Quarterly</i>
TSR	<i>The Sociological Review</i>
UL	<i>Urban Life</i>

Anthropological Newsletter, Vol.30, No.9, December 1989:4.

Ashley, C.A. "Annual Meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association, 1941." CJEPS, Vol. 7, No.3, August 1941:478-79.

Bannister, Robert C. Sociology and Scientism: The American Quest for Objectivity, 1880-1940. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1987.

Becker, Howard S.; Blanche Geer; David Reisman and Robert S. Weiss (eds). Institutions and the Person: Papers Presented to Everett C. Hughes. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1968.

Berger, Peter L. and Brigitte Sociology: A Biographical Approach. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1972.

- Bladen, V.W. "Annual Meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association, 1937." CJEPS, Vol. 3, No.3, August 1937:472-75.
- Bladen, V.W. "Annual Meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association, 1938." CJEPS, Vol. 4, No.3, August 1938:460-64.
- Bladen, V.W. "A Journal is Born: 1935." CJEPS, Vol.26, No.1, February 1960:1-5.
- Bowker, Alan (ed). The Social Criticism of Stephen Leacock. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1973.
- Brym, Robert J. "New directions in Anglo-Canadian historical sociology." CJS, Vol.4, No.3, 1979: vii-xi.
- Brym, Robert J. "Anglo-Canadian Sociology." CS, Vol.34, No.1, Spring 1986.
- Bulmer, Martin "Quantification and Chicago Social Science in the 1920s: A Neglected Tradition." JHBS, Vol.17, 1981:312-31.
- Bulmer, Martin "Chicago Sociology and the Society for Social Research: A Comment." JHBS, Vol. 19, October 1983:353-56.
- Bulmer, Martin The Chicago School of Sociology. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984.
- Bulmer, Martin "The Chicago School of Sociology: What Made it a 'School'?" JHS Vol.5, No.2, Spring 1985:61-77.
- Burgess, Ernest W. and Donald J. Bogue "Research in Urban Society: A Long View" In Ernest W. Burgess and Donald J. Bogue (eds). Urban Sociology. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, [1964] 1967:1-14.
- Burnet, Jean "Minorities I have Belonged to." CES, Vol.13, No.1, 1981:24-36.
- Callbeck, Lorne Clayton My Island, My People. Charlottetown: The Prince Edward Island Heritage Foundation, 1979.
- Campbell, Douglas F. Beginnings: Essays on the History of Canadian Sociology. Port Credit, Ont.: The Scribblers' Press, 1983.
- Carey, James T. Sociology and Public Affairs: The Chicago School. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1975.
- Cavan, Ruth Shonle "The Chicago School of Sociology, 1918-1933." UL, Vol.11, No.4, January 1983:407-20.
- Chekki, Danesh A. American Sociological Hegemony: Transnational Explorations. Lanham; New York: University Press of America, 1987.
- Clark, S.D. Review of C.A. Dawson and Eva R. Younge Pioneering in the Prairie Provinces: The Social Side of the Settlement Process, in CHR, Vol. 21, 1940:336-38.
- Clark, S.D. Review of Talcott Parsons The Social System, in AJS, Vol.58, No.1, July 1952:103-4.

- Clark, S.D. "Sociology in Canada: an historical over-view." CJS, Vol.1, No.2, 1975:225-34.
- Clark, S.D. "The changing image of sociology in English-speaking Canada." CJS, Vol.4, No.4, 1979:393-403.
- Clark, S.D. "How the Department of Sociology Came Into Being." In R. Helmes-Hayes (ed). A Quarter-Century of Sociology at the University of Toronto, 1963-1988. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press, 1988:1-10.
- Clarkson, Stephen H.E. "Annual Meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association, 1967" CJEPS, Vol.33, No.3, August 1967:447-57.
- Crano, William D. and Marilynn B. Brewer Principles of Research in Social Psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1973.
- Dawson, Carl A. and Warner E. Gettys Introduction to Sociology. New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1929.
- Dawson, Clara E. Leaves From Dawson's Grove: A Tree That Became a Forest. A private compilation of 11 volumes, 1982.
- Directory of Graduates: 1890-1965. Montreal: The Graduates' Society of McGill University, 1966.
- Drummond, Ian M. Political Economy at the University of Toronto: A History of the Department, 1888-1982. Faculty of Arts and Science, University of Toronto, 1983.
- Duncan, Otis Dudley "Introduction." In William F. Ogburn On Culture and Social Change. (Edited and with an Introduction by Otis Dudley Duncan). Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964:vii-xxii.
- Dupre, J.Stefan "Annual Meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association, 1966." CJEPS, Vol.32, No.3, August 1966:380-86.
- Durkheim Emile "Sociology and its Scientific Field." In Lewis A. Coser (ed). Georg Simmel. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965:43-49.
- Eastman, H.C. "Annual Meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association, 1956." CJEPS, Vol. 22, No.3, August 1956:384-87.
- Eastman, H.C. "Annual Meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association, 1957." CJEPS, Vol. 23, No.3, August 1957:412-15.
- Eastman, H.C. "Annual Meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association, 1958." CJEPS, Vol. 24, No.3, August 1958:410-13.
- Eastman, H.C. "Annual Meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association, 1959." CJEPS, Vol. 25, No.3, August 1959:341-44.
- Eastman, H.C. "Annual Meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association, 1960." CJEPS, Vol. 26, No.3, August 1960:484-487.

- Eastman, H.C. "Annual Meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association, 1961." CJEPS, Vol. 27, No.3, August 1961:384-87.
- Eastman, H.C. "Annual Meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association, 1962." CJEPS, Vol. 28, No.3, August 1962:434-38.
- Eastman, H.C. "Annual Meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association, 1963." CJEPS, Vol. 29, No.3, August 1963:372-75.
- Eastman, H.C. "Annual Meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association, 1964." CJEPS, Vol. 30, No.3, August 1964:439-43.
- Evans, Richard "Sociological Journals and the *Decline* of Chicago Sociology: 1929-1945." JHS, Vol.6:2, Spring 1986; Vol.7:1, Fall 1986; Vol.7:2, Spring 1987:109-30.
- Faris, Robert E.L. Social Disorganization. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1948 and 2nd edition 1955.
- Faris, Robert E.L. Social Psychology. New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1952.
- Faris, Robert E.L. "American Sociology." In George Gurvitch and Wilbert E. Moore (eds). Twentieth Century Sociology. New York: Books for Libraries Press, [1945] 1971:538-61.
- Faris, Robert E.L. Chicago Sociology, 1920-1932. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, [1967] 1979.
- Faught, Jim "Presuppositions of the Chicago School in the Work of Everett C. Hughes." TAS, Vol. 15, May 1980:72-82.
- Fay, C.R. Review of C.A. Dawson and Eva R. Younge Pioneering in the Prairie Provinces: The Social Side of the Settlement Process, in CJEPS, Vol.7, No.1, February 1941:120-22.
- Fay, C.R. and L. Tarshis Review of C.A. Dawson The Settlement of the Peace River Country: A Study of a Pioneer Area, in CJEPS, Vol.1, No.1, February 1935:110-16.
- Floro, George K. Review of E.C. Hughes The Sociological Eye: Selected Papers, in JHBS, Vol. 22, No.1, January 1986:66-72.
- Frisby, David Georg Simmel. Chichester, Sussex: Ellis Horwood Ltd., 1984.
- Hagedorn, Robert (ed). Sociology. Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston of Canada Limited, 1980.
- Hall, Oswald "Carl A. Dawson, 1887-1964." CRSA, Vol.1, 1964:115-17.
- Hall, Oswald "Some Recollections of Sociology in Two Universities: McGill and the University of Toronto." In R. Helmes-Hayes (ed). A Quarter-Century of Sociology at the University of Toronto, 1963-1988. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press, 1988:11-23.

- Harvey, Lee "The nature of *schools* in the sociology of knowledge: The case of the 'Chicago School'." TSR, Vol.35, No.2, May 1987:245-78.
- Hawthorn, Harry B. Review of Forrest E. LaViolette The Canadian Japanese and World War II: A Sociological and Psychological Account, in CJEPS, Vol.15, No.1, February 1949:99-101.
- Helmes-Hayes, Richard C. "A Dualistic Vision': Robert Ezra Park and the Classical Ecological Theory of Social Inequality." TSQ, Vol.28, No.3, 1987:387-409.
- Helmes-Hayes, Richard (ed). A Quarter-Century of Sociology at the University of Toronto, 1963-1988. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press, 1988.
- Hiller, Harry H. "The Canadian sociology movement: analysis and assessment." CJS, Vol.4, No.2, 1979:125-50.
- Hiller, Harry H. Society and Change: S.D. Clark and the Development of Canadian Sociology. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1982.
- Hoecker-Drysdale, Susan "Women Sociologists in Canada: The Careers of Helen MacGill Hughes, Aileen Dansken Ross, and Jean Robertson Burnet." In Marianne Gosztanyi Ainley (ed). Despite the Odds: Essays on Canadian Women and Science. Montreal: Vehicule Press, 1990:152-176 and 411-418.
- Howard, Ted and Jeremy Rifkin Who Should Play God? New York: Dell Publishing Co., Inc., 1977.
- Hoxie, R. Gordon (ed). A History of the Faculty of Political Science, Columbia University. New York: Columbia University Press, 1955.
- Hughes, Everett C. "The Dual Mandate of Social Science: Remarks on the Academic Division of Labour." CJEPS, Vol.25, No.4, November 1959:401-10.
- Hughes, Everett C. Review of Herve Carriere Le sociologue canadien, Leon Gerin 1863-1951, in CJEPS, Vol.27, No.4, November 1961:555-6.
- Hughes, Everett C. French Canada in Transition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press (Phoenix Books), [1943] 1963.
- Hughes, Everett C. "Teaching as Fieldwork." TAS, Vol.5, No.1, February 1970:13-8.
- Hughes, Everett C. The Sociological Eye: Selected Papers. Chicago: Aldine-Atherton, Inc., 1971.
- Hughes, Helen MacGill "From the Abacus to the Computer Age of Canadian Sociology: A Personal Account." Paper presented at a C.S.A.A. session on "The Sociology of Canadian Sociology." Toronto, Ontario, 1974.
- Hunter, Albert "Why Chicago? The Rise of the Chicago School of Urban Social Science." ABS, Vol.24, No.2, November/December 1980:215-27.
- Hurd, W.B. Review of C.A. Dawson Group Settlement: Ethnic Communities in Western Canada, in CJEPS, Vol.2, No.4, November 1936:574-76.

- Irving, Allan "Leonard Marsh and the McGill Social Science Research Project." JCS, Vol.21, No.2, Summer 1986:6-25.
- Jones, Frank E. "Current Sociological Research in Canada: Views of a Journal Editor." JHBS, Vol. 13, 1977:160-72.
- Jones, Frank E. "Establishing the Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association (CSAA)." S-S, Vol.14, No.3, May 1990:30-36.
- Jones, Orlo and Doris Haslam (eds). An Island Refuge: Loyalists and Disbanded Troops on the Island of Saint John. Abegweit Branch of the United Empire Loyalist Association of Canada, 1983.
- Kerbo, Harold R. Stratification and Inequality: Class Conflict in the United States. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1984.
- Keyfitz, Nathan "Sociology and Canadian Society." In T.N. Guinsburg and G.L. Reuber (eds), Perspectives on the Social Sciences in Canada. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1974:10-41.
- Kuhn, Martin A. "Characteristics of Canadian Sociology Theses: A Note on Some Differences." S-S, Vol.2, No.1, January 1978:11-13.
- Kuhn, Thomas S. The Structure of Scientific Revolutions (2nd ed). Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.
- Kuklick, Henrika "A 'Scientific Revolution': Sociological Theory in the United States, 1930-1945." SI, Vol.43, No.1, 1973:3-22.
- Kurtz, Lester R. "Robert E. Park's 'Notes on the Origins [sic] of the Society for Social Research'." JHBS, Vol.18, October 1982:332-40.
- Kurtz, Lester R. Evaluating Chicago Sociology. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984.
- LaViolette, Forrest E. Review of Charles J. Woodsworth Canada and the Orient: A Study in International Relations, in CJEPS, Vol.8, No.2, May 1942:314-15.
- LaViolette, Forrest E. The Struggle for Survival: Indian Cultures and the Protestant Ethic in British Columbia. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1961.
- Lengermann, Patricia Madoo "The Founding of the *American Sociological Review*: The Anatomy of a Rebellion." ASR, Vol.44, No.2, April 1979:185-98.
- Lengermann, Patricia Madoo "Robert E. Park and the Theoretical Content of Chicago Sociology: 1920-1940." SI, Vol.58, No.4, Fall 1988:361-77.
- Lipset, Seymour Martin "The Department of Sociology." In R. Gordon Hoxie (ed). A History of The Faculty of Political Science, Columbia University. New York: Columbia University Press, 1955:284-303.
- Lofland, Lyn H. (ed). "Reminiscences of Classic Chicago: The Blumer-Hughes Talk." UL, Vol.9, No.3, October 1980:251-81.

- Lofland, Lyn H. "Understanding Urban Life: The Chicago Legacy." UL, Vol.11, No.4, January 1983: 491-511.
- Lower, A.R.M. Review of E.C. Hughes French Canada in Transition, in CJEPS, Vol.10, No.1, February 1944:99-101.
- Lundberg, George A. Can Science Save Us? New York: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1961.
- Lundy, Katherina L.P. and Barbara D. Warne Sociology: A Window On The World. Toronto: Methuen Publications, 1986.
- MacGibbon, D.A. "Foreword: By the President of the Canadian Political Science Association." CJEPS, Vol.1, No.1, February 1935:1-2.
- Macpherson, C.B. "Annual Meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association, 1954." CJEPS, Vol.20, No.3, August 1954:375-79.
- Macpherson, C.B. "Annual Meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association, 1955." CJEPS, Vol.21, No.3, August 1955:373-77.
- Madge, John The Origins of Scientific Sociology. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1964.
- Madge, John The Tools of Social Science. Garden City: Anchor Books, [1953] 1965.
- Matthews, Fred H. Quest for an American Sociology: Robert E. Park and the Chicago School. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1977.
- McCall, George J. and J.L. Simmons (eds). Issues in Participant Observation: A Text and Reader. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1969.
- McCrorie, James N. Review of Audrey Wipper (ed). The Sociology of Work, in CRSA, Vol.23, No. 1, February 1986:138-39.
- The McGill News, Vol.50, No.5, September 1969.
- McGill University Annual Report for the years 1935-40, 1945-57, and 1960-69.
- Merton, Robert K. Social Theory and Social Structure. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1957.
- Mills, C. Wright The Sociological Imagination. New York: Oxford University Press, [1959] 1967.
- Miyamoto, Frank "Forrest E. LaViolette (1904-1989)," obituary appearing in the American Sociological Association Footnotes, Vol.17, No.10, December 1989:13.
- Mullins, Nicholas C. Theories and Theory Groups in Contemporary American Sociology. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1973.
- Nock, David A. "History and Evolution of French Canadian Sociology." IS, Vol.4, No.4, Summer 1974:15-29.

- Nock, David A. "The Chicago Imprint in Canada: Oswald Hall and S.D. Clark." Paper reprinted in the Proceedings of the 28th Annual Meeting of W.A.S.A., 12-15 February 1987, Boise State University, Boise, Idaho.
- Nolan, Brian King's War: Mackenzie King and the Politics of War, 1939-1945. Toronto: Random House of Canada Ltd., 1988.
- Ogburn, William F. "Bias, Psychoanalysis, and the Subjective in Relation to the Social Sciences." In William F. Ogburn On Culture and Social Change. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, [1922] 1964a:289-301.
- Ogburn, William F. "The Responsibility of the Social Sciences." In William F. Ogburn On Culture and Social Change. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, [1929] 1964b: 99-101.
- Ogburn, William F. "Statistical Trends." in William F. Ogburn On Culture and Social Change. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, [1940] 1964c:221-32.
- Ostow, Robin "Everett Hughes: The McGill Years." S-S, Vol.8, No.3, October 1984:12-16.
- Ostow, Robin "Everett Hughes: From Chicago to Boston." S-S, Vol.9, No.1, January 1985:8-12.
- Park, Robert E. "Physics and Society." CJEPS, Vol.6, No.2, May 1940:135-52.
- Park, Robert E. and Ernest W. Burgess Introduction to the Science of Sociology. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, [1921] 1972.
- Park, Robert E., Ernest W. Burgess and Roderick D. McKenzie The City. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1925.
- Parsons, Talcott "The Point of View of the Author." In Max Black (ed). The Social Theories of Talcott Parsons. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1961: 311-63.
- Platt, Jennifer "The Development of the *Participant Observation* Method in Sociology: Origin Myth and History." JHBS, Vol.19, October 1983: 379-93.
- Reynolds, Lloyd G. The British Immigrant: His Social and Economic Adjustment in Canada. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1935.
- Ritzer, George Contemporary Sociological Theory (2nd Ed). New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1988.
- Rocher, Guy A General Introduction to Sociology. Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada Limited, 1972.
- The Rockefeller Foundation Annual Report for 1930. The Rockefeller Foundation, 61 Broadway, New York.
- Ross, Aileen D. "Sociology at McGill in the 1940's." S-S, Vol.8, No.1, January 1984:4-5.
- Rucker, E. Darnell The Chicago Pragmatists. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1969.

- Schwendinger, Herman and Julia R. The Sociologists of the Chair: A Radical Analysis of the Formative Years of North American Sociology (1883-1922). New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1974.
- Shils, Edward "Tradition, Ecology, and Institution in the History of Sociology." Daedalus, Vol.99, Fall 1970:760-825.
- Shore, Marlene The Science of Social Redemption: McGill, the Chicago School, and the Origins of Social Research in Canada. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987.
- Shore, Marlene "Precarious Freedom: The Rise and Fall of Social Science at McGill University, 1918-1940." Paper presented at a Department of History and Philosophy of Education lecture, The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, Toronto, February 26, 1990.
- Smith, Dennis The Chicago School: A Liberal Critique of Capitalism. London:Macmillan Distribution Ltd., 1988.
- Solomon, David N. "Sociological Perspectives on Occupations." In Howard S. Becker, et al. (eds). Institutions and the Person, 1968:3-13.
- Spitzer, Frank and Elizabeth Silvester (eds). McGill University Thesis Directory: Volume I (1881-1959). Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1976.
- Spitzer, Frank and Elizabeth Silvester (eds). McGill University Thesis Directory: Volume II, Revised Edition (1960-1973). Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1978.
- "Symposium Review on E.C. Hughes." ISQ, Vol.13, Fall 1972:547-65.
- Taylor, E.K. "The Foundation of the Canadian Political Science Association." CJEPS, Vol.33, No.4, November 1967:581-85.
- Thomas, Jim "Chicago Sociology: An Introduction." UL, Vol.11, No.4, January 1983a:387-95.
- Thomas, Jim "Toward a Critical Ethnography: A Reexamination of the Chicago Legacy." UL, Vol. 11, No.4, January 1983b:477-90.
- Tiryakian, Edward A. "The Significance of Schools in the Development of Sociology." In William E. Snizek, Ellsworth R. Fuhrman and Michael K. Miller (eds). Contemporary Issues in Theory and Research: A Metasociological Perspective. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1979:211-33.
- Tomovic, Vladislav A. "Sociology in Canada: An Analysis of its Growth in English Language Universities 1908-1972." Waterloo: University of Waterloo, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, 1975.
- Turner, Jonathan H. The Structure of Sociological Theory (4th Ed). Chicago: The Dorsey Press, 1986.

Urwick, E.J. "The Role of Intelligence in the Social Process." CJEPS, Vol.1, No.1, February 1935: 64-76.

Wade, Mason The French Canadians, 1760-1967, Volume Two (1911-1967). Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, [1968] 1983.

Wilcox-Magill, Dennis William "Paradigms and Social Science in English Canada." In J. Paul Grayson (ed). Introduction to Sociology: An Alternate Approach. Toronto: Gage Publishing Ltd., 1983:1-34.

Wilcox-Magill, Dennis William and Richard C. Helmes-Hayes "Leonard Charles Marsh: A Canadian Social Reformer." JCS, Vol.21, No.2, Summer 1986:49-66.

Wiley, Norbert "The Rise and Fall of Dominating Theories in American Sociology." In William E. Snizek, Ellsworth R. Fuhrman and Michael K. Miller (eds). Contemporary Issues in Theory and Research: A Metasociological Perspective. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1979:47-79.

Wood, Brent Family History. Private publication, April 1976.

Zakuta, Leo "'We Distinguish -- They Discriminate': Observations on Race Relations." In Howard S. Becker, et al. (eds). Institutions and the Person, 1968:69-79.

INTERVIEW

Professor Stephen G. Triantis, 30 March 1989, Toronto, Ontario (phone).

Professor Emeritus Oswald Hall, 28 April 1989, Toronto, Ontario.

Professor Maurice Pinard, 27 September 1990, Montreal, Quebec (phone).

LETTER

Professor Mary Salisbury, Westmount, Quebec, 05 January 1991.

Professor Emeritus Nathan Keyfitz, International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, A-2361 Laxenburg, Austria, 26 June 1991.