

Please Do Not Cite or Distribute!

David M. Ferguson  
Race Workshop Draft  
6/5/2008

## **The Past as Present: Golden Age Sociology of the South and the Production of Interracial Knowledge**

### **I. “Golden Age” Sociology of the South**

The history of sociology of the South, or rather American sociology would seem to begin as early as 1854 with the publication of George Fitzhugh’s *Sociology for the South*, and Henry Hughes’ *Treatise on Sociology*. According to Heinz Maus<sup>1</sup>, the word sociology appears for the first time in America in these respective works, which both provide a sociological defense for the institution of slavery. Thus, in many ways one could argue that American sociology has been a southern project since its inception.

#### *Sociology of the South: A Definition*

I should first begin by defining this thing that I’m calling “Sociology of the South,” before embarking on a similar treatment of the specific period that I am referring to as The Golden Age. I define sociology of the South as empirical or theoretical work that is focused on the South with a particular emphasis on the unique processes and histories that characterize the region and its many constitutive states.<sup>2</sup> The concept as I am using it is to be most clearly distinguished from a sociology *in* the South, which

---

<sup>1</sup> *A Short History of Sociology* 1962.

<sup>2</sup> I fully recognize the danger in not specifying states, but I do so carefully with the hopes of casting a slightly broader net that is eventually tightened through an emerging theory.

would cover just about any type of sociology as long as it were performed within the South. Thus, the notion of sociology *of* the South is both tied to the region and freed from it. In other words, one must be focused on the region, but one need not be in the region. Though, for the most part there is a tremendous amount of overlap in that one typically lives in and works on the region simultaneously.

Sociology of the South is not black sociology, though blacks sociologists certainly play a pivotal role in the sociology of the South. Nevertheless, the phenomenon in question is a racially integrated field of knowledge in a racially segregated South. As such it is a particularly interesting site of analysis. The field brings together both white and black sociologists from racially segregated institutions through a shared sociological interest that is both personal and professional.

In a paper entitled, “The Promise of a Sociology of the South” Larry Griffin argues that:

Sociologists, social psychologists, and anthropologists in the 1930s and 1940s conducted some of the most illuminating and politically relevant research on the U.S. South. The books and monographs these social scientists-many but certainly not all southern in origin-wrote are today legion: Howard Odum’s *Southern Regions of the United States*, Hortense Powdermaker’s *After Freedom*, Charles Johnson’s *Shadow of the Plantation*, Harriet Herring’s *Passing of the Mill Village*, Rupert Vance’s *Human Geography of the South*. Focused and remarkably fecund, the list goes on and on and on (51-52).

He goes on to say that “this was sociology of the South’s golden age, a period lasting from the 1920s until roughly the immediate post-War era.” Griffin’s characterization of the golden age represents a general consensus amongst most scholars studying this

history. For the most part they begin somewhere in the 1920s around the time that Howard Washington Odum founds the sociology department at the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill. The golden age by most accounts ends in the middle of the 1940s and is dead and buried by 1950 largely as a result of changes in the larger discipline.<sup>3</sup> It is at this juncture that I suggest a revision in our conception of the golden age, such that the period begins at the turn of the century as opposed to 1920.

The major intervention here is to include W.E.B. Du Bois as a founding figure in the field of sociology of the South.<sup>4</sup> Du Bois developed the department of sociology at Atlanta University shortly after accepting a faculty position there in 1897. From 1897 to 1914 he supervised the preparation of sixteen sociological monographs widely known as the Atlanta University Studies. He outlines the goals and objectives of the Studies in a paper entitled “The Laboratory in Sociology at Atlanta University.”<sup>5</sup> The greater theoretical relevance however, lies in the fact that he uses Atlanta and the encompassing South largely as research site. In addition, to the Atlanta University Studies, I submit the following writings as further evidence of the primary claim: “The Negroes of Farmville, Virginia (1898),” “The Negroes of Dougherty County, Georgia (1901),” “The Relations of the Negroes to the Whites in the South (1901),” and “The Social Evolution of the Black South (1911).” In the first two writings, which function as small community studies, DuBois is empirically focused on the region, whereas in the latter writings he is tied to the South on a more theoretical level.

---

<sup>3</sup> Ida Harper Simpson. *Fifty Years of the Southern Sociological Society: Change and Continuity in a Professional Society*

<sup>4</sup> While, I’m arguing that DuBois is perhaps the father of the field of sociology of the South, there remains the obvious question of George Fitzhugh and Henry Hughes. I deal with Fitzhugh and Hughes and their role in an even longer history of Sociology of the South in another paper.

<sup>5</sup> The paper appears originally in *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* (May 1903) and is reprinted in Green and Driver’s edited volume *W.E.B. DuBois On Sociology and the Black Community*

Therefore, a new constitution of the golden age should begin with Du Bois and his turn of the century scholarship and stewardship of the South. For, much of the work that comes to define the golden age is indebted to Du Bois and as such he is often cited as foundational. Thus, it is only right that we begin with him given the effect that he had on scholars like E. Franklin Frazier, John Dollard, St. Clair Drake, and Odum who all credit him in their work. As it relates to the remainder of the golden age I find myself in general agreement with the scholarship. I like 1900-1950 because I think it captures the vast majority of that which is golden, while at the same time it provides a crisp category in the way of a half-century.

In sum, the golden age is made up of a set of scholars, a resultant scholarship, and a number of foundational institutions. In particular, I define the following scholars as golden age sociologists of the South: Du Bois, Odum, Rupert B. Vance, Frazier, Dollard, Charles S. Johnson, and Allison Davis<sup>6</sup>. The scholarship begins with the aforementioned work by DuBois and would include works like Odum's *Southern Regions of the United States*, Vance's *Human Geography of the South*, Dollard's *Caste and Class in a Southern Town*, as well as Johnson's *Shadow of the Plantation*.<sup>7</sup> I highlight the departments at Atlanta University, Fisk University, and UNC-Chapel Hill as key institutions within this framework. Finally, I could conclude this delineation of the field by highlighting the *Journal of Social Forces*, and the Southern Sociological Society.

### *The Death of Sociology of the South*

---

<sup>6</sup> This list is in no way exhaustive, but rather meant to lay out key figures.

<sup>7</sup> This is simply a sketch, and by no means is this list exhaustive.

A historical analysis that presents a golden age period must attempt to offer an explanation for the presumed decline at the close of said period. A number of scholars have grappled with this question of why a death of sociology of the South. As it turns out Odum's student, Rupert Vance, would put it best in 1960 as he opines, "the New Deal has been dealt; what is the fighting all about? As the affluent society crosses the Mason-Dixon line, the regionalist of the 1930's turns up as just another 'liberal without a cause.'"<sup>8</sup> It is particularly revealing that Vance, a strong proponent and architect of the field of regional sociology, uttered these remarks. Vance was confronted with the fundamental question of the need for a "problem" South to provide grist for the mill. He subsequently ponders the extent to which their earlier work has helped to produce a world where they are no longer needed.

John Shelton Reed is perhaps the first scholar since Vance to really delve into this question of a death of sociology of the South. His chapter "Whatever Became of Regional Sociology?" in *One South* posits that "whatever else it may have been, regional sociology was not very good *sociology*."<sup>9</sup> Reed goes on to argue that regional sociology was not informed by modern sociological theory. Furthermore, he takes umbrage with the well-articulated relationship between scholarship and politics in the work of the regionalists.

Finally, Ida Harper Simpson traces this decline in sociology of the South through her history of the Southern Sociological Society. She begins by detailing an interracial society that is deeply engaged in research that deals with the South as region from its inception in 1936, yet in the 1950s rapidly moves away from regional concerns to what

---

<sup>8</sup> "The Sociological Implications of Southern Regionalism" in the *Journal of Southern History* 26 (February 1960): 44-56.

<sup>9</sup> p. 34 *One South: An Ethnic Approach to Regional Culture* Reed.

might be referred to as more general sociology. Moreover, she argues that “once the shift from problems of the South was under way, not even major crises in the South were sufficient to stimulate research on the region (142).” The crisis she is referring to is the civil rights movement. Thus, she seems to provide the answer to Stephen Steinberg’s brilliant question “What did sociology do while Rome burned?<sup>10</sup>” Her answer (and his for that matter): Nothing!

Perhaps we might begin to theorize the sustainability of research paradigms organized around a particular historical problem; in this case one might argue the paradigm (sociology of the South) is fundamentally tied to a “problem” South. Thus, it would follow from this logic that the moment the “problem” South begins to disappear so too does its sociology. This level of argumentation would seem to prompt a series of intriguing questions of sociological import? What other fields of knowledge are dependent on a particular problem? Do all these subfields disappear with their problem? Or do many of these subfields simply reinvent themselves in order to survive?

Finally, I would like to challenge the notion of the disappearance of a “problem” South. I do not mean to deny the fact that the South has experienced a great deal of progress over the last half century, but rather to suggest that there remains a great deal of differentiation along the lines of the indicators<sup>11</sup> and measures that sociologists endlessly interrogate. It would seem to me that these scholars<sup>12</sup> were perhaps responding to a rapidly changing South coupled with a changing discipline and in the midst of it all they

---

<sup>10</sup>

Steinberg, Stephen. 2007. *Race Relations: A Critique*

<sup>11</sup> I’m thinking here of levels poverty, a host of educational outcomes, etc.

<sup>12</sup> In all fairness, Reed still sees the South as different and has dedicated his career to this very work.

simply threw out the baby with the bathwater. In other words, the discipline was clearly moving in a new direction and the South appeared to be converging, so why not move on.

If sociology of the South did indeed suffer a premature death, can it be revived? Is there no room for sociology of the South? Are we overrun with subfields? These questions seem particularly relevant in a discipline with so many subfields, which makes it all the more perplexing that sociology of the South does not survive. What would a new sociology of the South look like? Better yet, what would it *need* to look like to reemerge?

## **II. Interracial Knowledge**

### *Interracial Association*

There has been a long history of scholarly work on interracial association with historians at the forefront. As one might imagine the bulk of this work is clustered around Reconstruction in the American South. These scholars are grappling with a world where race and power are in flux and there is a moment of uncertainty with respect to the continuation of the status quo.<sup>13</sup> This is the moment *Before Jim Crow*, that historian Jane Dailey chronicles in her treatment of the Readjuster Party and their rise to power in Virginia between 1879 and 1883. The historiography in this area is dense and well chronicled.

While historians have produced the lion's share of scholarship on this issue, in recent years sociologists have joined the conversation. Joseph Gerteis and Moon-Kie Jung<sup>14</sup> have both looked at interracial social movements, Gerteis studying the Knights of Labor in 1880s and 90s Virginia and Jung's work on Hawaii's interracial labor

---

<sup>13</sup> C. Vann Woodward, *The Strange Career of Jim Crow*.

<sup>14</sup> Joseph Gerteis, *Class and the Color Line: Interracial Class Coalition in the Knights of Labor and the Populist Movement*. Duke University Press, 2007. Moon-Kie Jung, *Reworking Race: The Making of Hawaii's Interracial Labor Movement*. Columbia University Press, 2006.

movement in the 1920s and 30s. I intend to build on this interdisciplinary body of scholarship as I move toward a similar analysis of interracial association in the academy.

### *Interracial Knowledge Production*

I argue that we can read interracial knowledge production as both a continuation as well as an extension of the preexisting phenomenon. Moreover, I would argue that intellectual production in the academy acts as somewhat of a final frontier with respect to interracial association. Particularly if we think critically about academic exchange and the practice of citation where deference, and power, and authority are at work when one scholar cites another's work. This phenomenon is particularly compelling as white scholars begin to cite their black colleagues. This is not to diminish the reciprocal practice, but rather to highlight the novelty in white recognition and acknowledgement of black intellectual contributions. For we need only think of Dan Green and Edwin Driver's fascinating article<sup>15</sup> on the sociological negation of Du Bois, where they in essence chastise the white sociological fraternity for systematically overlooking the seminal contributions of Du Bois that preceded the Chicago School by decades. Earl Wright's work<sup>16</sup> on Du Bois is equally critical with respect to this point. Anyhow, I say all this to say there was a time when blacks were not cited by whites, so to locate the origins of reciprocity and interracial citation is a fruitful endeavor and something that I believe emerges in this period in the South against the backdrop of Jim Crow.

### **III. Segregated Sociologists**

---

<sup>15</sup> Green, D.S., and E.D. Driver. 1976. "W.E.B. DuBois: A Case in the Sociology of Sociological Negation." *Phylon*. 37:308-33

<sup>16</sup> Wright II, Earl. 2002. "The Atlanta Sociological Laboratory. 1896-1924: A Historical Account of the First American School of Sociology." *Western Journal of Black Studies*. 26 (3) : 165-174.

### *Race and Academic Segregation*

Academic segregation occurs both within institutions and within subject areas/subfields. While black sociologists attain Ph.D.s from white institutions in the North (Chicago, Columbia) they are denied access to the professoriate at these same universities. Thus, they are relegated to faculty positions at historically black colleges and universities in the South. In this way, we see a form of academic segregation that is both regional and racial. While there is a certain visibility attached to the black scholar in the South in the period<sup>17</sup>, there is nevertheless a clear hierarchy and an ideal type of white sociologist in the North.

The fascinating aspect of the phenomena of racial exclusion is that it created a class of highly trained, visible black sociologists with Ph.D.s from the most prestigious sociology departments in the country. Thus, when these scholars moved to HBCUs in the South they also carried with them a tremendous amount of prestige and rank within the discipline and the academy at large. It is by no means coincidental that black sociologists trained at Chicago, Columbia, and Harvard led many key departments in the South. In particular, if we were to examine the departments at Atlanta University, Fisk University, and Howard University we would see the effect of the aforementioned prestige on the relative prominence and visibility of these departments among all of the HBCUs, as well as departments in the South more generally.

Ida Harper Simpson is eloquent in her remarks as she laments the demise of the HBCU, which occurs largely as a result of integration. She suggests:

---

<sup>17</sup> Earl Wright "The Big 4 and American Sociology: Atlanta, Tuskegee, Fisk and Howard"

black institutions have lost *visibility* as centers of research for a variety of reasons: the decline in emphasis on social problems of the region, shortages of funds, and the loss of scholars to predominantly white institutions. It thus seems, paradoxically, that racial segregation supported a strong identity of black institutions that has been partially lost with desegregation. By the mid-1980s, if one wanted to know about social problems of blacks or research on black social life, one would be unlikely to single out black institutions as sources of information in the way that one would single out Fisk, Atlanta, or Tuskegee in the 1930s and the 1940s. An unfortunate casualty of racial integration has been the research distinction that earlier characterized the black universities of the South (Italics added 211).

### *Learning from Women*

In “The Second Sex and the Chicago School,”<sup>18</sup> Mary Jo Deegan analyzes the role and positioning of women receiving the Ph.D. at Chicago in the mid century.<sup>19</sup> She argues that:

sociology is embedded in society: ...a highly problematic fact for a discipline that studies society. It creates an irreducible tension in the profession between being part of a society and claiming to be outside its rules. One of the most burdensome and embarrassing challenges to sociological assertions of disinterest is the incorporation of inequality within its practice, ideas, networks, and fundamental social processes. This injustice undermines sociologists’ avowal of “objectivity,” “expertise” in interpreting social problems, and “difference” from the groups they study. Furthermore, like members of other groups, sociologists do not want to examine their biases, patterns of discrimination, and failure to meet their ideals.

Deegan extends her argument by moving into a discussion of “women’s work” within sociology. What emerges in her analysis is conceptualization of segregation on a functional level, whereby women fulfill the “invisible tasks of clerical labor, library research, and data collection (326).” We see a world where women earn the Ph.D., yet have few options available to them beyond

---

<sup>18</sup> “The Second Sex and the Chicago School: Women’s Accounts, Knowledge, and Work, 1945-1960” In *A Second Chicago School?* ed. G.A. Fine, 322-64. University of Chicago Press.

<sup>19</sup> Deegan looks at women trained at Chicago between 1945-1960.

menial positions as research associates, lecturers, and instructors within universities. However, women's colleges provided a space for women to ascend to the professoriate a function analogous to that of the HBCU for the black sociologist in this early period.

While, it is true in the South as in the North that men are dominant, I think a regional analysis offers a number of subtle nuances on the familiar. Race and region act in similar ways as marginalizing forces, while simultaneously presenting new possibilities for the discipline. Perhaps I can construct an "ideal type" of sociology in the first half of the century as precisely that which is white and male and centered in the Northern university. Thus, I could argue that anything short of that "type" is less than and an inferior brand of sociology altogether. For, one might argue that even at the height of its prominence sociology of the South is marred by the very fact that its main proponents are both black and/or Southern.

#### **IV. Past as Present**

##### *Path Dependence*

I argue that there is a logic of path dependence that is at work with respect to academic segregation. I mean to suggest that blacks enter the academy in the Jim Crow era and as such they are forced into a particular path that dictates an engagement with race relations, and blacks as research subjects. This path is essentially the same for black scholars both as graduate students and later in their careers as faculty members. While we can easily make sense of this racial tracking in the Jim Crow period, the burden shifts as

we move through the latter half of the twentieth century. For we seemingly witness the disappearance of many of the barriers and forces responsible for tracking these scholars, yet black sociologists remain similarly situated with respect to their scholarly interests and pursuits.

### *Insider v. Outsiders*

I look to position my work within the more recent debate over *insiders and outsiders*, which is in essence a debate over subjectivity and objectivity respectively. I would argue that these recent debates would greatly benefit from a historical analysis that underscores the decades of racial segregation both within the academy and larger society. My argument is that these debates do not take place in a vacuum but rather are contested moments in a longer discourse on subject position, race, and knowledge production. In other words, I argue that what is missing from these debates is a deep understanding of the preexisting structural framework that emerged in the first half of the century.

While, Merton briefly mentions this history of restriction in “Insiders and Outsiders”<sup>20</sup> it is by no means a sustained discussion. He notes that “the handful of Negro sociologists were in large part expected, as a result of social selection and self selection, to study problems of Negro life and relations between the races just as the handful of women sociologists were expected to study problems of women, principally as these related to marriage and the family.” Thus, with a brief stroke of the pen Merton dismisses any history of structured tracking along research lines by presenting a narrative of benign “social selection and self selection.” It is as if blacks scholars or women for that matter

---

<sup>20</sup> Robert K. Merton “Insiders and Outsiders: A Chapter in the Sociology of Knowledge” *The American Journal of Sociology* Vol. 78, No. 1 (Jul. 1972), pp. 9-47.

do not face any real and or structural forces, but merely expectations about appropriate research topics and interests. This premise would seem to be misleading at best. For, I would argue that as it relates to black sociologists in the Jim Crow era there exists little to no mobility with respect to research interest.

For example, in 1927 Frazier is forced to flee Atlanta out of fear for his life after “The Pathology of Race Prejudice” creates a storm of unrest amongst whites. In the article Frazier argues in a vein similar to Ida B. Wells’ 1892 editorial, in the Memphis paper *Free Speech*, that white women are not in fact being raped by black men. Rather the sex is consensual and they desire these black men. Moreover, he goes on to compare race prejudice to insanity, a bold claim to say the least. He quickly becomes the center of controversy and intense criticism as his comments quickly circulate in conservative circles in Atlanta. Frazier leaves Atlanta and heads to Chicago spurred on by threats of lynching. Thus, we see social forces at work beyond the mere “expectations” suggested by Merton.

### *Conclusion*

Sociology of the South had a glorious past and at its height it was able to garner a tremendous amount of prestige and acclaim. Nevertheless, this great history is almost nonexistent with respect to the historical record. I remember searching through the ASA’s 1000 page edited volume *Sociology in America*<sup>21</sup> only to discover that not one

---

<sup>21</sup> *Sociology in America: A History*, edited by Craig Calhoun. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 2007.

chapter dealt with this history in any real way.<sup>22</sup> Thus, in many ways this project is fundamentally sociology of knowledge as much as it is historical sociology.

I am interested in this long-standing tension between sociology's desire to answer questions that are relevant to society as well as those relevant to sociology as an academic discipline. It would seem that there are often moments when these concerns overlap and are one in the same. Yet at other moments, the discipline privileges a disciplinary concern over what might be regarded as a question of centrality to society at large. While many scholars would argue the discipline is a discipline first and foremost (and I would agree), we nevertheless vacillate on this issue. I would argue that the subfield of urban sociology has and continues to be a lifeblood of our discipline as it ties us to a social world and a major "question of the day" so to speak.<sup>23</sup> So, I'm interested in the question of how and why sociologists turn away from the South, particularly given the widespread interest in the region both in and outside the academy.<sup>24</sup>

## **Research Design**

### *Archives*

I am interested in presenting a history of sociology of the South in the first half of the twentieth century with particular emphasis on interracial knowledge production. I will use archival research to sketch out the nature of interaction and conversation between a number of key sociologists in the golden age period. Moreover, I will be looking for

---

<sup>22</sup> I should mention that there are 3 chapters that deal with race. Though the South as region is all but absent in these accounts.

<sup>23</sup> I'm arguing this is the perception that exists in the discipline.

<sup>24</sup> To this point Reed writes, "it is no accident that the golden anniversary of Odum's *Southern Regions*, which passed almost unobserved by the Southern Sociological Society, was marked by a well-attended session at the annual meeting of the Southern Historical Association.

remarks and comments that shed light on their own conception of the period and their place within this interracial community of scholars. Key Archives:

W.E.B. Du Bois Papers

Howard Washington Odum Papers (Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill)

E. Franklin Frazier Papers (Moorland-Spingarn Research Center, Howard University)

Charles S. Johnson Papers (Fisk University Special Collections)

Allison Davis Papers (Special Collections Research Center, University of Chicago)

Rupert Vance Papers (Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill)

Guy Benton Johnson Papers (Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill)

### *Interviews*

While all the scholars that constituted the golden age have passed away, I plan to conduct indepth interviews with a number of scholars who arrived on the scene just as the field was beginning to decline. It is my hope that these scholars will be able to speak to the zeitgeist, as well as any relevant conversation and/or desire to continue this research tradition. I plan to begin by interviewing Ida Harper Simpson, who authored the definitive history of the Southern Sociological Society and just recently retired from Duke University.<sup>25</sup> I am both interested in her deep historical insight into the period, as well as her thoughts on how women fit into this history of sociology of South. I will then

---

<sup>25</sup> An organization that is crucial during the golden age.

interview John Moland, Jr. who received his Bachelor's degree in sociology under Charles S. Johnson at Fisk University in the 1940s. He received his Ph.D. from Chicago and has spent his entire career at HBCUs throughout the South.<sup>26</sup> Moland served as president of the Southern Sociological Society, and has a wealth of knowledge about the relationships between black and white sociologists both in the organization and in the South.<sup>27</sup> Finally, I will interview John Shelton Reed the most famous and well-known "Southern" sociologist of the last half-century. He is emeritus Professor at UNC-Chapel Hill and will serve as a great interview as a scholar who picked up the mantle of sociology of the South and tried to carry it forth even after it had long been clear that the discipline had moved in another direction. Thus, I'm interested in getting his thoughts on a host of questions, not the least of which is how one builds a career on subfield that is nearly extinct?

### *Interracial Citation Analysis*

I will draw on theories of citation analysis as I work to build a theory of interracial citation. I will begin by developing a list of scholars that are central to the period. Thereafter, I will put together a subsequent list of all of their published writings. I will then conduct a rigorous search of the text in these various bodies of work with attention to all citations of other golden age sociologists, but particular attention to citations of scholars of another race.

### *Journal Ecology*

---

<sup>26</sup> Florida A&M, Grambling, Southern and now Alabama State.

<sup>27</sup> I had a conversation with him at the annual meeting in Richmond and he remarked that he had been attending for 60 years.

I will examine seven journals in print during the golden age period, the earliest of which emerges in 1890 and the last in 1940. I have selected four journals that I have categorized as “mainstream”<sup>28</sup> and three that I refer to as “Negro”<sup>29</sup> journals. I intend to search these journals as sites of knowledge production. Thus, I am both interested in the function of each particular journal with respect to types of knowledge and types of producers. In other words, where do sociologists working on the South publish their work? Where do black sociologists publish? What type of work does *Social Forces* publish? How do these functions change over the course of five decades?

### **Contribution of the Dissertation**

The dissertation is an epistemological meditation on “golden age” sociology of the South. The period, from 1920-1940, commonly referred to as the golden age represents the high water mark for sociologists of the South, both in terms of productivity and prestige. Nevertheless, a fundamental tension exists in so far as this same set of scholars and their resultant scholarship has been marginalized with respect to the historical record and the sociological canon. Thus, I attempt to argue for the restoration of this period and the reconsideration of this knowledge as vital. Moreover, I posit that the scholarship that emerged is constitutive of a concept of interracial knowledge that I will develop in the dissertation. For it is in the production of an interracial knowledge of the South that we find the historical antecedents and problematics that have and will continue to define our contemporary debates about race, region, and knowledge.

---

<sup>28</sup> *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*(1890), *American Journal of Sociology*(1895), *Social Forces*(1922), *American Sociological Review* (1936)

<sup>29</sup> *The Journal of Negro History*(1916), *The Journal of Negro Education*(1932), *Phylon*(1940)

This dissertation seeks to contribute to the sociology of knowledge literature, as well as scholarship on race and knowledge production in the academy. Moreover, I intend to build on previous work done in the field of historical sociology. In many ways I see the project as exploring the unique configuration of race, region and knowledge production in a historical period as a means of generating social theory.

## **Possible Dissertation Chapters**

### **Chapter 1. “Golden Age” Sociology of the South: A Brief History**

This chapter will sketch the history of sociology of the South, with particular attention to the golden age period from 1900-1950. Moreover, I will introduce the key scholars and scholarship that defines the period. Finally, I will conclude with a theoretical exposition of sociology of the South as a case of a death of a field.

### **Chapter 2. Integrated Pages and Segregated Spaces: Interracial Citation in the Jim Crow South**

This chapter will draw on theories of citation analysis to posit a theory of interracial citation with the page as the unit of analysis. I examine the body of work produced by all scholars introduced in the previous chapter (both books and articles) and search for all instances of interracial citation. I am particularly interested in cases of whites citing blacks as I think these moments both destabilize and cement knowledge hierarchies.

### **Chapter 3. North and South Networks of Knowledge**

This chapter will argue that the South and its sociology was inextricably linked to sociology in the North vis-à-vis Chicago and to a lesser extent the department at Columbia. In many ways, I follow historian James Cobb’s line of thinking in *The Most Southern Place on Earth*, where he argues that the Mississippi Delta and the South have endured in spite of rather than despite outside influence. In other words, the notion that there is an unchanging preserved South existing in a vacuum is in fact a myth. Moreover, he argues that we “look outward and reexamine the South’s socioeconomic and cultural characteristics within the context of its interactions with, rather than its isolation from, the larger national and global setting. My analysis of the emergence of a thing called sociology of the South seeks to follow this same logic. I will examine the relationship between the American Sociological Society/Association and the scholars in question. I intend to suggest that these scholars and their scholarship is both mainstream and marginal in relation to a dominant sociology in the North. I will use network analysis as a means of linking sociologists North and South through a number of key nodes and institutions.

### **Chapter 4. Sociology’s Great Migration**

In 1936, Atlanta, Fisk, and Howard employed 80 percent of all black Ph.D.s.<sup>30</sup> Moreover, in a 1937 article in *Social Forces*, Luther Lee Bernard refers to sociology at Fisk as “a department of distinction” and mentions it in the same breath with Duke and UNC. Thus, I am interested in the shifts in knowledge production as these institutions decline, partly as a result of integration and the relocation of “elite” black sociologists to white universities (primarily Northern). Perhaps not surprisingly, this relocation mimics both the great migration and the aforementioned disciplinary shift in focus from the South to North.

---

<sup>30</sup> Platt, Anthony. 1991. *E. Franklin Frazier Reconsidered*. Rutgers University Press.

### **Chapter 5. Interracial Cooperation: Sociology and Social Reform in the South**

This chapter will argue that sociology of the South is deeply engaged in a social reform agenda. I will locate a number of key sociologists who are at the forefront of a social movement intent on improving both economic and racial conditions in the region. A number of interracial organizations are pivotal in this process and provide spaces outside the academy for interracial exchange. I conclude by contrasting this reform aesthetic in the South with what is by that point a decidedly apolitical Chicago sociology. I will use theories of organizational analysis to guide this research.

### **Chapter 6. Sociology of Knowledge or the Path Not Taken**

This chapter will draw on the sociology of knowledge literature to suggest an alternative possibility with respect to the standing of the South within the discipline. It will attempt to chart out the course for a new sociology of the South.

## References

- Abbott, A. 1999. *Department & Discipline: Chicago Sociology at One Hundred*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Blackwell, J, and M Janowitz. eds. 1974. *Black Sociologists: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bracey, J, A Meier, and E. Rudwick. 1971. *The Black Sociologist: The First Half Century*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Bulmer, M. 1984. *The Chicago School of Sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Davis, A, and J. Dollard. 1940. *Children of Bondage: The Personality Development of Negro Youth in the Urban South*. Washington, DC: American Council of Education
- Davis, A, B.R. Gardner, and M.R. Gardner. 1941. *Deep South: A Social Anthropological Study of Caste and Class*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Dollard, J. 1937. *Caste and Class in a Southern Town*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Drake, St. C, and H. Cayton. 1945. *Black Metropolis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- DuBois, W.E.B. 1898 “The Negroes of Farmville, Virginia: a Social Study.” *Bulletin of the Department of Labor*. 14:1-38
- DuBois, W.E.B. 1899. *The Philadelphia Negro: A Social Study*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- DuBois, W.E.B. 1901. “ The Relation of the Negroes to Whites in the South.” *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. 18:121-40
- DuBois, W.E.B. 1903. “The Laboratory in Sociology at Atlanta University” *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. 21:160-63
- Fitzhugh, G. 1854. *Sociology For the South*. Richmond: A. Morris Publisher.
- Frazier, E. F. 2001 [1939]. *The Negro Family in the United States*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

- Gilpin, P. J. 1980. "Charles S. Johnson and the Race Relations Institutes at Fisk University." *Phylon*. 41:300-11
- Green, D.S., and E.D. Driver, eds. 1978. *W.E.B. DuBois: On Sociology and the Black Community*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Green, D.S., and E.D. Driver. 1976. "W.E.B. DuBois: A Case in the Sociology of Sociological Negation." *Phylon*. 37:308-33
- Griffin, L. 2001. "The Promise of a Sociology of the South." *Southern Cultures*. 7: 50-75
- Hughes, H. 1854. *A Treatise on Sociology*. Philadelphia: Lippincott, Grambo & Co.
- Johnson, C. S. 1934. *Shadow of the Plantation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Odum, H.W. 1936. *Southern Regions of the United States*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Reed, J.S. 1982. *One South*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.
- Reed, J.S., and D. J. Signal. 1982. *Regionalism and the South: Selected Papers of Rupert Vance*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Simpson, I. H. 1988. *Fifty Years of the Southern Sociological Society*. Athens: University of Georgia Press.
- Vance, R. 1935. *Human Geography of the South*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina.
- Wright II, E. 2002. "The Atlanta Sociological Laboratory. 1896-1924: A Historical Account of the First American School of Sociology." *Western Journal of Black Studies*. 26 (3) : 165-174.
- Wright II, E., and T.C. Calhoun. 2006 "Jim Crow Sociology: Toward an Understanding of the Origin and Principles of Black Sociology via the Atlanta Sociological Laboratory." *Sociological Focus*. 39: 1-18.
- Young, A.A. Jr., and D.R. Deskins Jr. 2001. "Early Traditions of African-American Sociological Thought." *Annual Review of Sociology* 27: 445-477.

## **What Needs to Be Added to this Proposal**

### ***Sociology of Knowledge Lit.***

Karl Mannheim

Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann

Pierre Bourdieu's notion of an intellectual field

Fritz Ringer article The intellectual field, intellectual history, and the sociology of knowledge *Theory and Society*

***Memory Lit.*** (tip the cap to this literature and suggest an engagement in the future)

Think Fitz Brundage's use of memory in *The Southern Past*. Really useful metaphor.

### ***Philanthropy and the role of foundations***

John Stanfield *Philanthropy and Jim Crow in American Social Science*

Ellen Condliffe Lagemann *The Politics of Knowledge: The Carnegie Corporation, Philanthropy, and Public Policy*)

***Role of Civic Organizations*** (Southern Commission on Lynching, Commission on Interracial Cooperation, Southern Regional Council, etc.)

### ***Brief Discussion of Theory on "Schools"***

Bulmer, Abbott, Wright III

