The manuscript has been read in whole or in part by all of the living "chiefs"—George Bohmstedt, Karl Schoessler, Elton Jackson, Sheldon Stryker and Peter Burke. They have made many helpful suggestions, but the final responsibility rests with the author who hopes the mistakes are minimal and that he has not "left anyone out."

Almost all of the historic facts have come from the Indiana University Archives. The Archivist, Dolores Lahrman, has provided indispensable assistance.

Fiscal support for the publication came from the Office of University Relations. We thank Vice President Danilo Orešcanin for making it possible for the Sociology Centennial Year to have a printed history.
History can be viewed as a river. At its mouth the river is usually at its widest and is therefore most visible and most impressive. So it is with Indiana University Sociology, where today the Bloomington department boasts of 28 full-time faculty, all trained in graduate schools of the highest quality, and with long records of achievement. It is generally conceded by experts that Indiana University Sociology ranks in the top ten departments in the nation and it has grown stronger with each passing year. The full professors have established national and international reputations and many assistant and associate professors are adding lustre to the department by their research and teaching. If you will examine Figure 1, A Schematic History of the Indiana Sociology Department, you will see that our present Chair is Professor George Bohnstedt, who directs not only the 28 full-time faculty but also 20 associate instructors, the Institute of Social Research, and a staff of 10 who assist in counseling, office, computer, editorial, library, and other services.

All of this took 100 years to establish. The schematic history depicts four historic periods in the life of the department and the men who provided leadership over these years. These periods have been called: (1) The Origins (1885-1889), (2) The Foundation (1899-1935), (3) Growth and Quality Improvement (1935-1948), and (4) Progress Toward Excellence (1949-1985). Each period has distinctive qualities based on the leadership of the department, the growth and quality of faculty and students, the inclusion of graduate study at master and doctoral levels, and the encouragement and funding of research.

(1) The Origins of Sociology

If we go back to the source of the sociological river shown in Figure 1, the schematic diagram, we find an unknown and unsung professor named Arthur B. Woodford, who was the first to get an appointment in June 1885 as “an Assistant and Associate Professor of Economics and Sociology” at $1,300 per annum. He was one of the first appointments made by the new 34-year-old President of Indiana University, David Starr Jordan, who took office on January 1, 1885. Woodford was first placed in the Department of History and Political Science. The next year a new Department of Economics and Social Science was created with Woodford as Head for the first three years. Note the picture of Professor Woodford on page 3.

The time has come to hail the progenitor of Sociology at Indiana University for he was the first to bear the title of a professor of Sociology and the first to introduce a course by that name. In the 56th Indiana University Catalog of 1885-86 we find
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Progress Toward Excellence

1965
- 1982 George Bohmstedt (In House Appt.)
- 1979 Peter Burke (4 years) (In House Appt.)
1975
- 1975 Elton Jackson (3+ years) (In House Appt.)
- 1969 Sheldon Stryker (6 years) (In House Appt.)
1965
  -The Schuessler Era-
    - 1960 Karl Schuessler (9 years) (In House Appt.)
1955
- 1953 John Mueller (7 years) (In House Appt.)
- 1949 Clifford Kirkpatrick (4 years) (Outside Appt.)

Growth and Quality Improvement

1945
- The Sutherland Era-
  - Edwin H. Sutherland (14 years) (Outside Appt.)
1935

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY ESTABLISHED

The Foundation of Sociology

1925
- The Weatherly Era-
1915
Department of Economics and Sociology (1915)

1905

1900
- 1899 Ulysses Grant Weatherly (36 years) (In House Appt.) Professor and Head of Economics and Social Science

The Origins of Sociology

1895
- 1895 Frank Petter, Head (4 years) U. G. Weatherly appointed Asst. Professor of European History
- 1892 John R. Commons (3 years)
- 1891 Edward A. Ross (1 year)
- 1889 Jeremiah Jencks (2 years)
- 1886 Woodford, Professor and Head, Dept. of Economics and Social Science (newly separated from History and Political Science)
1885
- 1885 Arthur B. Woodford (3 years) Assistant and Associate Professor of Economics and Sociology

Woodford has been assigned a course in Sociology in addition to courses in Political Economy, Advanced Political Economy, History of Economic Theories, and Industrial History. Sociology is outlined as follows:

The aim of this course is to bring before the student the latest results in this new Department of scientific investigation—life as it is manifested in human societies (Senior Year). See Figure 2, 56th Annual Catalog of Indiana University, 1885-86.

From 1885 to the current year 1985, an introductory course has been taught consecutively for 100 years.

What is significant about this introduction of sociology in the curriculum of Indiana University in 1885 is the national perspective. The following statement is from G. Duncan Mitchell, A Hundred Years of Sociology, Chicago: Aldine, 1968, pp. 218-219. The reader will note that Indiana University was one of the very first universities in the United States to introduce sociology—and unquestionably the first in the Big Ten Conference.

In America sociology courses were introduced in Boston University in 1883, in William and Mary College and in Indiana University in 1885, and in the University of Wyoming two years later. I have changed the date for Indiana University from Mitchell's 1886 to 1885 based on the 56th Annual Catalog of Indiana University 1885-86, pp. 48-49. (Shown as Figure 2 in this History of Sociology at Indiana University). It was introduced into Brown University in 1890, where Ward taught. A number of colleges, including Oberlin and Vassar, took it up in 1891, but it was not introduced into Chicago and Cornell until 1893. This may be regarded

ARThUR B. WOODFORD

First Professor of Sociology, 1885-1889, and first coach of the Indiana University football team, 1886, 1887, 1888
as the first stage of university development of sociology in America. The second stage dates from a decade later and included the widespread introduction of sociological teaching in liberal-arts colleges, where there was a rapid increase in student numbers, but development may also be seen in universities which give a liberal-arts type of education. Subventions for rural sociological research by the state encouraged its development in agricultural and land colleges. The energetic Albion Small probably did more than anyone to establish sociology in the U.S.A. His appointment to the first chair of sociology in Chicago, the founding of the *American Journal of Sociology* under his editorship in 1895, and his establishment of the American Sociological Society in the same year under the presidency of Lester Ward, represent an important point in the history of sociology in that country. In 1889, Franklin Giddings was elected to the chair of sociology in Columbia University, New York, and from then onwards Chicago and Columbia dominated the field, becoming the main centres for research and graduate work; indeed one may say that very largely these two centres have been responsible for the staffing of sociology departments at the higher levels, throughout the U.S.A.

The creation of the new Department of Economics and Social Science in 1886 with Woodford as Head is another milestone in the history of Indiana University Sociology. In this department Woodford taught such subjects as Sociology, Political Science, Political Economy (Economics), History of American Politics, and 'Seminar in American Political History.' These departments, as we know them, are here compressed in one with a single professor in charge. See Figure 3, the Schedule of Recitations and Lectures for the Fall Term, 1887.

We shall see that in the training of subsequent heads of this department, history, political science and economics were core subjects. Arthur Burnham Woodford, who was born in Winsted, Connecticut on October 7, 1861, was no exception. His vita reads:

Winsted (Connecticut) H.S., 1869-76
Williston Seminary, Easthampton, Massachusetts, 1876-77
PhB 1881, Sheffield Scientific School, Yale University;
Special student in History and Political Science under
Professor W. G. Sumner
University of Michigan, 1882; Political Economy and kindred
subjects
Ecole Libre des Sciences Politiques, Paris, France, 1883
University of Berlin, Germany, 1884; Political Economy and
kindred subjects
Yale University, 1884-85
AM 1886, Indiana University (pro-merito)
PhD 1891, Johns Hopkins University.

He married Margaret Cornelia Bowditch of New Haven, Connecticut on August 19, 1885. They raised four children.
Professor Woodford remained three years as head of the department, leaving in 1889 to complete a Ph.D. at Johns Hopkins.

While at Indiana University he continued to teach a full schedule but was joined in 1886 by Ernest Ludlow Bogart who was appointed as Assistant Professor of Economics and Sociology. The new professor was assigned to teach the Sociology course.

His career history after his doctorate was received in 1891 shows that he served as instructor of political economy at the Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania, 1891-92; School of Economics, New York City, 1892-1896; Lectures at New York University, 1895-98; and instructor of English and History, Hopkins Grammar School, New Haven, Connecticut, (1897-1919) (Head Master, 1906-1916). Woodford made an impact on the lives of hundreds of young people but his most lasting achievement may be his University contribution to Sociology from 1885 to 1889.

Now in rapid succession there came to the Department of Economics and Social Science, four young men who were to win national acclaim in Economics and Sociology as their careers matured. They were in order: Jeremiah W. Jencks, Edward A. Ross, John R. Commons, and Frank Petter.

Jencks put in a two year stay (1889-91) before leaving for Cornell University and later prominence as an outstanding economist, winning election as President of the American Economic Association.

Ross came for one year (1891-92) and made his mark as an outstanding teacher and public lecturer. In his autobiography, he writes at some length about his appointment, experiences on the Bloomington campus, public lectures in Indianapolis, and his marriage to Rosamond Simons, niece of Lester Ward. He describes that in the spring of 1891 while he was studying at Johns Hopkins, President David Brazil Jordan of Indiana University came looking for a man in economics and was referred to Ross. "We had a talk and presently he notified me that I had been elected to the Chair at $1,500. Ross accepted and began his work in Bloomington. It was his first full-time position and he was just 25 years of age, but no one doubted his ability. He was a tall (6'7"), muscular man who always dressed in a black suit with a starched white collar. He came with a European education and a Ph.D. from Johns Hopkins where James Albert Woodburn was a fellow student. (You know Woodburn Hall named for the man who served Indiana University for a lifetime as Professor of History). But about Ross. He says: "Sociology? No! I have written thousands of pages about it but never had an hour's instruction in it." Nevertheless, he was an avid reader and learned what sociology should be. His pioneer books on Social Psychology and Social Control are still being printed and sold. But in 1891 there was not much to choose from for teaching if you were a sociologist. In his autobiography he says: "In teaching sociology I was at my wits' end for a text. On almost any sociological topic today from twenty to fifty times as much good material is at hand as we had forty odd years ago. I realized then how pitifully little I—any of us—knew, but I never doubted there was room for a science of society and determined that it should come in my time. It did."

Professor Ross felt he had but two choices for a text. "Spencer's Principles wouldn't do at all. Ward's Dynamic Sociology made a strong case for planned social progress but neglected the ordinary life of society." So it was Ward's book that was selected.
He writes, "At Bloomington, Indiana, I joined a faculty of keen up-to-date young men, headed by the delightful biologist, John N. Coulter. I had thirty-five men in Economics, seventeen in Sociology, and five in Comparative Politics. I served on the faculty athletic committee and soon became very popular with the students."

He won that popularity by merit and respect. He tells an anecdote that has been repeated for so many years that Ross has become a legend in sociological circles.

In my economics class there was a "smart aleck" from Southern "Injiney" who had been in the legislature and hankered to "show off." As he had given signs of intending to "have fun with the professor," I kept a suspicious eye on him. One day when I took the chair I noticed him sitting by the open window, his chair tilted back and his feet on the window-sill. As usual I said "The class will please be in order" and everyone came to attention except G., who went on chewing tobacco.

"Mr. G., will you kindly remove your feet from the window-sill and sit up."

No response. I rose and moved rather seriously in his direction. Feet and chair came down ker-blap, and from then on he was the flattest tire on campus. Of course I had no intention of hurting him—I hadn't hit anyone since I was twelve years old—I thought of nothing further than taking him by the scruff of the neck and dragging him through the open window to the ground under his feet below. The incident was trivial and I tell it only because at Cornell and at Stanford I found that all my students had heard of it.

Since then I have had from my students nothing but the most beautiful consideration.

His marriage to Rosamond brought Ross great happiness throughout his life. Moreover, it brought him close to Ward. He describes his first view of Ward at a reception in the Cosmos Club in Washington:

A man sought me out and whispered excitedly, "Come have a look at Lester P. Ward!" I beheld a tall, stooped man of sixty with thick iron-gray hair and strongly-molded features, every inch the Thinker. I gazed with awe, little dreaming that I was to marry his niece, call him "Uncle," and have unlimited converse with him. If I should meet socially Aristotle, "Master of Them That Know," I doubt if I would find him a bigger man than Lester P. Ward.5

Ross soon made his abilities known. Northwestern University offered him a chair at $2,250 a year. President Jordan invited him to come to Stanford at $2,250. Cornell University proposed an associate professorship at $2,500. He visited Cornell and decided to accept their offer.

Ross was to continue a career leading from Cornell to Stanford, Nebraska, and lastly to Wisconsin where his growth in sociology flowered. He was a prolific writer of books, his texts selling in the aggregate nearly a half million copies. He was also an inveterate traveler moving hither and yon inside and outside his America, to Mexico, to China, to Russia, to Sweden, to India and many other places. Harry Elmer Barnes in his social history concludes that "no other American has had so interesting and colorful a life as Ross." Next to Sumner he has been the most popular teacher of undergraduates and for thirty years he headed one of the most distinguished departments in America.6

At Indiana University Ross will be remembered as having "found himself," beginning his specialization and his career in sociology. He writes: "In my post-graduate study in the Universities of Berlin and Johns Hopkins, 1888-1891, I took courses in philosophy and economics but nothing in sociology was offered. As soon as I held a University Chair (Indiana in 1893) however, I began teaching it for it had a fascination for me." His career attests to a life-long fascination.

When Ross left Indiana, there was John R. Commons, another superb scholar waiting in the wings, and after him Ulysses G. Weatherly was to follow.

John R. Commons came to Indiana University for a three year period—1892-1895. He arrived from Oberlin College where he had been Professor of Sociology. As Head of Economics and Social Science he had responsibilities for both economics and sociology. The Indiana Student newspaper reports in 1894 that 25 students were enrolled in the advanced class in sociology. "The popularity of the department is shown by the fact that nine students graduated from it in the class of 1893 and eight will graduate this year (1894)...In addition to the undergraduate students there are seven post-graduate candidates for the master's degree, only one of whom is in college. All of the other six are former graduates of Indiana University who have evidently taken their interest in the work with them into their business and professional life."8

The course of study is well arranged and can be completed in nine terms. The first year's work in the department is designed as a general introduction into the Principles of Economics.9 During the fall term the texts used were Professor Elly's Outlines of Economics, Henry George's Progress and Poverty, and Gunton's Wealth and Progress. Other areas of study included money and banking, public finances, and socialism.

The advanced work for Juniors and Seniors consists of a careful study of economic theory and sociology which are given in alternate years. During the present year the advanced students are working on sociology. Begin-
ning with a comparative study of different stages of social development, an attempt is made to get together a mass of facts from which fundamental laws and theories may be deduced. The writings of Ward and Spencer who are recognized as the world's greatest authorities on the subject are carefully studied. The problems of sociology are put clearly before the class—and without attempting to establish any certain theory as infallible, each student is encouraged to form his own opinions. During the present term the members of the class have been engaged in what Prof. Commons aptly terms "laboratory work in sociology." Recognizing the fact that in our own student body and in the social features of every day life as it is manifested in Bloomington, there is a rich field for investigation and research, many interesting facts have been developed and applied in the work of the classroom. The importance of this departure can scarcely be estimated, for with the practical experience thus gained the student can form a basis for work in the social circles he will enter on leaving college and thus fit himself for earnest effort in the broader fields of manhood and womanhood.

During the last few weeks, the advanced students in sociology organized a Sociological Club. Briefly stated, the objects of the association are to apply the principle of co-operation to their study of the social subject and to promote original research among the members. The previous week's work is discussed at each meeting, special topics of interest are assigned for report and plans for promulgating the ideas of practical sociology are discussed. All are freely invited to attend and much interesting work is promised. This is a step in the right direction and it will certainly lead to valuable results. 10

When John R. Commons came to Indiana he was 29 years old. He was born in Winchester, Indiana, and graduated from Winchester High School in 1881. He spent several years afterwards as an assistant to his father, who was editor of the Winchester Herald. He joined the typographical union at Cleveland, Ohio, and served all grades in the printing office. Thereafter he went to Oberlin College and received his M.A. degree. At Johns Hopkins he studied with the renowned economist, Richard Ely. His teaching led him from Middleton College (Middleton, Connecticut) to Oberlin and then Indiana. One of the activities to engage Professor Commons while at Indiana was the American Institute of Christian Sociology. Mrs. Commons was the secretary of this organization and is said to have given "tireless and efficient aid." 11

The object of the Institute was to stimulate the study of sociology in all sections of the country. Fifty local branches had been established in 1894 and the work received a "great impetus from the principal religious leaders of the country, who are earnestly taking it up." 11

Professor Commons was at Indiana long enough to establish a model of what sociology should be. He was to be succeeded by Frank Fetter, another excellent scholar, but whose main interest was in economics.

Fetter did have on his staff a young Hoosier who had joined the faculty as an Assistant Professor of History, but whose main interest was sociology. He was Ulysses Grant Weatherly, who transferred to the Department of Economics and Social Science and was to become its head when Fetter left for Cornell as Professor of Political Economy.

Of these men, the historian Thomas Clark says:

With all the records in on these famous scholars who pioneered the field of economics at Indiana University, one can only speculate what glory the institution might have enjoyed had it retained these youthful front runners. It is doubtful that any American university in its history has had so many promising young men interested in the social sciences on its staff, and who later achieved such high scholarly recognition. Even one at a time and in succession they added luster. If for no other reason, William Lowe Bryan had eloquent reason to bemoan the stinginess of a state which left its university economically strapped to the point that it could not stave off repeated raids. Obviously, promising men were enticed away by more attractive salaries and career prospects. 12

Sociologists can especially bemoan the loss of Ross and Commons. Since they both went eventually to the University of Wisconsin, it is easy to see what their influence did in bringing lustre to that institution when the fullness of their work matured there. Still, since the young discipline must first take root, Ross and Commons were superb in their institution building capabilities during their early careers at Indiana.

2. The Foundation (1899-1935)

To explain the foundation of the modern Department of Sociology is to describe the life work of Ulysses Grant Weatherly, who gave 36 years of service as Head of the Department of Economics and Social Science and four preceding years as Assistant and Associate Professor of History. The following three pages contain Figure 4, which is a reproduction of pages from the Indiana University Catalog showing courses in the Department of Economics and Social Science in 1899-1900 when Weatherly took over as Head.

Out of the department that Weatherly headed came the firm establishment of sociology as an independent science in the curriculum, the introduction of Anthropology, the beginning of an Anthropology Museum, a School of Social Work and a School of Business. Each of these achievements will be briefly documented. But first a description of this remarkable man is in order.
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS AND SOCIAL SCIENCE

*WESLEY O. WHITELAW, Professor.

HERMANN E. BILL, Assistant Professor.

WILLIAM A. RAWLINS, Assistant Professor.

Students selecting Economics and Social Science as their major subject are required to take twelve terms of daily work, at least six terms of which must be in Economics and Social Science and three terms in History and Political Science. The remaining three terms may be selected either from the Department of Economics, or from Courses 6, 10, 18, 21, 23, 24, and 26 in the Department of History and Political Science. Students intending to take the work of this Department as their major subject are advised to take the required three terms of history during the first year of their University course. The usual sequence of studies is as follows:

First year: History 1, 2, and 3.
Second year: Economics 1, 2, 10, 9, and 13.
Third year: Economics 20, 7, 6, 6, and 6.
Fourth year: Economics 6, 10, 18, 11, 8, and elective courses in History and Political Science.

The substitution of the additional three terms' work in History and Political Science, which is allowed by the Department, may be made in either the third or the fourth year. The student is advised to take as much additional work in history, political science, ethics, and psychology, as possible. The work of the Department is designed to furnish a broad preparation for work in law, journalism, charities, the public service, and for future specialization in economics or sociology. A narrow specialization in the undergraduate course is discouraged.

1. Political Economy. An introduction to the leading principles of economic science. Designed for students of other departments and as a basis for more advanced studies in economics. The instruction will be given principally in the form of lectures. Professor WEATHERLY.
   Fall and Winter terms, M. W. F., at 10:30.
   Open to all students. This course should be taken in the second year, after a year's work in History.

2. Political Economy. A repetition of Course 1. Assistant Professor RAWLINS.
   Spring term, daily, at 9:00.
   Open to all students.

12. Practical Questions in Economics. The study of questions of present importance; intended especially as a continuation of Course 1. Lectures and reports on assigned topics. Professor WEATHERLY.
   Spring term, M. W. F., at 9:00.
   Open to students who have passed in Course 1 or its equivalent.

*Almost on Iowa, Columbia University, until June 20, 1900.
1 In charge of the Department, 1899-1900.

Figure 4. Catalog of Indiana University 1899-1900.
WEATHERLY—THE MAN AND SCHOLAR

This is the way the new I.U. professor was introduced in the IU Alumni Bulletin in 1895:

Dr. Ulysses Grant Weatherly, assistant professor of history, is a native of Indiana having been born in Indianaoplis. He is about thirty years of age. He prepared for college in Pillsbury Academy, and was graduated from Colgate University, N.Y. 1890. While in college he won several prizes for efficiency in Latin and History work. The year following his graduation from Mathaon Regents Academy in New York he went to Cornell University and spent two years in graduate work in history and political science. Dr. Weatherly was also sorary assistant to ex-President Andrew White during this time. In 1891-2 he won the Barnes-Shakespeare prize and was subsequently Andrew D. White's fellow in modern history. He spent 1893-4 in Europe traveling in England, Germany, Austria, and studying in Heidelberg and Leipzig. Upon his return he was given the degree of Ph.D. by Cornell University in 1894.

Last year he was teaching in the Philadelphia Central College. Among the articles he has published are "Evolution as related to Historical Study" and "Lichtenstein, a Histrionic European State."

Now Weatherly knew that he was lucky to find a position in a depression year like 1895. Positions in the social sciences were especially hard to find, and a professorship in sociology was almost unknown. It is an important part of the record of American Sociology that so many of the earlier sociologists trained in history and economics and carved out for themselves a place in sociology which they, in turn, developed to fuller stature. This was shown clearly in the case of E. A. Ross. Like Ross, Weatherly was following an early American pattern; graduate work in history and economics, study in Germany, teaching in two or more social sciences, and finally a professorship in sociology. After coming back to his own native region in 1895, Weatherly moved from Assistant Professor of History to Associate Professor and then Professor and Head of the Department of Economics and Social Science (1899). This move did not seem particularly abrupt since only five years earlier, prior to the separation from the History Department, the Department was called History and Political Economy. Besides, Professor Weatherly had told President Bryan that he had a strong interest in sociology and wished to pursue it. He began offering courses in this field and soon his career began to be established. He stayed at Indiana as head of the "new" department until 1935 and remained in Bloomington until his death in 1940.

During these years he devoted himself primarily to teaching and contacts, mostly at Indiana, but also to teaching in summer sessions at Columbia, Cornell, Oregon, and Southern California. He received honorary degrees from his alma mater, Colgate, in 1910, and from Indiana in 1911. He was president of the Indiana Conference of Charities and Corrections, Chairman of the Indiana...
Child Labor Commission, and a member of the Indiana Commission of Industrial Education. In 1923 he was elected 13th President of the American Sociological Society. In 1927 his major work was published with the title, Social Progress: Studies in the Dynamics of Social Change. This is a well-balanced, scholarly work that demonstrates his maturity as a sociologist. This scholar, a former historian who taught himself sociology, demonstrated his early development in 1906.

In a small book of 34 pages Weatherly lays out his conception of sociology in outline form. He begins with a preface note as follows:

The study of sociology has been hampered by lack of consistent agreement as to the exact scope and content of the science. Is it concerned primarily with social process or with social structure? Of the two men whose names stand first among the pioneers of the science, Comte emphasized the philosophical element, Spencer the historical and descriptive. The predominant trend among recent French and American scholars has been in the direction of social philosophy rather than of social history. Nevertheless, all the work in the field of sociological scholarship that of Spencer remains the most fruitful, despite wide dissent from many of his conclusions. The reason for this lies, doubtless, in the fact that, while his investigation is confined to the too-narrow field of the lower levels of culture, it at least attempts to deal with concrete facts, and is susceptible of definite tests. From the psychological group, on the other hand, the significant results they have obtained, must be confessed that the results thus far have been disappointing. The charge that the current sociology is a compound of a bankrupt philosophy of history and a spurious psychology has had enough of the shadow of truth in it to bring to the nascent science some little discredit. Part of this odium, I venture to think, has been caused by the adoption of a harsh, complicated terminology, but more, probably, by an unnecessarily remote and abstract mode of dealing with social forces. Particularly have these difficulties manifested themselves in the consideration of the pedagogical side of the subject. Political economy passed through the same troubled period, and is now emerging from it by the process of blending the inductive and deductive methods. No one is adequately equipped for the study of sociology, certainly not for the teaching of it, who has not some definite knowledge of anthropology and culture-history, as well as some correct training in psychology.

The present outline attempts to group a few of the fundamental social facts and to suggest some interpretation of them. Such interpretation, it is believed, will be more fruitful if kept in close contact with the facts themselves than if given independently. Close association with facts lessens the taste for wide generalizations, while it breeds wholesome distrust of a philosophy which promises too much. The ambition to create a universal philosophy of things human, from breakfast foods to the immortality of the soul, is no doubt a laudable one, but it demands an equipment of knowledge which is in the nature of things impossible. The more modest task of seeking to understand a limited group of facts that are distinctly social in character is not so alluring, but it offers less danger of final disappointment.

Bloomington, Indiana, April, 1906. UGM.

The general statement of Contents forewarns most introductory textbooks of today—at least there is sufficient correspondence to evoke a surprising familiarity. Only the modern knowledge of social psychology and collective behavior seem conspicuous by their absence in the Weatherly statement.

CONTENTS

U. G. Weatherly (1906)

Part I. Nature and Purpose of Sociology

I. Sociology and the Cognate Sciences
II. Development of Sociology as an Independent Science
III. Sociological Method

PART II. Units of Sociology

I. The Family
A. Marriage and Kinship
B. Infancy
C. The Household

II. The State
III. The Church
IV. The School
V. The Town
VI. International Contacts
VII. Other Derivative Groups

PART III. Basis of Society

I. Physical Environment
II. Population and the Social Environment
III. Embryonic Societies
IV. The Organic Concept of Society
V. The Contract Theory of Society
VI. Sovereignty
VII. Society and Numbers
VIII. Race
PART IV. Social Forces and the Process of Socialization

I. Social Evolution
II. The Exceptional Man and Individual Initiative
III. Custom
IV. Imitation
V. Conflict and Compromise
VI. Selection
VII. Mutual Aid
VIII. Heredity
IX. Public Opinion

PART V. Social Pathology

I. Type and Variation
II. Degeneration
III. Parasitism
IV. The Passive Abnormals
V. The Self-Assertive Abnormals
VI. The Unadapted: Exaggerated Individualism
VII. The Mob: Morbid Sociality

Note below how the Outlines were constructed:

PART I. Nature and Purpose of Sociology

I. Sociology and the Cognate Sciences

Definitions: Society, the regulated contact of men in groups; mere physical juxtaposition contrasted with association.

Sociology concerned with the phenomena connected with the organization and discipline of men in groups.

Etymology of the terms used.

Sociology uses much of its material in common with the sciences of Biology, Anthropology, Psychology, History, Economics, Politics and Ethics: special relation to Psychology and History.

The distinctive point of view of sociology: the social sciences and the science of society.

II. Development of Sociology as an Independent Science

Its right to be classed as a science: the various texts proposed; the physical and mathematical sciences contrasted with the several social sciences.

Not a new field of study: it has existed wherever man has thought systematically on the facts of association; Plato, Aristotle, political philosophy, the utopians, Rousseau, industrial reform movements of the early nineteenth century.

Coote and his classification of the sciences: the naming of Sociology.
Herbert Spencer: his method; his contributions.
LePlay and his followers.
Schaeffle, Ratzenhofer, Gumplovics.
The socialists.
Recent contributions and tendencies: De Greef, Mackenzie, Tarde, Ward, Giddings.

III. Sociological Method

The question of emphasis: social structure or social process.

Induction: historical and descriptive sociology; classification of facts; sources.

The deductive method: extent of actual achievement; the value of hypotheses.

Sociology both a science and an art: "pure" and "applied" Sociology; the quest of facts and the quest of laws.

The static and the dynamic methods: social progress.

Special sociologies.

Wide range of subject-matter: need of strict delimitation.

Practical utility of sociology, and utility as a discipline.

Between his Outlines of Sociology and the major book on Social Progress Weatherly devoted most of his sociology writing to book reviews, and his bibliography contains more than fifty. The Proceedings of the American Sociological Society records the following research and opinion papers:

1909 How Does the Access of Women to Industrial Occupations Affect on the Family
1911 The Racial Element in Social Assimilation
1915 Freedom of Teaching in the United States
1920 Democracy and Our Political Systems

WEATHERLY AS SOCIOLOGY DEPARTMENT BUILDER

To assess the work of the Weatherly Era in sociology is to look at the longest period in which any one head dominated the department. Weatherly truly laid the foundations of sociology at Indiana and left his mark on social work, anthropology, and business.

His struggle to build sociology shows clearly in his Annual Report to the President and Board of Trustees in 1906. He writes:

Each year makes more clear to me the pressing need for further developing the work in sociology. The fragmentary character of the courses at present given is made necessary by the pressure of the work in Economics—older and longer established but not, I believe, more
essential to a satisfactory curriculum. I personally do not believe in giving any very large amount of abstract or theoretical sociology to undergraduates, but the divisions of the subject in which I am particularly interested are the concrete ones. I have long had in mind the outline of a general course in Sociology for Juniors and Seniors that would open some of the richest fields of intellectual activity. At present, only the merest fragments of these are touched in our courses. Students cannot get the proper foundations for advanced work from these as they are at present. Many students who would be attracted by this work if adequately represented do not get it at all. This is particularly true of our women students. Girls are repelled by economics (there are only six girls in my classes this term) but ought to be more interested in sociology if the subject were given in form to be taken as a regular course. Without much multiplication of courses and with such rearrangement and expansion of courses as a little added time would allow, we could build up the work in sociology so that it would begin to meet the needs of this rapidly growing line of cultural interest. Later in the year I hope to present some definite suggestions as to meeting this problem. At present I am merely stating some aspects of it from the point of view of actually existing conditions.

Respectfully submitted,

U. G. Weatherly

WEATHERLY AS ORGANIZER OF SOCIAL WORK

In 1908, in the Annual Report, Weatherly stressed the importance of sociology to the growing professional careers represented by Social Work. He pointed out that graduate work was needed. He makes his case with examples as follows:

A new career for college graduates is rapidly developing, that of social service, and I am endeavoring, in a limited way, to organize a line of work that is best adapted to give a general training for such work. But it is to our graduate work that I believe we must turn with the most earnest attention. This seems to me to be the field that calls for a larger emphasis in this department and in the university in general. For the present, I should like to be able to develop a full year of distinctly graduate work, so that a postgraduate student could spend one year of his course here as profitably as anywhere.

Sociology has never had here an adequate representation, and not until quite recently has it had much recognition in any American institution. The immense growth of interest in this field is forcing on us the necessity of enlarging the scope of the work in our classes. I desire to again emphasize the statement made in a former report that the state university in particular ought to be a center for the development of social studies. Beginning this year I have introduced some additional sociological courses. So as to form the groundwork of a general course which will appeal to such as may wish to make this the chief part of their major work, particularly women students. Heretofore the only choice in this line has been a course preeminent ly economic, with incidental courses in Sociology more or less inarticulated. As at present arranged, these courses are as follows:

1. Ethnology
2. Comparative Sociology: the Family
3. Demography of the United States

1. Social Pathology: Poverty and Charities
2. Social Pathology: Crime and Penology
3. Social Pathology: Special Problems

1. Socialism and Social Reform
2. Industrial Society
3. General Sociology

(All courses above are shown according to the terms in which they are given—1st term, September to December vacation period; 2nd term, January through March; 3rd term, April through June.)

The correlation of the work in sociology at the University and the Charity Organization Society of Indianapolis which began two years ago was continued last year with increased interest and profit. Mr. Grout & I are now working out the plans on a still more thorough union of effort. It is our hope to arrange to have students carry on special investigation of social conditions at Indianapolis under Mr. Grout's direction, the materials thus gathered to be used in our work here and also to constitute the basis of my lectures to the Charity Organization Society. This plan has great possibilities for usefulness to both sides, and I bespeak for it the support and cooperation of the Trustees. Nearly every year one or more students go from their work here directly into social service as a profession. The gratifying success of some of our recent graduates seems to indicate that a real need is being met. The following cases may be cited as examples:
Brubaker, 1901, Treasurer, University Settlement, New York.
Williams, 1902, Head of Charity Organization Society, Orange, N.J.
Weil, 1903, Chief Probation Officer, Cincinnati
Dunn, 1905, Assistant Secretary, Associated Charities, Cincinnati
Pieser, Ex 1908, Head Truant Officer, Indianapolis
Owen, 1908, District Secretary, Associated Charities, Baltimore

In addition to the plan of cooperation with the Indianapolis work, the Department is now in affiliation with the Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy, of which institution I am one of the trustees.

The new history of social work education at Indiana University describes Weatherly's role in establishing the School of Social Work when it was first set up as a Department of Social Service in the new School of Medicine (1911).

History of the School for Social Work

Among the sociologists who had talked of training was Dr. Ulysses Grant Weatherly, Professor of Sociology and Head of the Indiana University Department of Economics and Social Sciences (after 1915 known as the Department of Economics and Sociology). He had for some time maintained arrangements with social agencies where his advanced students interested in social work might observe, and he regularly invited visiting lecturers who could narrate and describe the work, functions, and problems of social workers. He, like other sociologists of the era, saw the growing field of social work as "applied sociology," and sought practical training for students wanting to prepare themselves for that field. He also sought a laboratory or research facility, and research materials for students to work with. He surveyed several possibilities before settling on the Medical Dispensary in Indianapolis. He presented his request to the University President and Board of Trustees, and $800 was set aside in 1911 for the Department of Social Service to be set up in conjunction with the Medical Dispensary of the New School of Medicine in Indianapolis. This was a "subdepartment" of Dr. Weatherly's department, although its day-to-day operations would be under the supervision of the incoming dean, Dr. Charles P. Emerson.16

The history of Weatherly's contribution to social work is contained in many pages of the new history of the department as demonstrated over many years.17 Weatherly is hailed as a champion of child welfare (p. 22), as a stimulator of student research (p. 23), and as a developer of a new combined course for the training of social workers (July 1920) (p. 25).

WEATHERLY AS ANTHROPOLOGIST
and Builder of the Anthropology Museum

Weatherly taught a course in Anthropology regularly and was the builder of the first museum of Anthropology. In his 1906 Report to the President and Board of Trustees he wrote (in long hand):

"Permit one to call attention to the desirability of further developing our little museum of Anthropology and Social History which I have for some years been attempting to get started. A museum is a rather costly thing and I have not asked for any special funds in this line, but it is a field that ought to be expanded as soon as the University is in any position to undertake it. Now that the room in Kirkwood Hall formerly used by the Y.M.C.A. is vacated, I ask that this be set aside for the use of this museum, and that it be fitted up with what equipment may be needed for its present uses.

I would request a library appropriation equal to that of the past year—$500. The increasing number of periodicals in the rapidly growing fields covered by this Department makes every year a larger inroad into the appropriation, leaving a relatively smaller amount available for books. Economics proper, Sociology proper, Anthropology, and the Commercial courses are all large and more or less distinct fields, each with its own special literature which is a necessary equipment for any successful work.

Figure 5. This artifact is housed in the new William Hammond Harrington Museum of Anthropology, History, and Folklore at Indiana University, Bloomington."
I ask also a departmental appropriation of $100 to be used for material equipment for the museum and for the incidental expenses of the lectures mentioned above. The disposition of the $100 appropriation of the current year was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case for museum</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressage</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casts for museum</td>
<td>37.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel and traveling expenses of special lecturers</td>
<td>15.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$57.94</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The course in Anthropology was placed in the Sophomore year and was taught as three lines of study: Ethnology, Primitive Technology, and Social Origins.

**WEATHERLY AS DEVELOPER OF A SCHOOL OF BUSINESS**

Being responsible for a Department of Economics and Social Science was a large order. Weatherly taught economics as well as anthropology and sociology. Of course, he relied heavily on his junior professor, William A. Rawles, for major support in the teaching of economics. The department had a proud masthead on its stationery.

Department of Economics and Social Science

Ulysses G. Weatherly, Professor
William A. Rawles, Junior Professor
Ulysses B. Smith, Instructor
Walter Myers, Assistant

In 1908 he wrote to the President of the problems ensuing with the trend toward professional training.

The present trend toward the professional courses has affected this Department to the extent of taking into the five-year law course about fifty percent of the students who would normally choose economics and sociology as their major subject. While I do not wish to depreciate this tendency, I do feel that in the interest of liberal scholarship some effort should be made to influence as many as possible to complete the regular course before beginning professional training. We have provided within the limits of this Department a Commercial Course for those who contemplate a business career. For the prospective teacher we can offer no specific inducements, because there is little call for the teaching of our subjects below the college.

By 1916 the Commercial course in the department had grown and William A. Rawles was named Director of Commercial Courses, which constituted two years of a four-year course leading to a baccalaureate degree. Preparation for a business career was desired by even more students and The School of Commerce and Finance was established in 1920 with an initial enrollment of 70. Professor Rawles was named Dean and introduced the first graduating class of 14 in the Spring of 1921. The establishment of the School of Commerce and Finance divorced commercial courses for the first time from its progenitor, the Department of Economics and Sociology. But students were encouraged to take courses in these two social science fields and many did so.

Now launched, business education continued its growth. In 1932 the Board of Trustees approved a four-year course allowing freshmen to enroll directly in the new school which was renamed the School of Business Administration. In 1935 a young man by the name of Herman B. Wells became the Dean of the School of Business Administration.

Weatherly could not know that he was recruiting a man who would be a dean of the new School of Business in five years when he hired a young instructor of economics in 1930. This is how today's Chancellor of Indiana University and former president of 35 years describes his first college teaching appointment:

In the spring of 1930, my second year with the Indiana Bankers Association, I was invited by U. G. Weatherly, then head of Indiana University's Department of Economics and Sociology, to come to Bloomington for a Sunday noon dinner. It was customary in those days to use the Sunday noon dinner for entertaining. I remember the visit vividly. J. E. Moffat and his wife also were guests, Dr. Moffat then being the senior professor in the department next to Dr. Weatherly. The Moffats were good friends of mine, with whom I had often shared social occasions during both my undergraduate and graduate days.

Mrs. Weatherly had an excellent dinner, a fine roast, and it was all beautifully served in the dining room with the best linen and china by help who had been brought in for that occasion. After dinner Dr. Weatherly asked the ladies if we might be excused, and Dr. Weatherly, Dr. Moffat, and I went into Dr. Weatherly's study, where he began the laborious task of filling his pipe, a task that went on sporadically during the whole of any conference with him. He cleared his throat a time or two and then said that he and Dr. Moffat had been discussing their staff situation for the next fall and they had determined that there would probably be an instructorship open. He asked if I would be interested in accepting the position if the opening occurred.

I was surprised, but after swallowing a couple of times I replied that I would be honored to accept. I did point out that I was engaged in some interesting research with the IBA at that particular time, and I raised the question of my possibly continuing some
research for the association in addition to my teaching duties, thus maintaining a practical connection with the financial field. This later proved to require my driving back and forth to Indianapolis two or three times a week. They expressed approval of the idea and then said we would consider the matter settled and I would in due course receive a formal letter. There was no discussion of salary. In fact, I did not find out what my salary was to be until I received either the formal letter some weeks later or my first salary check. I do not recall which. I drove back to Indianapolis and then on Monday, en route to Lafayette on my regular rounds, stopped to see Father and Mother to discuss the matter with them. Afterward I wrote Dr. Weatherly: "Monday, I discussed with my Mother and Father the matter of accepting the position in your department in case the opening occurs as expected. They were enthusiastic over the idea. Consequently I now confirm the favorable decision I gave you Sunday." I was greatly flattered by the offer and really tremendously excited by it. I realized from Dr. Weatherly's reaction when I told him my present salary that I would be receiving a salary perhaps less than half my current rate; but, so long as I had enough money to live on, that salary reduction seemed a small matter compared to the prospect of being a member of the faculty and having the opportunity to teach full time. The very thought of being on the faculty was exhilarating to me.19

We have come to the end of the Weatherly era. This description described the works of a remarkable academic man but did not reveal much about the man himself. Of course, a full biography lies beyond the range of this history, but perhaps one letter written by Professor Weatherly to a student will describe Weatherly, the teacher. This following excerpt is from a letter by Weatherly to Harry V. Craig who graduated from IU in 1896. He found it very hard to get a job but finally he secured a teaching position at Noblesville High School (where he graduated in 1890) in 1901 and taught a few years in this school. Professor Weatherly then received a letter from Mr. Craig who was having a most difficult time finding a teaching position.

10 October, 1896

Dear Mr. Craig:

Your letter has remained unanswered much longer than it ought, owing to the fact of my having been very busy during the opening weeks of the term. I was pleased to hear from you and I assure you of my hearty appreciation of your kind words with reference to our work together last year. I also derived much pleasure and profit from the year's work, and I think that my students of that first year at the University will always seem to me a little better than any others that may come hereafter. The best that we can hope to do in our general courses here is to arouse in students—some students at least—the dormant tastes and energies that will inspire the ambition to go on and do independent scholarly work. Surely we have long outlived the old idea that one who does the work laid out in the curriculum is a finished scholar. My own aspiration is rather to induce students to feel that this work can be only the beginning, the preparation for scholarship. A college course does not educate one; it can only prepare him to educate himself.

It is very gratifying therefore, to learn that you hope to do further work in history at some larger institution. I earnestly hope that you may soon be able to do so. Meanwhile a year's well-directed private reading will help you a great deal.

I was sorry to learn that you did not succeed at Indianapolis. I saw Mr. Goss for a few minutes recently. He spoke most kindly of you and I think the ordinary circumstances your chances would have been good, but this year seems to have brought an unusually large number of applicants, and among them were some of considerable experience and of considerable post-graduate training. There is therefore no cause to be discouraged. I trust you may find something satisfactory before the year ends, and I repeat my request that you will notify me whenever I can aid you in any way. It will be a real pleasure for me to do so.

The University opens up favorably. My class in modern history numbers 20, double the number of last year. The attendance at the University is nearly 600. I shall be glad to hear from you again.

Believe me,

Sincerely yours,

U. G. Weatherly20

On June 26, 1897, just nine months later, Weatherly answered another letter from Mr. Craig who was still looking for a position. Weatherly sent this message:

I hope that you may secure for next year a satisfactory position in the line you desire to reach, and beg that you will remember my offer to aid you in any way possible. I presented your name to Mr. Goss again this year, but unfortunately did not get a chance to talk with him until his mind was about made up. I was hoping there would be more places open this year than last, but there does not seem to have been any great improvement. Shall we attribute this to the
failure of the promised wave of prosperity that was to come with the new administration.

Then in another vein Weatherly demonstrates that an academic man always must be vigilant, if not also worried, about the world outside the campus. He complimented Mr. Craig for his help in a fight that IU was having with the "non-state college men."

We have heard of you during the year in a very pleasant way, i.e., in connection with your defense of the University against the attacks of its enemies in the press. This is a time when every friend of the University ought to stand forth as her champion, for, although it is the period of her greatest prosperity, it is also the period of greatest danger. The non-state college men are organizing for a systematic attack, and will use every means possible within the next two years. So it is all the more gratifying to hear of your loyal efforts in a county where there seems to be considerable opposition to the University.

Ulysses Grant Weatherly has received four major recognitions for his contributions to Sociology and Indiana University. These are (1) the U. G. Weatherly Award for Distinguished Teaching, (2) the naming of a graduate student residence center as Ulysses Grant Weatherly Hall, (3) the naming of a Student and Faculty Lounge in Ballantine Hall as the U. G. Weatherly Room, and (4) the Ulysses Grant Weatherly Award in Sociology.

(1) The Weatherly Award for distinguished teaching was established by George A. Schilling of Lafayette, Indiana. Mr. Schilling was a former student of Professor Weatherly. Awards were made from 1962 to 1976. By 1976 funds were exhausted and no further awards were made after that date. The bronze plaques with the names of recipients are on display in the Wittenberger Lobby of the Indiana Memorial Union.

(2) The U. G. Weatherly Residence Center was dedicated on November 15, 1970 as part of the Sesquicentennial celebration of Indiana University.

(3) The U. G. Weatherly Room was designated for Ballantine Hall, Room 748, by the Executive Committee of the Department of Sociology in the Fall of 1982.

(4) The Ulysses Grant Weatherly Award in Sociology was established by Mrs. Alice B. Weatherly and Mrs. Ruth Weatherly Gray, widow and daughter of Professor Weatherly, respectively. The Weatherly Award is given annually to an undergraduate student majoring in sociology on the basis of a competitive paper.

THE SUTHERLAND ERA 1935-1949

When Edwin H. Sutherland came to Indiana University at 53 years of age, sociology received both its independence from economics and a new image. Henceforth, for many years it would be known as the great center of criminological study. Edwin Sutherland was at the peak of his productive years and established as one of the greatest living criminology scholars. He was already the author of a classic text called simply Criminology (1924) which was to dominate the field for more than 50 years. Its influence continues strongly to this day thanks to the editorial work of Donald R. Cressey.

After he came to the IU campus he published The Professional Thief (1937) and White Collar Crime (1949). At Indiana he produced the third and fourth editions of the now famous Principles of Criminology (1939, 1947). In 1939 he became President of the American Sociological Society, the last Indiana University Professor to win that post in this century. He was President of the Indiana University Institute of Criminal Law and Criminology; of the American Prison Association; of the Chicago Academy of Criminology; and of the Sociological Research Association.

Sutherland, like many of the leading sociologists, as already noted, came to sociology from another field. Like Odum, he was teaching Latin and Greek in a small college. He had plans to take graduate work in history, but found that a course in sociology was a prerequisite for graduate work in history, and consequently he took a correspondence course in sociology to meet this requirement. From this he decided to select sociology as a minor while keeping history as a major. Following his A.B. at Grand Island College in 1904, Sutherland entered the University of Chicago and took one course in sociology and decided to make sociology the major rather than the minor. He completed his Ph.D. degree work at the University of Chicago in 1913, at thirty years of age.

Upon receiving the doctorate, Sutherland accepted a post at William Jewell College in Liberty, Missouri, where he taught until 1919. In that year he moved to the University of Illinois to join a sociology faculty that included such notables of the day as E. C. Hayes.
and E. T. Hiller. In 1925 Sutherland left Illinois for the University of Minnesota, staying until 1929, when he was given a leave of absence to work at the Bureau of Social Hygiene in New York. During the course of that year, which included research in England, he resigned from Minnesota to accept a research professorship at the University of Chicago. In announcing his appointment, President Robert M. Hutchins stated that the step was taken to strengthen the university’s crime-study program.

Sutherland stayed at Chicago until 1935 when he moved to Indiana University as head of the sociology department. Although the reasons for his move from the University of Chicago to Indiana University are obscure, we can imagine that he was more or less dissatisfied with his dispensation in the department at Chicago, which did not include permanent tenure. There was probably more push than pull.

Sutherland was somewhat restless and peripatetic. He was affiliated with five different schools (excluding his pre-doctoral positions), with an average stay of around seven years. However, he covered no great distance and remained within a rather restricted geographical area throughout his academic career. This pattern is of no special significance, except that it kept him within easy distance of his friends in Chicago (McKay, Ogburn, and Hughes) and relatively distant from sociologists outside the Midwest. Thus the biases of his graduate training were reinforced by his somewhat provincial pattern of contacts.

It should be noted that he was born in Gibbon, Nebraska and educated in Missouri and Illinois. These facts become important when he began the building of the department at Indiana.

SUTHERLAND—BUILDER OF A QUALITY DEPARTMENT

Sutherland lost no time in building a quality department. In two years he had four very able professors recruited and they were to leave their mark on the ever-improving department. These men were John Mueller who came in 1935, and August Hollingshead, Harvey Locke and Alfred Lindesmith, all of whom came in 1936. All but Hollingshead had earned their Ph.D.s from the University of Chicago, known in those years, 1925–45, as preeminent in graduate training in sociology. Since Sutherland himself had just arrived as a professor of sociology from Chicago he knew many of these young men as students. There is little doubt that he had excellent knowledge of the men he selected. And as head, there is little doubt that he was solely responsible for those selected.

A short history of each of these four professors follows:

John H. Mueller was born in St. Charles, Missouri in 1895. He received his Ph.D. degree at Chicago and began his teaching at the University of Oregon. Sutherland called him to Indiana where he was appointed Associate Professor (1935). He was a trained musician as well as a sociologist and he chose sociology over a career as a concert musician. It is not surprising that he developed a specialized interest in the Sociology of Music. And it is fitting that his single most important publication is The American Symphony Orchestra: A History of Musical Taste. What is surprising is that he combined a strong interest in statistics which he taught for 30 years at Indiana, remaining active until his death in 1965. He served as Chairman of the Department from 1953 to 1960. The Mueller administrative period will be described later.

August B. Hollingshead was born in Lyman, Wyoming in 1907. He earned his Ph.D. at Nebraska and came to Indiana as a young man of 29 years in the rank of Assistant Professor (1936). His career at Indiana is marked by a progression which reads: Assistant Professor 1936–39; Associate Professor 1939–46; Professor 1946–47. Subsequently he reads Yale University, Professor and Head of the Department of Sociology, 1947—. This progression has a special interest because one of the most intriguing articles he wrote for the American Sociological Review was entitled “Climbing the Academic Ladder.” While at Indiana Hollingshead wrote Plimpton’s Youth. This research was widely read across the social sciences and brought prominence to Professor Hollingshead. Later at Yale he wrote another path breaking book (with F. Redlich) based on extensive research. Social Class and Mental Illness is similar to Plimpton’s Youth in that each reveals a comprehensive grasp of the impact of social class on society. His scale, Index of Social Position has had wide usage.

Harvey J. Locke was born in Linfield, Colorado in 1903. With his Chicago Ph.D. he arrived at Indiana as an Assistant Professor (1936) and stayed until 1945 when he left for the University of Southern California. While at Chicago and Indiana he collaborated with Professor Sutherland on Twenty Thousand Homeless Men. His specialty was family and marriage and much of his research was concerned with prediction of success and failure in marriage. He wrote The Family: From Institution to Companionship. His debt and inspiration to Professor E. W. Burgess of Chicago shows clearly in his work.

Alfred R. Lindesmith was born in Owatonna, Minnesota in 1905. He came directly to Indiana as a graduate student from Chicago (1936) and was appointed an instructor of sociology. He received his Ph.D. in 1937 and climbed the academic ladder reaching the rank of full professor and later was awarded the title of University Professor of Sociology. He was acknowledged as the authority of drug addiction in the U.S. He greatly supplemented the work in social disorganization, teaching courses in juvenile delinquency, criminology, and penology. Similarly, he added to social psychology bringing the interactionist viewpoint to bear in his text, with (Anselm L. Strauss) Social Psychology, which was to run into many English and foreign language editions. Professor Lindesmith retired in 1975 and continues active service in the University and the American Red Cross in Bloomington. It was a lifetime of 40 years of unbroken service to one university, although leaves of
absence included three years in the U.S. Air Force in World War II, a Fulbright Fellowship in India, and a visiting professorship at the University of Southern California.

Dinko Tomasic came to Indiana University (1943) during World War II to assist in the newly created Russian program. Tomasic was born in Yugoslavia and received a doctor's degree in jurisprudence at the University of Zagreb. He taught and served as a newspaper correspondent for many years. Forced to flee Yugoslavia because of his anti-communist beliefs, he arrived in the United States and was shortly asked to come to Indiana. In 1945 he transferred to the Department of Sociology as an Associate Professor. His major contribution was his ability to bring his experiences and sociological interpretations to bear on the growing number of Marxist societies in Europe and Asia. No one could do what he could do and his students recognized the authenticity of his teaching. He was a thorough scholar and wrote many books and articles on power in the Communist state and its impact on society. He retired in 1975 after giving 32 years of service to Indiana University—most of it as Professor of Sociology, but also in the Russian Institute.

Anselm L. Strauss received his Ph.D. at Chicago and came to the Indiana Sociology Department in 1947. His interests were mainly in social psychology while he was here from 1947 to 1952. It was during this period that he and Lindesmith collaborated on their textbook in social psychology. They interpreted and codified the interactional viewpoint that had been made famous at Chicago by George H. Mead and his student, Herbert Blumer. Neither of these able Chicago scholars, Mead or Blumer, produced much writing to bear these interactional views they espoused in lectures, so that Social Psychology came to serve as an important as well as a pioneering book. After leaving Indiana Strauss served on the faculties of Chicago and the University of California (San Francisco) where he developed a strong interest in medical sociology.

Karl Schuessler is one of Sutherland's own students who was to win his Ph.D. at Indiana in 1947 and begin his long Indiana career, now stretching over 38 years with a leave of four years as a Commander in the U.S. Naval Reserve (1942–46). He has become the department's first Distinguished Professor of Sociology and has served as department head for nine years. His tenure in this post is the third longest after Weatherly and Sutherland. His administration has been called the Schuessler Era (1960–69) and will be described as distinctive because of the influence of Schuessler who has given strong leadership to statistics and methodological study. His most important books have been Statistical Reasoning in Sociology (editions 1, 2, 3) (with J. H. Mueller and later Herbert Costner), Analyzing Social Data, and Measuring Life Feelings. His work in editing the American Sociological Review and Sociological Methodology have emphasized his leadership. He continues today as the "Dean" of the department, full of life and new ideas, always seeking the cutting edge of methodological knowledge.

A number of men joined the faculty as instructors in the Sutherland period and a few were to remain for considerable time in the department. Like Schuessler, Albert K. Cohen and Erwin Smigel were to become full-time professors. It will be remembered that Albert K. Cohen was a student of Sutherland. He received an M.A. at Indiana and a Ph.D. at Harvard. He was appointed an instructor in 1948, rose to a full professor and remained at Indiana until 1965. His dynamic teaching and his seminal book, Delinquent Boys, characterize his years as teacher and researcher.

Erwin Smigel was another young instructor that was one of the last Sutherland appointments. Smigel came in 1949 with a new Ph.D. from New York University to offer courses in occupations and professions and in complex and formal organizations. He was a man full of life and humor. He began his study of the Wall Street Lawyer and almost had it finished when he left Indiana in 1959 to return to New York University where he became head of the Sociology Department. (The writer was to become Smigel's replacement in 1959).

Many former instructors were to leave and become well known sociologists including Frank Sweeters, Paul Campini and Louis H. Orzack (Ph.D. Indiana, 1953). Sutherland's student, Donald R. Cressy (Ph.D. Indiana, 1950) has revised Sutherland's Principles of Criminology and kept it alive through successive revisions. It is said that no American textbook in Sociology has had a longer life as a text in continuous use.

THE KIRKPATRICK YEARS, 1949–1953

Clifford Kirkpatrick was the unanimous choice of the department to succeed Edwin Sutherland. He came from Minnesota in the fall of 1949. The department was little changed that year from the previous three years. The stable core of Sutherland, Mueller, Lindesmith, Tomasic, Schneider, and Strauss was here, Schuessler had become an Assistant Professor and the young instructors were Cohen, Orzack, and Smigel. The one new face was an instructor named Frank Westie who had a Ph.D. from Ohio State University. One could know that Frank Westie would have the longest Indiana tenure of those four instructors. He was to rise to full professor and remain to serve a total of 34 years. Sutherland's sudden natural death at age 67 on October 11, 1950 was a shock to everyone. The "King" was dead!

Clifford Kirkpatrick was the major Eastern breakthrough at Indiana. Born in Pittsburg, Massachusetts, he received a prep school education before going to Clark for an AB in 1920, and an AM and Ph.D. at Pennsylvania in 1922 and 1925 respectively. After teaching at Brown and Pennsylvania, he went to Minnesota as a young Assistant Professor in 1925, Associate Professor in 1930, and Full Professor in 1936. It was in 1949 that Indiana claimed him as the new head. He came as a recognized scholar in the family, social psychology, and research methodology. His work on Immigration, Religion, Nazi Germany, Social Psychology, Collective Behavior, and the Family all testify to a broad, ranging mind. He had served as a Survey Research leader of a Bombing Survey in Germany in World War II.
His scholarly attributes did not equip him to deal with administrative matters. His years as head are best characterized as a holding operation. The core faculty stayed pretty much together. Cohen went to full-time service in the Russian Institute. Strauss went to Chicago. Cohen was promoted, and a new instructor by the name of Sheldon Stryker arrived in 1952 with a Ph.D. from Minnesota. Stryker, like Westie, was to establish a lifetime of service in the department. Cohen, with his work in Juvenile Delinquency and Social Organization, Westie in Social Psychology and Race, Stryker in Social Psychology, and Smigel in occupations and Formal Organizations were to become national scholars and add strength to the department. They are the brightest spots in the Kirpatrick years. All of these young men brought a new dimension to Sociology. They represented a wave of scholars well trained in the latest developments of statistics and methodology. The increased role of quantification in sociology has become enhanced as each new generation of scholars is better trained. At Wisconsin and later Chicago and Harvard, Sam Stouffer was providing outstanding training opportunities in statistics; at Minnesota, Chapin and his staff were stressing quantification as a major dimension of sociology. At all major universities statistics and methodology had become a required field. Cohen, Westie, Smigel, and Stryker represented this new group of statistically trained scholars.

Meanwhile, the post-war boom in enrollment continued at Indiana and the growing pains were straining the University at many points—classroom space, adequate library service, laboratory facilities, etc. University enrollment in 1935-36 when Sutherland arrived was 4500; when Kirpatrick arrived 14 years later the University's enrollment was 12,000+, an increase of 270 percent. Sociology felt the full population pressures with its staff also becoming larger. The Mueller years ahead were to test the capacity of the University and Sociology to meet the ever-increasing expansion of the returning post-war veterans and the baby boom that was soon to come.

THE MUELLER YEARS 1952-1959

John Mueller was the first in-house appointment as head since Weatherly assumed the headship of Economics and Social Science in 1899. As it turned out he was to be an initiate of a sequence of in-house appointments that continues to the present. The appointment of Mueller was of acting status because Kirpatrick resigned the chairmanship suddenly on August 31, 1953, but remained as a professor. The usual search for a suitable replacement was delayed, but the department was able to function without difficulty. John Mueller was now in his 19th year of service and knew the ropes. The older group of Linder, Smith, Schneider, Strauss, Kirkpatrick, and Mueller was matched with the younger Schuessler, Smigel, Cohen, Stryker, and Westie. By now they all knew one another and the department ran smoothly. One year later Mueller was still in an acting status. The department remained the same except a new man, John Liell arrived in 1954 with his Ph.D. from Yale. He came highly recommended and was made an Assistant Professor.

The Mueller years were years when the older group continued to remain. Dinko Tomanic rejoined the department in 1958, transferring from the Russian Institute. Smigel left for New York University in 1959 and was replaced by a full professor named Delbert Miller, who had a Minnesota Ph.D. and had wide teaching and industrial experience. He had written the first book (with William H. Form) on Industrial Sociology, which has been subsequently published in three English language editions and many foreign language editions. He offered a course by this title and also assumed the teaching of Occupations and Professions and courses in Formal and Complex Organizations. He later offered a course on Industry, Labor, and Community based on a book published (with W. H. Form) in 1960 with the same title. He served 15 years as a joint professor of sociology and business administration and continues to be active during the past 25 years of retirement. His writing includes International Community Power Structures, Leadership and Power in the Non-Westen Megapolises, and four editions of Handbook of Research Design and Social Measurement.

Many new faces appeared among the younger instructors: Melvin DeFleur, George Panthas, and Allen Grimshaw. These three were to give many years of service, but none established the record of Allen Grimshaw, who climbed through all the ranks to a full professorship and remains at IU today with 26 years of service. He has established a solid reputation for his scholarship in socio-linguistics. Step by step, Stryker and DeFleur demonstrated increased contribution to their respective fields; Social Psychology and Mass Communication.

In 1959 the department got a new "lock" as offices were moved from Rawles Hall where they had been for so many years, and Sociology, along with the Departments of Social Work, Philosophy, and History, occupied the seventh floor of Ballantine Hall. This handsome new building was a ten-story edifice with two major wings attached to a central connecting structure. It contained offices and classrooms. Economics and Political Science had adjacent floors to History, Philosophy and Sociology. Many of the Arts were housed in the new building including English, Comparative Literature, and a course of foreign languages including French and Italian, German, Spanish and Portuguese, Greek, Chinese, Russian, Slavic, and others.

The new building offered sociologists new opportunities to have close contact with historians and all social sciences with the exception of Psychology and Anthropology, which were housed in more distant buildings.

The new quarters made possible future expansion of Sociology in the same wing, as Philosophy and Social Work moved to other quarters in the 1960s. The University would soon double in size and more than 10,000 students a day would attend class in Ballantine Hall.

John Mueller expressed a desire to leave the chairmanship in 1959 and a search was made for a successor. In this period every major department tended to "look outside" for a triple-headed
candidate: one who could administer, teach, and publish, and whose name already carried high status and prestige. It was the head who was to recruit faculty and attract graduate students, so the status of the department would rise with his coming and increase with his service. The search committee interviewed such candidates as Dean Harry Alpert of the University of Oregon and highly respected William Sewell of Wisconsin. For various reasons they did not accept appointment. Karl Schuessler was asked to accept an acting chairmanship for 1960. He agreed and the Schuessler era was underway.

THE SCHUESSLER ERA 1960-1969

The 1960s have been regarded as the most difficult that administrators have been called upon to face. Karl Schuessler became head of the Sociology Department in 1960 and proved durable. He served nine years and these years deserve to be called the Schuessler era. They represent the third longest term any chairman has headed the department, and some significant features characterize this era.

Perhaps the most outstanding is the growth of the University and the department. The total enrollment of the University in the fall of 1960 was 14,487; in the fall of 1969 it was 29,428, an increase of 103 percent. This was not growth. It was an explosion. Sociology grew with the University or perhaps one could say it grew the University. Student rebellion marked the decade and sociology offered an outlet for student needs. The counter-culture found much in sociology to provide a basis for their expression of new ideas and their establishment beliefs. There was a search for a freer sex code, civil rights, and feminist equality. Gay men and lesbian women organized for their rights. There was never a dull moment and many young sociology professors themselves were demanding new status and equality rights. They were in the thick of student power and professional power contests.

This was the era when students and professors alike wanted a "piece of the action." Social forces shook college administrations from top to bottom. The department head was not excluded. This position often became a focal point of pressure, with cries of equality and power coming up and around from all quarters. It swept many a president and chairman from office and wrung previously unknown concessions from heads who had never before experienced such pressure. Students wanted easy grades so that they could escape a draft into a hated war. They wanted to elect their own courses without restriction. They wanted a seat on the Board of Trustees and got representation. They wanted professors who would support the counter culture in all its manifestations from marijuana use (and LED) to free love. Ties and coats were regarded as too "square" for professors who were "with it." Long hair and necklaces appeared as badges of the new professor.

In this maelstrom, Schuessler held his ground. The department maintained critical standards and attracted new faculty of high quality. The number of majors and total enrollment in sociology reached new levels. Academically, sociology, as a discipline, achieved higher recognition while it was regarded at the same time as a hot bed of radicalism among the social sciences.

Among the new faculty was Richard H. Hall. He came in 1961 with a Ph.D. from Ohio State. His specialization was bureaucracy and he was to make some outstanding contributions in this field. He taught occupations and formal organization and wrote books in each field. He continued at Indiana until 1968 when he left for Minnesota. Today, he is Chair of Sociology at the State University of New York at Albany. Austin Turk became a member of the department in 1962. He had just received his Ph.D. from Wisconsin with specialized training in crime and delinquency, law and society. He was to advance to a full professorship, making significant research contributions in his specialized field. He was co-director of a graduate training program in deviance and control for some years. Turk kept alive the tradition and image established by Sutherland projecting Indiana as an important center for criminology. His departure for the University of Toronto in 1974 was a loss of a solid scholar that was difficult to replace.

Elton Jackson, Michael Schwartz, and James D. Thompson made their appearance in 1964 in the department. Jackson was acquainted with Indiana sociologists who had known him as an Indiana graduate (B.A. 1952). Now after graduate training at Michigan (Ph.D. 1960) and teaching at Yale, he was returning "home." He was appointed an Associate Professor and continued his work in social stratification, social mobility, statistics, and methodology. He continued to teach full time after giving three plus years (1975-1978) as Chair of the Department. The Jackson years will be described later.

Michael Schwartz received his Ph.D. from the University of Illinois. In 1964 he was appointed an instructor of Sociology at Indiana. His interests were in social psychology and deviant behavior. He and Sheldon Stryker produced one of the first monographs in the Arnold Rose Monograph Series with a study titled, Deviance, Beliefs, and Others (1971). No one, not even Michael Schwartz himself, was to anticipate the career that lay ahead. In 1967 he was asked to become an Associate Dean in the Undergraduate Division in a part-time capacity. He served for two years, leaving in 1969 to become Head of Sociology at the new Florida Atlantic University. From there he went to Kent State University as Vice President of Administration. In 1981 he was appointed President of the University and has completed four years in this post at the time of this writing (1985).

James D. Thompson was given a nominal professorship in the Department of Sociology while serving principally as Professor of Business Administration in the School of Business. Trained as an organizational sociologist, he taught courses in organizational structure and behavior. He was joined by two other sociologists in the School of Business. Delbert C. Miller came over from the Sociology Department as a joint Professor of Sociology and Business Administration, and Donald Van Houton arrived as a young sociologist with a Ph.D. from the University of Pittsburgh (1967).
Thompson and Van Houton both left in 1968; Thompson to Vanderbilt and Van Houton to Oregon. The Division of Organizational Structure was absorbed in a new department at the School of Business called Personnel and Organizational Behavior.

While at Indiana, Thompson published a seminal book called *Organizations in Action*. It is a minor classic and continues to be read widely because it raises fundamental propositions about organizational structure and functioning.

1965 was a banner year for new people. Peter Burke, John Scanloni, Gary Schuman, Irving Zeitlin, Marvin Olsen, and Charles Tittle were added. These six new members alone could have furnished enough faculty to operate a good sized department in earlier days. They testify to the explosive growth now going on in the University. The post-war babies were now being enrolled in full flood and a larger faculty was needed urgently. A quick inventory shows:

- 20 years at IU and continuing, Peter Burke, Ph.D. Yale, 1965; Small Groups, Social Psychology
- 13 years at IU, John Scanloni, Ph.D. University of Oregon, 1964; Social Organization, Marriage and Family
- 11 years at IU, Marvin Olsen, Ph.D. University of Michigan, 1965; Political Sociology, Social Organization
- 4 years at IU, Gary Schuman, Ph.D. University of California at Santa Barbara; Social Psychology, Small Groups
- 4 years at IU, Irving Zeitlin, Ph.D. University of California; Political Sociology, Comparative Sociology
- 3 years at IU, Charles Tittle, Ph.D. University of Texas, 1965; Social Control, Deviant Behavior

These men were trained at different universities spanning the United States. They were the young breed, nurtured in the sixties themselves. The roster reveals that Peter Burke outlasted all of the professional class of 1965. Professor Burke not only became a full professor with 20 years of service (1985), but also served 3 1/2 years as Chair of the department.

John Scanloni became an active contributor to the field of family and marriage. Some of his books are: *Opportunity and the Family*, *The Black Family in America*, and *Sexual Bargaining*. He brought strong attention to the family field at Indiana because of his research and writing. He left Indiana to go to the University of North Carolina at Greensboro in 1978.

Marvin E. Olsen was an active researcher and added strength to social organization. He wrote *The Process of Social Organization* (1968) and a number of research articles. From 1970-74 he directed the Institute of Social Research while serving as a Professor of Sociology. He left for the Battelle Human Affairs Research Center in Seattle. In 1984 he became the Chair of the Sociology Department at Michigan State University.

Gary Schuman is remembered for his interests in social psychology and small groups. Irving Zeitlin introduced courses in the examination of Marxist sociology. Charles Tittle produced research studies in deviant behavior. He left in 1969 to join Michael Schwartz at the new Florida Atlantic University.

Throughout the academic year (1965-66) Sheldon Stryker acted as chairman during the sabbatical leave of absence of Karl Schuessler.

In the last three years of the Schuessler chairmanship, the new members numbered William Simon, Martin Weinberg, and T. R. Balakrishnan. William Simon and Martin Weinberg became jointly affiliated with Sociology and the Kinsey Sex Institute. Martin Weinberg came in 1968 and remains a full Professor in the department with books on social and sexual problems. Some of his books are: *Deviance* (with Earl Rubington), *Sexual Preference* (with Alan Bell and Sue Hamermith) and *Homosexuality* (with Alan Bell).

William Simon edited (with John Gagnon) a book called *Sexual Deviance* while he was here. He had an appointment in Sociology only in 1967. T. R. Balakrishnan was recruited to offer work in demography. He remained through 1968 and 1969, returning to the University of Western Ontario in Canada.

A new structure appeared in the Schuessler era that was to change graduate training for the master's degree in sociology and to have significant effects on research publication. This was the Institute of Social Research.

The Institute of Social Research was installed by approval of Dean Frank Gucker of the School of Arts and Sciences in 1963 to promote and facilitate research in sociology and other social sciences. Delbert C. Miller, a Professor of Sociology and Business Administration, was appointed as the Director, and during the first year of operation a Social Area Analysis Study of Indianapolis was made in preparation for the creation of the Indianapolis Area Project. The next Director, Sheldon Stryker, activated the project and it continues today under the direction of various professors in the Sociology department who conduct research projects of their choosing.

In 1984-85 the name of this project was changed to Sociological Research Practicum. It is a combined research and training program operated jointly by the Institute and the Department of Sociology. An annual community study is conducted in Indianapolis (or occasionally in other cities). As a graduate training program, the SRP is designed to give first year graduate students direct experience in all phases of research as well as to provide data for their M.A. theses. The SRP maintains data tapes for all previous projects which may be used by faculty and students for secondary analysis.

The Institute itself operates as an autonomous organization within the College of Arts and Sciences, although its activities are closely related to those of the Department of Sociology. It is housed today in the former Phi Psi house at 1022 East Third Street and encompasses four specialized sub-units: The Sociological
Research Practicum, the Indiana Poll, the Social Interaction Laboratory, and the Sutherland Library.

The SRP has been described and it remains today a major arm for research and training purposes.

The Indiana Poll was funded initially by the University in 1982 to carry out two annual surveys of about 1000 Indiana adults on such subjects as taxation and expenditure, crime and law enforcement, and public morality. The poll is intended ultimately to become a self-supporting research enterprise capable of conducting statewide sample surveys on a variety of topics. The Indiana Poll is currently one set of projects within the Center for Survey Research.

The Social Interaction Laboratory provides many facilities for conducting experimental studies of social interaction and small group processes. It is located in Room 342 in Ballantine Hall.

The Sutherland Library is named in memory of Professor Edwin H. Sutherland. A bequest from his wife, Myrtle Sutherland, made it possible to put many core sociological journals in the library. A major contribution of books has been made by Mrs. Kate Mueller, from the library of her husband, Professor John Henry Mueller. Other faculty members of the department have made book contributions. This library is now in a holding pattern awaiting new space and library direction.

Other functions of the Institute include office space for research projects, preparation assistance for grant applications, computer facility and consultative advice, manuscript typing, and editorial consultation.

The Directors of the Institute since its founding include:

Delbert C. Miller 1963-1965
Sheldon Stryker 1965-1970
Marvin Olsen 1970-1974
George Bohmstedt 1974-1979
James Wood (Acting Director) 1976-1977
David Snyder 1979-1980
James Lincoln 1980-1982
David Knoke 1982-1984
Arne Kalleberg 1984-1985
Robert Robinson 1985-

The Schuessler Era is marked by some significant attributes which gave it a specific uniqueness in the history of the department.

(1) It grew faster than ever before in any nine year period. Twelve new faculty were added throughout the period, 1960-69, and many graduate students became teaching assistants. 

(2) The new faculty brought back to life many former fields such as Sociology of Religion and Political Sociology. A fully qualified Demographer opened up courses in Population and Demography. Courses in Marxist Sociology appeared. New interest in Bureaucracy was developed. The older faculty found a high response to courses on War, Communist Societies, Industrial Sociology, Criminology, and Juvenile Delinquency. Statistics and Methodology were required subjects for undergraduates and graduates. A surprising interest in Social Theory developed, especially among graduate students. Many new graduate seminars were introduced to service the growing number of graduate students.

(3) Social Research was utilizing many new statistical tools and models. Path analysis became a popular form as it provided a "causal" model for hypothesis testing. Computers were becoming better and their use was mounting.

(4) The Institute of Social Research provided editorial and computer assistance to faculty. The Indianapolis Area Project was established to aid faculty research and field and laboratory training for graduates.

STRYKER—LEADER OF A BIG DEPARTMENT 1969-1974

In the fall of 1969 when Sheldon Stryker became Chairman of the Department of Sociology, the enrollment in Indiana University, Bloomington, was 29,428 students. In 1960-61 the enrollment was 14,487—less than half of the enrollment now to be serviced. Sheldon was ready to undertake the largest responsibility ever faced by any previous chairman. He had served as Acting Chair in the academic years 1965-66 when Schuessler was on extended leave. He had joined the department in 1950, becoming an instructor in 1951. He had a record of continuous service climbing through the ranks to full Professor. He knew the department and the University well. His record of research and publication had established him as a nationally recognized scholar in social psychology.

The department reached 27 in the number of faculty in 1969. It was to remain at this level during the next five years in which Stryker was Chairman. Once in 1972 the faculty numbered 30. In the University as a whole, enrollment kept climbing—not dramatically, but steadily, reaching 32,000 in the fall of 1974.

As the new chairman looked over the department he could see University Professor Lindesmith; Professors Grimshaw, D. Miller, Schuessler, [Stryker, Chairman], Tonnani, and Westie; Associate Professors Balakrishnan, Burke, Jackson, Liell, Olsen, Scanzoni, Schneider, Schwartz, Tittle, Turk, and Weinberg; Assistant Professors Garner, O'Connor, and Wood; and Lecturers Birrell, J. Cohen, Morgan, S. Mueller, Pope, and White.

The University had a regulation that a husband and wife should not be hired as faculty in the same department, but one exception had already been made in another department. It was unthinkable for a husband and wife to be hired in the same department if either was a department chairman. And of course, Chairman was still an adequate title. Many years would elapse before the office would be
called Chair. But before Stryker would leave the Chair many new changes would be pressing down on the recruitment of faculty. The Civil Rights Act and Affirmative Action brought changes in the ensuing years. Already the faculty were calling for an Executive (advisory) Committee to "help" the Chair govern the department. This type of committee functions regularly to the current time.

In 1974, five years after Stryker took office, the Sociology faculty roster read: University Professor Lindesmith; Professors Bohmstedt, Cutright, Gilman, Jackson, Olsen, Scanzoni, Schuessler, Stryker (Chairman), Weinberg, and Westie; Associate Professors Althausen, Armer, Burke, Hazelrigg, Mullin, and Woody; Assistant Professors Arnold, Bernstein, Garnier, Hadden, Hudis, Knoke, Lane, Morgan, Pope, Reskin, and Snyder (D. Miller and Schneider, Emeritus Professors).

A number of observations can be made:

(1) Only 13 of the 27 faculty of 1969 were here five years later. More than half had moved.

(2) Those who moved did so either because of retirement (Miller and Schneider), tenure problems, or the offer of a better position as they defined it.

(3) It was a time of movement. Jobs were plentiful; qualified people in short supply.

(4) Four women, all Assistant Professors had joined the faculty.

(5) Two very able full Professors had been added, Bohmstedt and Cutright.

(6) No black faculty member had been added, although each year a serious effort was made to recruit minorities and women. Offers were made to prospective black faculty members, but were not accepted. The number of qualified black candidates is relatively small and the competition to acquire their services is great.

(7) The department was stronger. It was increasingly developing research oriented personnel and faculty with strong quantitative skills. The number of undergraduate majors was in excess of 400 and graduate students numbered about 60. The department was ranked in the top 10 of sociology departments in the United States.

(8) Based on enrollment, the department was authorized a faculty of 39. It was never possible to recruit top quality candidates to completely fill this authorization.


The high mobility made recruitment a burdensome obligation for all members of the faculty. Perhaps an average of two to three persons were interviewed before faculty agreement and final acceptance brought a new member on the rolls. Faculty agreement on a new candidate is not easy to come by. In the explosive age of large and ever larger enrollments, all qualified applicants had many offers. They could pick and choose. Maintenance alone for faculty, staff, space, travel money, and supplies was a big headache for a Chair. No longer could a "Chairperson" play adequately the conventional three roles: Administrator, Teacher and Researcher. Something had to give. Tenure became reduced to a three to five year appointment. The Chairperson was usually only too willing to use the phrase "the term is enough." For the Chair, the difficulty of maintaining a research reputation was jeopardized by a lengthy administrative stint. Even a half-time load of teaching was difficult with the endless administrative responsibilities. The only real bonus for a Chair was an increase in salary, a secretary, assistants, and a modicum of increased prestige. Even the prestige diminished as faculties curbed the powers of the Chair. It became more difficult to recruit Chairpersons. Instead of the traditional search for the outside scholar of high repute, the search narrowed to the insider upon whom the faculty could agree for a three or five year term. On the large faculty there was choice, and increasingly departmental faculty became happy with someone they knew well within their own ranks.

In the Sociology Department the acceptance of leadership became increasingly seen as a duty and opportunity. The challenge is to strengthen the department and carry it to higher levels of national repute. Committed faculty, proud of their identification with a prestigious department and university, give their finest effort during their tenure as Chair. The genuine satisfaction accruing to the successful Chairperson is the feeling that the department moved forward no matter what difficulties were encountered.

Sheldon Stryker was at the bridgehead of this change from Head to Chairman. All departmental chairholders of large departments had to ask themselves now: Do I want to remain a productive scholar and teacher, or do I prefer administration that may cut away my opportunity to return to a full faculty role? In this soul struggle the long socialization of the faculty teacher and scholar usually won out. But the administrative itch is real. It offers the opportunity to make important decisions in the department and the university. It is "where the action is." A department is always a possibility—and past chairpersons have become presidents of colleges. Being a chair of a large department is the best of all possible training for bigger administrative posts. Stryker was mentioned for more responsible administrative posts. He chose to return to the traditional faculty road. On this road he has subsequently directed large research programs in social psychology and is currently editor of the American Sociological Review, official journal of the American Sociological Association (1962—).

THE JACKSON PERIOD (August 1975—December 1978)

Elton Jackson was an Indiana graduate, having been awarded his B.A. in 1952. No chairman before or since can make such a claim, although Schuessler had a graduate degree from Indiana (Ph.D.). It will be recalled that Jackson joined the Sociology faculty in 1964 after graduate training at Michigan (Ph.D. 1960) and a number of
years on the Yale faculty. He came as an Associate Professor with specialities in social stratification, social mobility, statistics, and methodology.

He shared with his predecessors an appreciation of the quantitative approaches to sociology as well as the social psychological, demographic, and structural treatments of sociological problems. And like those same predecessors he recognized quality people and sought to bring them into the department. Among the new faces in 1975 were Lowell Hargens, William Corsaro, Jacques Delacocix, Marilyn Lester and Richard Wilsnack. In 1976 Arne Kalleberg, Charles Ragin, Larry Griffin, and Susan Stephens became faculty members. In 1977 the new faces included Duane Alwin, David Taret and Nancy Davis. Finally, to close out Jackson's last year as Chairman the department recruited James Lincoln, Martha Cook, Donna Eder and Thomas Gleyz.

Among those appointees who have served through 1985 are Lowell Hargens, William Corsaro, Arne Kalleberg, Larry Griffin, David Taret, James Lincoln, Donna Eder and Thomas Gleyz. Hargens and Lincoln resigned in 1985; Hargens to accept a position at Illinois, and Lincoln to the School of Business at the University of Arizona.

Recruitment was aided by a new option providing for one semester of additional research time for non-tenured faculty. This option was first made available in 1977 and continues in force today (1984). The intent is to allow non-tenured faculty the option of a semester free from course teaching during their fourth or fifth years in order to devote full time to research (assuming the prospect for tenure was positive). This option was to be available to current faculty members with four years or less toward tenure and all non-tenured faculty to be recruited in the future.

The Jackson era gets high marks for maintaining a high standard. The Institute of Social Research continued to discharge its many functions under the strong guidance of George Bohnstedt, who directed it from 1974 to 1979. Both undergraduate and graduate training were given serious attention. Both teaching and research were made a continuous requisite for merit increases and promotion. Enrollment on the campus maintained a level of 32,000 and sociology serviced about 10,000 student enrollments each year.

THE BURKE YEARS (January 1, 1979–June 30, 1982)

Peter Burke joined the Sociology faculty in 1965 as a young Assistant Professor. He was awarded his Ph.D. at Yale in that year. Like his predecessors, John Mueller, Karl Schuessler, Sheldon Stryker, and Elton Jackson, Burke brought a background of experience in both the department and the university. He had some good models to teach him administrative behavior and the folkways and mores of the Indiana sociologists. His specialties, small groups and social psychology, were useful guides for the direction of a University department.

Knowing how to lead a group of faculty is to understand the deep-rooted collegial traditions of a university. A university has been defined as a group of scholars jointly governing an academic institution. Collegial governance stands in contrast to authoritarian hierarchical management as practiced in the military and in business organizations. Colleagues stand as equals and share in all phases of academic decision making. Collegial governance begins in the department, continues in the college, and extends to the top levels of the university.

Peter Burke as the new Chair was always cognizant of his role in the faculty. He inherited an Executive Committee and the problems of a large department. With the pressures of bigness, affirmative action, and increasing specialization in sociology, the Burke years were marked by more stringent demands for change. Burke and the department had to continue to face four persistent faculty problems. These problems were:

1. The Rank Distribution
2. The Gender Mix
3. Representation of Sociological Specialties
4. The Racial Mix

1. The Rank Distribution

F. Stuart Chapin, the Minnesota sociologist, referred to the progressive changes in the distribution of the ranks as Institutional Metabolism. Departments (and the university too) can become unbalanced: too many in the top ranks or too many in the lower ranks. The opposite is also possible. Unbalance is unhealthy for many reasons. But most importantly a department needs its outstanding senior professors to maintain prestige through research productivity and its younger members to provide new vitality and future replacement of the senior professors as they retire or move to better positions in or outside of the university.

When a department is unbalanced, it must recruit appropriately to maintain the optimum "metabolism."

Burke inherited a department in 1979 with 10 full professors, 13 Associate Professors, 12 Assistant Professors and 2 Lecturers. They included Distinguished Professor Karl Schuessler; Professors Bohnstedt, Crichton, Grimshaw, Jackson, Mullin, Stryker, Weinberg and West; Associate Professors Althauser, Alwin, Arner, Bernstein, Garnier, Hargens, Hazen, Knopke, Lincoln, Pope, Reskin, Snyder and Wood; Assistant Professors Cook (part-time), Corsaro, Davis, Eder, Gleyz, Gottlieb, Griffin, Hudis, Kalleberg, Ragin, Stephens and Zaret; Lecturers Flemlee and Robinson; and Emeritus Professors Lindesmith, Miller and Schneider.

Any qualified judge would say that this was a well balanced department with both current and future promise. Burke's responsibility would be to keep it that way.
2. The Gender Mix

Affirmative action required the recruiting of more women faculty. Increasingly the search for qualified women raised new questions. Can we find qualified women? Yes! Should the department lower its quality standards in making offers to women? No! Should it hire husband and wife teams? Only if both are tenured or show evidence of eventual tenure! Other questions are not so easily answered. What do you do when the woman faculty candidate is much stronger than her husband? What will happen as merit increases and promotions are determined, especially if one spouse is superior to the other? What will happen when one spouse gets a good job offer on the outside and both threaten to move? These are all new questions and no department had experience to provide definitive guidance.

In 1979 there were eight women out of the total 33 on the Sociology faculty. As more qualified female Ph.D.s became available, the Indiana Sociology Department added women members. Some were single; some were married with husbands in other departments; there were two husband and wife teams; and a team of "best friends" living together.

3. Representation of Sociological Specialties

In the new proliferation of interests, a sociologist might wish to offer a course on Social Problems of Third World Countries, Homosexuality and the Gay Life Style, Currrent Issues of Social Change Faced by Women, Marxist Social Thinking, Bayesian Statistics, Human Sexuality, or Alternate Family Styles, on-on-on.

A centrifugal motion had been given to sociology and the central core was being obscured. The department clung tenaciously to a five-field classification required or majors in undergraduate and graduate training. These fields were: (1) Theory, (2) Social Organization, (3) Social Psychology, (4) Social Deviation, and (5) Statistics and Methodology.

But this agreement on the central core does not answer some vital questions that a department should address. Most importantly, the mission or orientation of the department is significant in giving a department an individuality. What it emphasizes makes it known across the nation and in the international community.

Ever since the Sutherland years, Sociology continued to carry the reputation of being strong in criminology. Sutherland's contributions and legacy were long lasting. The Sociology Department in the Burke years still carried a surviving image. Lindesmith had attracted national attention with his work on drug addiction and the debate over the treatment-correctional phases of that international problem. Albert Cohen attracted national attention for his work on juvenile delinquency. And Austin Turk had continued the image of strong work in criminology.

Lindesmith (with Anselm Strauss) had brought attention to Indiana with his text on Social Psychology (Symbolic Interaction), and reinforcing a strong offering in social psychology was the research of Stryker (with Michael Schwartz), Eder, Westie, Burke and Corsaro. After a long search, the department now had strong work in demography led by Cutright.

A number of faculty espoused social stratification as their chief interest. They included Althauser, Robinson, Garnier, Griffin and Jackson.

Organizational sociology was strongly represented by Kalleberg (sociology of work), Snyder, Ragin, Knoke, Griffin (political sociology), Westie (race relations), Wood (voluntary organizations), Lincoln (urban sociology), and Cutright (family and social policy). Miller, although retired, was actively publishing industrial sociology and research design and measurement.

Theory received high attention by Pope, Mullins and Zaret, Hargens, Mullins, Gleyon, Reskin, Zaret and Westie researched the sociology of knowledge and science. Grimson and Corsaro were exploring socio-linguistics. Bernstein was cultivating sociology of law. Weinberg was writing about research growing out of his interest in social deviance and human sexuality. He continued his joint appointment as Professor of Sociology and Senior Research Sociologist at the Institute for Sex Research.

A new image of the department was already in place. Indiana had become a center of quantitative sociology as represented in statistics and methodology. Twelve members of the department listed this field as a major interest with Schuessler, Bohmstedt and Knoke leading the way. These members were writing texts and monographs. National journals on methods were being edited in the department. Every new faculty member felt the quantitative interest that permeated the department. It attracted some and repelled others.

The presence of high standards for research quality and quantity was also felt. Almost equally demanding was the parallel insistence on excellence in classroom teaching. These requirements sent many new members flying to other places. The department was productive and it climbed in national prestige. Its graduate students were filling important posts in American and foreign universities. The faculty was reaching out in international research by opportunities offered through ambticles, Fulbright and Guggenheim Fellowships.

4. The Racial Mix

The search for qualified blacks continued. Offers were made, but none accepted appointment. They simply got better offers elsewhere. Qualified blacks were hard to come by and they still are (1985). This is true in the recruitment of graduate students as well as potential faculty. The department has awarded Ph.D. degrees to three blacks who have combined academic careers: Francis Okeoji (University of Ibadan, Nigeria), Joseph Scott (University of Notre Dame), and Clovis White (University of Wisconsin).
Much of the problem is due to the fact that the best qualified blacks can command higher salaries in business, government and the professions.26

Valedictory for Burke

When Burke left the Chair on June 30, 1982, he could observe that the faculty of 1979 was little changed. David Heise was a major appointment. He came from North Carolina to add strength to his interests in social psychology, research methods, and microcomputers. He fitted right into the group of quantitative sociologists. Bernice Pescebolda, with interests in medical sociology, comparative sociology, and methods and statistics, also joined the faculty. Charles Povars came from California with interests in social theory and stratification. A faculty of 33 now offered the full range of sociological disciplines. All had PhD degrees from outstanding major universities.

Bohnstedt—1982—The Sociology Department is Directed by a Pro

No chairperson of the Indiana Sociology Department had ever directed a Department of Sociology before George Bohnstedt took over in the fall of 1982. George William Bohnstedt, born in 1938, earned three degrees at the University of Wisconsin (B.S. in 1960, the M.A. in 1967, and the Ph.D. in 1966). He was the choice of the Minnesota Sociology Department as its first elected chairman. He served one term of three years at Minnesota (1970–73). It was a term filled with many problems according to the account of Professor Don Martindale.27 Bohnstedt had been brought to Minnesota with the task of restoring a prestige Sociology Department once enjoyed under F. Stuart Chapin and his staff. In 1957 Minnesota Sociology ranked 7th among Leading Institutions by Rated Quality of Graduate Faculty; in 1964 this ranking dropped to 9th, and in 1969 it was 15th.28 The new Chairman quickly made it clear that teaching loads were to be reduced; maximum concentration was to be devoted to research and publication. "Deadwood" would be removed and appropriate reward given to producers. Faculty hiring would be restricted to prominent departments of sociology.

How well he succeeded in the quest for qualified faculty is set out in a Self Survey Report of five professors in the Minnesota department:

After 1969 the emphasis shifted to hiring primarily from universities with well established and nationally prominent departments of Sociology, such as Stanford, the University of Wisconsin, and the University of Chicago. They were as a group, well trained and highly motivated professional persons, who placed the emphasis upon research and publication, as well as upon quality teaching. They brought with them the experience of working with current leaders in the field of sociology.29

Interdepartmental cliques formed and conflict of various kinds surfaced. Throughout, Bohnstedt attempted to pull the department together with social functions and an easy familiarity. The department had a strong committee system.30

While the Martindale report is biased and self-serving, it does reflect the effort of Bohnstedt and his supporters in the faculty to pull Minnesota up by its bootstraps. Such efforts take time and every attempt to bring it about quickly usually causes great pain and conflict. The tradeoffs between teaching and research seem inevitable unless reductions in teaching loads are great.

The chairmanship of Bohnstedt at Minnesota was an essential learning experience for a young professional. He had taken over at Minnesota at 31 years of age and was a veteran at 35.

In the fall of 1973 Bohnstedt joined the Sociology faculty at Indiana as a full Professor. Already he had a reputation as a nationally recognized statistician and methodologist. In the fall of 1974 he was appointed Director of the Institute of Social Research in the department. He was to serve in that position for five years (1974–79). One of the main purposes of the Institute is to help Sociology faculty get grants for research and assist in the publication processes as faculty prepare research papers for journals, monographs, and books. When he assumed the Chair in Sociology he was a well-seasoned administrator—a pro.

The years 1982–1985 have demonstrated the value of his training, his ability to work comfortably with faculty, and to recruit top-flight people. A new warmth in departmental social relationships is noticeable. His own productivity as a research methodologist continues at a high level. He now edits the scholarly journal Sociological Methods and Research and was editor of Social Psychology Quarterly prior to that.

The Indiana Sociology Department which Bohnstedt inherited in 1982 did not pose the problems he faced at Minnesota. Instead of sliding downward, Indiana was slowly ascending in national prestige. There were no major conflicts within the department. Of course, there is always an incipient cleavage between the quantitative and non-quantitative sociologists. At Indiana the large number of faculty members interested in statistics and methods muted this cleavage. There is, however, a cleavage throughout modern sociology. This discipline requires both verbal and quantitative skills. All faculty have varying orientations as they address the substantive areas of sociology in contrast to the methodological areas. And still more importantly, the sociology profession awards greater prestige to members that display quantitative finesse. This shows up in the receipt of research grants, in the attraction of graduate students, in research papers published, and in outside offers received. A chairperson must mediate in the midst of these discrepancies. He must be cognizant of the teaching success of the faculty and their contribution to the university, the professional organizations, and the community.
In the fall of 1982 the faculty roster for the Sociology Department read as follows:

**Chairperson:** Professor George Bohmstedt

**Distinguished Professor:** Karl Schuessler

**Professors:** Peter Burke, Phillips Cuthbert, Allen Grasmick, David Heise, Elton Jackson, David Knoke, Alfred Lindesmith (Emeritus), Delbert Miller (Emeritus), Nicholas Nullins, Joseph Schneider (Emeritus), Sheldon Stryker, Martin Weinberg, Frank Westie, and James Wood

**Associate Professor:** Robert Althausen, William Corsaro, Maurice Garnier, Larry Griffin, Lowell Hargens, Anne Kalleberg, James Lincoln, Ilene Nagel, Whitney Pope, Charles Ragin, and Barbara Reskin

**Assistant Professor:** Nancy Davis, Donna Eder, Diane Felmlee, Thomas Gieryn, Avi Gottlieb, Alan Lisotto, Bernice Pescosolido, Charles Powers, Robert Robinson, and David Zaret.

In the fall of 1983 the same roster appeared but with three additions: Assistant Professors Judith Seltzer, Herbert Smith and Pamela Walters. Associate Professor Charles Ragin and Assistant Professor Nancy Davis left the department. Rank distribution: Professors—13, Associate Professors—10, Assistant Professors—11. Gender distribution for 1983: 27 men, 7 women. Racial Mix: 34 white, 3 black.

At the end of the 1983-84 year Barbara Reskin resigned to accept a position in Sociology and Women's Studies at the University of Michigan. Strenuous efforts were made to replace her with a senior woman. James Lincoln also resigned and recruitment was undertaken to seek a replacement. David James, a Ph.D. from Wisconsin, was appointed an Assistant Professor of Sociology in 1984.

The Department of Sociology remains strong. Four major journals are now being edited on the campus. They are: *Social Psychology Quarterly* (Peter Burke, editor), *Sociological Methods and Research* (David Heise–George Bohmstedt, editors, 1983–84 respectively), *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility* (Robert Robinson, editor), and *American Sociological Review*, Official Journal of the American Sociological Association (Sheldon Stryker, editor).

The Institute of Social Research continues its research functions, assisting faculty and students in seeking grants and fellowships, and offering computer and editorial service in the preparation of articles, monographs and books. The Indiana Poll is serving as a statewide polling service.

The following undergraduate courses are currently being offered:

- 2100 Sociological Analysis of Society
- 2100 Sociology of Society
- 2101 Social Problems and Policies
- 2110 Social Organization
- 2115 Social Change
- 2120 Society and the Individual
- 2125 Methods and Statistics I
- 2131 Methods and Statistics II
- 2132 Bureaucracies
- 2135 Population and Human Ecology
- 2136 Introduction to Comparative Sociology
- 2137 The Community
- 2138 Comparative Sociological Analysis of Political Systems
- 2139 Sociology of Religion
- 2141 Sociology of Work
- 2142 Sociology of the Family
- 2143 Social Stratification
- 2144 Deviant Behavior and Social Control
- 2145 Sociological Aspects of Mental Illness
- 2146 Criminology
- 2147 Adult Socialization
- 2148 Race and Ethnic Relations
- 2149 Sociology of Sex Roles
- 2151 Social Theory
- 2152 Topics in Social Policy
- 2153 Topics in Social Organization
- 2154 Sociology of American Political Behavior
- 2155 Sex Inequality of Society
- 2156 Sociology of Science
- 2157 Sociology of Education
- 2158 Sociology of Language
- 2159 Revolutions and Social Movements
- 2160 Topics in Deviance
- 2161 Sexual Patterns and Variations
- 2162 Sociology of Law
- 2163 Social Conflict
- 2164 Topics in Social Psychology
- 2165 Small Group Processes
- 2166 Language and Communication in Groups
- 2167 Social Psychology of the Self
- 2168 Workshop in Self and Group Interaction
- 2169 Child Development
- 2170 Socialization
- 2171 Social Interaction
- 2172 History of Social Thought
- 2173 Topics in Social Theory
- 2174 Theories of Social Change
- 2175 Sociology of Marx
- 2176 Topics in Methods and Measurement
- 2177 Urban Sociology
- 2178 Senior Seminar
- 2179 Survey Research Practicum I
- 2180 Survey Research Practicum II
- 2181 Field Experience in Sociology
The Institute of Social Research publishes an Annual Report on Current Research and Writing of Sociology Faculty. The report for 1983-84, distributed in November 1984, showed 174 published items including research articles, monographs and books. More than 111 items are in various stages of completion.

Enrollment at Indiana University-Bloomington averages 33,000 students. Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis has an enrollment in excess of 23,000. The six regional campuses at Richmond, Kokomo, Gary, South Bend, New Albany and Fort Wayne add another 23,000+, making a total enrollment of 80,000. Sociology departments are in place in all parts of the Indiana University State System.

The highest degree in sociology, the Ph.D., is awarded only at Bloomington, where graduate enrollment numbers about 50. About 160 undergraduate sociology majors are studying on the Bloomington campus.

There are more than 3000 living Indiana University alumni with majors in sociology (1985) of these, more than 1200 live in Indiana. All the others are distributed across the United States and in the world generally.
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END NOTES

Sociology Faculty in the Department of History and Political Science, and the Department of Economics and Social Science 1885-1915

1885 Woodford, Arthur R. Assistant and Associate Professor in Economics and Sociology in Department of History and Political Science

1886-1889 Professor of Social Science and Economics; Head of newly created Department of Economics and Social Science

1891-1892 Ross, Edward S. Head, Department of Economics and Social Science

1892-1895 Commons, John R. Head, Department of Economics and Social Science

1898-1900 Bogart, Ernest Ludlow Assistant Professor of Economics and Sociology

1895 Weatherly, Ulysses Grant Assistant Professor of European History

1896-1898 Associate Professor of European History in Department of Economics and Social Science

1899-1915 Professor of Economics and Social Science and Head of Department of Economics and Social Science

Sociology Faculty in the Department of Economics and Sociology 1915-1935

1915-1935 Weatherly, Ulysses Grant Professor of Economics and Sociology and Head of Department

Other Sociology faculty included:

Luck, Thomas S.
Mills, Mark Carter
White, R. Clyde
Watts, Shelley Diggs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty in the Department of Sociology at Indiana University, Bloomington 1935-1985</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty 1935-1985 (Continued)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Althausen, Robert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alwin, Duane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amer, Michael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold, Martha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balakrishnan, T. R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bean, Frank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernstein (Nagel), Ilene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birky, Carl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bogart, Ernest L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bohrnstedt, George</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Helen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burke, Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campisi, Paul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohen, Albert K.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohen, Jeri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook, Martha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corsaro, William</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cressey, Donald R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cutright, Phillips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis, Nancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dobsick, Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeFleur, Melvin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depoister, W. Marshall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delacroix, Jacques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downall, George</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dowdall, Jean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eder, Donna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felamee, Diane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garnier, Maurice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gieryn, Thomas F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gottlieb, Avi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffin, Larry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grimshaw, Allen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hadden, Stuart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall, Richard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hangeman, Margaretta S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hargens, Lowell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazelrigg, Lawrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heise, David</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinkle, Gimela J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hirsch, Paul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollingshead, August B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudis, Paula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson, Elton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James, David</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalleberg, Arne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkpatrick, Clifford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knoke, David</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane, Angela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lester, Marylin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levinson, Richard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaret, David</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HONOR ROLL

1. Ulysees G. Weatherly (dec.) 1895-1935 40 yrs.

*Leaves of Absence are counted as continuing service.
+Service continuing.

**Apologies to Professor Schneider who should have made his appearance on page 32 of this history. He was one of my all-time favorite teachers during my graduate years at Minnesota. Both of my children became his students at Indiana.

Joseph Schneider joined the Sociology Department in 1947 during the Sutherland years. His Ph.D. was earned at the University of California at Berkeley and his early teaching was spent at the University of Minnesota. He was a social theorist with a specialized interest in the Sociology of War. His teaching was dynamic and provocative. He made his students "think" and "re-think."