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d’étudier sociologiquement leur discipline. Le mérite de l’ouvrage est alors de considérer la sociologie et son histoire, non pas seulement d’un point de vue académique, mais aussi dans sa dimension publique et sociale. Si parfois des éléments de l’histoire institutionnelle de la discipline nous semblent manquer – mais comment justement tenir l’ensemble des facettes de cette histoire? –, et malgré certaines répétitions, il apporte une contribution pertinente à l’histoire de la sociologie comme « sociologie publique », une thématique qui a retrouvé un écho depuis une dizaine d’années au sein de la discipline.

SÉBASTIEN MOSBAH-NATANSON
Université du Québec à Montréal


The main goal of this ambitious and engaging study is to recover the voices of African-American pioneers of sociology like W.E.B. Dubois, E. Franklin Frazier, Charles Johnson, and Oliver Cromwell Cox. For Saint-Arnaud, these black sociologists have languished in obscurity for too long and deserve to be paid greater attention by social scientists. To recover their voices, Saint-Arnaud writes a history of the main theoretical and methodological contributions of African-American sociologists in the field of race relations from 1896-1964. Saint-Arnaud contrasts the work of African-American sociologists with that of their more privileged Anglo-American counterparts and shows how the institutional racism of the American academy shaped both of these camps’ work. African American Pioneers of Sociology is an important and timely work that makes a significant contribution to discussions of how ‘race’ has been constructed in the human sciences and in American history.

The first part of Saint-Arnaud’s book describes the history of “Anglo-American” sociology from 1865-1965. During the first phase of sociology, from the end of Civil War up until World War I, early academic sociologists adopted general theories in the mould of Spencer, Comte, and Darwin, and sought to explain the evolution of society by appeal to first principles, causes, and laws of human association. Anglo-Americans dominated sociology at this time, and used evolutionary theories to justify the divide between rich and poor, and to explain the economic inequalities between the races; however, after the First World War, sociology took an empirical turn under the influence of Robert E. Park and the Chicago School, whose studies of race relations were based on extensive fieldwork.
Whereas early sociology sought to justify racial inequalities, Park provided sociology with a highly influential model of race relations, which described four stages of racial contact: competition, conflict, accommodation, and assimilation. Saint-Arnaud argues that the final stage, assimilation, reflects the ideological influence of Booker T. Washington.

Park’s influence waned after his death in the late 1930s and from the Second World War to the 1960s, the Swedish social scientist Gunnar Myrdal provided sociology’s most significant innovations. Whereas sociologists during the Parkian era strove for value-free inquiry, Myrdal argued that social scientists should be explicit about their values if they are to claim objectivity. Myrdal’s pioneering work *An American Dilemma* work was concerned with not only a thorough description of the situation of black people in America but also with reforming white Americans’ attitudes towards racial issues.

In the remainder of the book, Saint-Arnaud contrasts the careers of Anglo-American sociologists with those of their African-American counterparts. Whereas Anglo-American sociologists received ample funding, institutional support, and cushy postings throughout their careers, Afro-American sociologists were forced to operate from the margins of the discipline, taking on jobs in southern colleges or black universities and having no real chance at getting a job at a northern university. As a result of these important structural differences African-American scholars developed a distinct theoretical corpus, which can be characterised by a common concern for the emancipation of black people in the United States and worldwide and an emphasis on the connections between political economy and race.

Saint-Arnaud’s discussion of the development of African-American sociology focuses primarily on the research of W.E.B. Du Bois and E. Franklin Frazier, as well as on that of four lesser known scholars: Charles Spurgeon Johnson, Horace Roscoe Cayton, J.G. St. Clair Drake, and Oliver Cromwell Cox. Saint-Arnaud identifies W.E.B. Du Bois as the founding father of black sociology as well as an outsider, visionary, and iconoclast within his field. During the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, when sociology was dominated by theoretical speculation, Du Bois opted for an on-the-ground methodology using door-to-door canvassing and interviews. Du Bois’ theorization of races as historically constructed entities shaped more by historical, cultural and social processes than by biological essences was also a radical departure from the trends of his time. Du Bois’ innovative approach is best seen in his 1899 study *The Philadelphia Negro*, which narrates the history of Negros in Philadelphia and presents the ethnographic and statistical results of a fifteen-month survey into their living situation. *The Philadelphia Negro* was also innovative for its description of the class structure within black communities, a phenomenon that mainstream sociology had all but ignored up until Du Bois’ study.
The black sociologists who followed Dubois shared his interest in community studies, his highly descriptive and empirical approach, as well as his concern for black emancipation; however, the subsequent generation differed from Dubois in that Park at Chicago trained them and had a strong theoretical and methodological influence. Charles Johnson, who was Park’s first black student, employed Park and Burgess’ human ecology model in his 1923 book *The Negro in Chicago*, which was a report of an inquiry commissioned by the Illinois government into the Chicago race riots. In *Black Metropolis*, a community study of the black Chicago neighbourhood of Bronzeville, Cayton and Drake used Park’s ecological theory as a way of describing the structural barriers to employment faced by the neighbourhood’s black inhabitants. Oliver Cromwell Cox, who studied economics and then sociology at Chicago, was trained in the ecological theory and the qualitative methods of the Chicago school but ultimately abandoned them in favour of a Marxist approach to race relations emphasising the social stratification produced by capitalism. E. Franklin Frazier was also trained by Park and applied his concepts during his studies of black urban families; however, in his last major work *The Negro in the United States*, 1949 Frazier refined Park’s race relations cycle by introducing much more explicit considerations about class and viewing the conflict stage of the cycle as a meeting between opposing class consciousnesses.

Saint-Arnaud’s work is an important contribution despite some weaknesses. The main weakness is the somewhat artificial distinction between African-American and Anglo-American sociology. This distinction is useful as a way of pointing out how knowledge production in early sociology was racialized, but leads him to overemphasise the boundaries between these two camps. Given that the African-American scholars he surveys were all trained in Anglo-American and European institutions, it should not come as a surprise that they adopted some of the racist assumptions of their Anglo-American counterparts; however, rather than contextualising these attitudes as forming part of a broader discourse, Saint-Arnaud opts to label them as failures to meet the standards of objectivity, as if there could be a pure form of scientific production free from social influences. This is particularly evident in his critique of Dubois, who Saint-Arnaud describes as “unable to contain himself in the role of the pure scientist” for his value-laden judgments of working class blacks as lacking civilisation (p.152). But this should not deter potential readers from engaging with this valuable work.
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