

6

The *Année Sociologique* as Training Ground for Sociology: Durkheim, Mauss, and the Art of Book Reviewing in *Fin de Siècle* France

Daniela S. Barberis

Introduction

The efforts of Émile Durkheim and his colleagues to institutionalize sociology as a scientific research discipline in France in the late nineteenth century encountered several roadblocks. One of them was the difficulty of providing professional training for the emerging sociologists given the lack of a formal program of education and of dedicated faculty or facilities. Durkheim and his associates worked around their relative lack of institutional resources through the foundation of the journal *Année sociologique*, a collaborative project of considerable scope. While this journal has been extensively studied, the role that book reviews played in the formation of the Durkheimian group and its common identity has not been explored before. The reviews were conceived as a means to an end by Durkheim and his collaborators; they were not simply reporting on the work of a particular author, but highlighting what they themselves saw as valuable to the construction of sociology in his work, thus presenting their point of view and their work methods to the public *through* the critique of the work of others. Reviewing was conceived as a creative task, albeit one done using an impersonal and scientific method—a method spelled out by Durkheim in the *Rules*. It is also significant that the group was very much aware of the role of the book review, i.e., this is their own description of their practice.

I will furthermore argue that in the process of creating this collective work, the Durkheimian group also produced a moral community, with

specific moral-epistemic virtues and that they were aware of the importance of these epistemic values to their enterprise. They write of the collective character of the true scientific enterprise and of the solidarity needed to achieve it.

The issue of training younger researchers was particularly salient among the Durkheimians¹ and justifies focus on their project to the exclusion of other contemporary competing sociologies.² In order to discuss the efforts of Durkheim and his colleagues to make sociology into an academic discipline, I will first sketch the challenges posed by the status quo in the French university at this time.

French University System

During the liberal phase of the Second Empire (1864–70), French academics became increasingly aware of the deficiencies of their higher education system. A decade of political repression during the 1850s had made them intensely conscious of their vulnerability and relatively low status within French society. The growing prestige of German science and universities also generated concern that France's intellectual status within the international academic community was on the wane; these fears were intensified

¹ Durkheim's competitors took very different approaches to the creation of the new discipline. Gabriel Tarde (1843–1904), a provincial examining magistrate for most of his life, was an intellectual isolate. His provincial location and lack of institutional affiliation to the University system played a role in his lack of intellectual following, but it was also a matter of temperament. Tarde achieved international fame with the publication of his *Lois de l'imitation* in 1890 and from then on accumulated marks of institutional recognition, including an appointment to the Collège de France in 1900 (chair of modern philosophy), where, despite the chair's title, he was left free to teach as he pleased. Tarde did not start teaching until late in his life and did not cultivate followers. See Terry N. Clark, *Prophets and Patrons: The French University System and the Emergence of the Social Sciences* (Cambridge, 1973), 68.

René Worms (1869–1926) created his multiple institutions — *Revue internationale de sociologie*, Institut International de Sociologie, Bibliothèque sociologique internationale (1893) and Société de sociologie de Paris (1895)—by recruiting already established figures of international standing. This approach also avoided the problem of training new recruits and providing them with academic positions. On Worms' institutions and theories, see Daniela S. Barberis, 'In Search of an Object: Organicist Sociology and the Reality of Society in Fin-de-Siècle France', *History of the Human Sciences*, 16 (2003), 5.

Finally, the institutions created by Frédéric Le Play (1806–82) were focused on social reform, privately funded and independent of the University system. Following the monographic method pioneered by Le Play, they did train those who collected family data, but Le Play's social economy remained focused on influencing government policy rather than on training researchers. On Le Play see Janet R. Horne, *A Social Laboratory for Modern France: The Musée Social and the Rise of the Welfare State* (Durham and London, 2002).

² For an overview of the field of French sociology and a brief history of its emergence, see Daniela S. Barberis, 'Sociology' in Michael Moriarty and Jeremy Jennings (ed.), *The Cambridge History of French Thought* (Cambridge, 2019), 477–87.

by the German victory in the Franco-Prussian war of 1870.³ From this point on, the French state began attempting to equal or surpass Germany academically, and sponsored fellowships to allow its academics to study the rival German university system.⁴ Reports on the state of German disciplines were frequently published in the *Revue internationale de l'enseignement* and in journals with a broader public. France had not been keeping up with the innovations introduced by the emergence of the modern research university, which included the development of new spaces and new ways of training students. In response, a reform movement developed, aimed at academic professionalization. One of the highest priorities for the small group of reformers was that research and intellectual production be a central task of professional life. Other closely linked demands were for academic freedom and institutional autonomy, increased resources and salaries, and the creation of universities to unify the separate professional faculties—of law, medicine and pharmacy, theology, and letters and sciences.⁵

A serious hindrance to reform, however, was built into the existing system. Faculties were geared primarily for training in the professions or for preparation of secondary school teachers rather than research. The university was dominated by three national examinations (or four, if one includes the *baccalauréat*, the final examination for secondary education): the *licence*, the *agrégation*, and the doctorate. For the letters and science faculties, the *licence* and *agrégation* were certification degrees for *lycée* (French secondary school) teachers, while the doctorate later in the century became a test of research ability demanded of faculty personnel. The difficulty, however, was that the *agrégation* was in fact required for most university positions. Consequently, the training and early careers of university teachers revolved around the needs of the *lycées*: emphasis was placed on the development of rhetorical skills and mastery of knowledge appropriate to teachers of secondary students.

³ George Weisz, *The Emergence of Modern Universities in France, 1863–1914* (Princeton, 1983), 6.

⁴ Both Durkheim and Célestin Bouglé held such fellowships. Durkheim studied with Wilhelm Wundt and Bouglé with Georg Simmel. The minister for education sent the most promising *agrégés* to study the German system and the scientific work that was being done.

⁵ In the nineteenth century, the French term 'Université' embraced secondary as well as higher education. Both *lycées* and *facultés* were part of a single centralized system, controlled by the Ministère de l'Instruction Publique. In 1896, Louis Liard unified the *facultés*—which had been largely unconnected and dispersed—into institutions called *universités*. As the century progressed, the administration of the Université increasingly extended its jurisdiction to include the Collège de France, Institute de France and other institutions of research and erudition. On the development of the complex French University system in this period, see Weisz, *The Emergence of Modern Universities*.

Besides taking time away from research, national examinations rigidly defined university programs. Certain courses had to be taught because the subject matter would be tested; other offerings generally failed to attract students because they were not included in examination programs. National examinations tied the professor, in principle at least, to a rigid syllabus. They often forced academics to teach subjects far removed from their area of research specialization. Courses geared to national examinations left little time for research seminars. Consequently, professors could not train research-oriented students who might pursue problems relevant to the formation of new disciplines such as sociology. All this was exacerbated by the growth of enrollment in university programs under the Third Republic.

An obvious solution to this hindrance to research training would have been to shift the burden of national examinations. This, however, proved impossible. Professional credentials needed to be protected by objective guarantees, and university academics thought they were better placed than others to grant such credentials. Although they were a burden, national examinations were also a source of power due to guaranteed student enrollment that brought leverage when requesting larger budgets. The *baccalauréat*, for instance, was especially resented, and during the 1880s there was widespread sentiment among academics in favor of abandoning it to *lycée* teachers. Ultimately, however, university professors were unwilling to give up a responsibility that, burdensome though it might be, concentrated enormous power in their hands.

Given that the basic systemic problem could not be easily resolved, reformers searched for other ways of increasing research time. One strategy was the establishment of special research institutions, such as the *École Pratique des Hautes Études* (EPHE, founded in 1868), linked administratively to universities but free of all teaching responsibilities except for the training of advanced research students through small seminars and laboratory work. However, as Weisz has argued, 'the dilemma specific to French higher education was the structural inability to separate *training* for the research role from training for the liberal and teaching professions. To put it another way, except at the EPHE, French higher education was incapable of making room for a formal system of graduate studies capable of producing teacher-researchers.'⁶

University reform, unlike primary and secondary education reform, never attained widespread political support during the Third Republic. But it did have the backing of a small group of strategically placed politicians, like Jules Ferry and Léon Bourgeois, who recognized its

⁶ *Ibid.*, 212.

ideological significance. Believing that the conflicts that had afflicted France during the 19th century were the result of intellectual and religious divisions, these men looked to universities to help promote intellectual and social consensus. According to their plan, academics should be called upon to develop a system of political and moral principles based on scientific procedures to which all men of good faith could adhere—principles they would then use to train teachers, administrators, and loyal citizens, immune to all forms of political extremism. In order to pursue this vision, republican leaders appointed a new generation of administrators and gave them considerable freedom to renovate the system.⁷ The period of most intense reform began in 1884 with the nomination of Louis Liard as director of higher education in the Ministry of Public Instruction.

The first post in the social sciences in France was established by Liard at the University of Bordeaux and was given to Émile Durkheim. The aim was to challenge the German monopoly on these new disciplines and, at the same time, to use higher education to foster social integration. Given the decline of religion as a unifying ideology, science was now appealed to as the basis for unifying moral and political values. Durkheim's appointment as *chargé de cours* in 'Science Sociale et Pédagogie' by a ministerial decree of July 29, 1887 was part of this attempt to pursue the 'social mission' of the University. Durkheim had impressed Liard with his republican idealism and his desire to establish a secular morality based on science.⁸ Yet, while Liard was sincere in his desire to utilize universities for the purpose of social integration, it was not easy for politically motivated teaching to penetrate the system. Although it was possible to establish a new course or a chair, unless the subject found a place on the severely overloaded examination programs it would have little impact.

Strategies Going Forward

A great deal was expected of the social sciences by both the general public and the university administration, as they would, it was believed, help to restore social peace. Durkheim designed a lecture series aimed at introducing social science for students from various disciplines (philosophy, history and law) and for the public at large. He believed sociology had a fundamental role to play in forming the moral unity of the French Third Republic.

⁷ Ibid, 10.

⁸ Steven Lukes, *Émile Durkheim: His Life and Work. A Historical and Critical Study* (Stanford, 1985), 103.

The efficacy of his series of public lectures on this mixed audience, however, is hard to assess. According to Inspector Zeller, the audience for his lectures on social science was at first 'quite large', but then 'thinned out a lot'. The situation changed in his second year, when Durkheim enjoyed 'great success'. There were several philosophy students from the faculty of letters, as well as 'jurists, law students, [and] a few colleagues; this was quite a demanding audience', noted his nephew and student, Marcel Mauss.⁹ There were also 'the stray members of the public who pack into the lecture theaters of our big provincial universities'.¹⁰ But even degree seekers were not required to attend lectures. As Durkheim wrote of Mauss, 'He chose what seemed to him to be the most useful courses, and attended lectures only when he wished to. This was in keeping with the university's principle of academic freedom.'¹¹

In his opening lecture for his social science course, Durkheim stated that there was room in the university for a science that was in the process of being created at the same time it was being taught and that the auditors of his courses were as much collaborators as pupils, who should 'join him in searching, in feeling the way, and sometimes even in wandering astray'.¹² He called for all workers of good will to join him in this effort and repeated the call the following year: 'Let us proceed as quickly as possible. . . let us unite our efforts and work in common.'¹³ He envisioned his classroom as research laboratory and not only as a place for transmitting knowledge. He was not there to reveal a doctrine or offer ready-made solutions but to attract students of various backgrounds to sociology—he hoped philosophy, law and history students would be interested—and to educate public opinion as a whole.

Some of Durkheim's students did take a more active interest in sociology. Marcel Mauss is the obvious example, but Charles Lalo, Paul Hourticq, Marcel Foucault and Abel Aubin all displayed interest and eventually obtained their *agrégation* at Bordeaux. But all of them were still philosophy *agrégés* since the discipline of sociology did not exist independently. Although they all collaborated in the first *Année sociologique*, especially in

⁹ Marcel Fournier, *Émile Durkheim: A Biography* (Cambridge, UK/Malden, MA, 2013), 110; Marcel Mauss, 'In memoriam: L'oeuvre inédite de Durkheim et de ses collaborateurs', in *Oeuvres*, iii (Paris, 1969 [1925]), 484.

¹⁰ In 1887–8, the faculty of letters had some 120 students, including twenty or so philosophy students (thirteen degree seeking candidates and six candidates for the *agrégation*). *Ibid.*, 91.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 131.

¹² Émile Durkheim, 'Course in sociology: opening lecture', in Mark Traugott (ed. and trans.), *Émile Durkheim on Institutional Analysis* (Chicago, 1978 [1888a]), 43.

¹³ Émile Durkheim, 'Introduction to the sociology of the family', in Mark Traugott (ed. and trans.), *Émile Durkheim on Institutional Analysis* (Chicago, 1978 [1888b]), 228.

its earlier period (volumes 2–6, 1899–1903), yet, with the exception of Mauss, none of these young men remained attached to the Durkheimian enterprise for long because the pursuit of a career in the social sciences remained constrained by the absence of positions and the domination of the traditional disciplines.

A New Strategy: Create a Journal

Durkheim's great strength was his ability to draw together a team of collaborators who produced the *Année sociologique* and formed what is now known as the French school of sociology. The strong academic credentials of the *Année* team (who possessed credentials from the École normale supérieure as well as *agrégation* and doctoral degrees) set it apart from other groups with which they were in competition to found an independent sociology. It was also particularly successful in attaining posts in higher education and prestigious teaching institutions (the Faculté de lettres de Bordeaux, the Sorbonne in Paris, as well as the École pratique des hautes études). While the group was not homogeneous in its views, a case can be made that the most heterogeneous members of the initial group left as the group stabilized, and that it presented a united front to outside critiques.

The first issue of the *Année* (1898) included as collaborators, besides Durkheim himself, his nephew Marcel Mauss, Célestin Bouglé, Paul Lapie, Dominique Parodi, Henri Hubert, Paul Fauconnet, François Simiand, Emmanuel Lévy, Gaston Richard, Albert Milhaud and Henri Muffang. Durkheim had by then been promoted to *professeur de sciences sociales* at Bordeaux (June 1896)—a double promotion because he was both given tenure and the name of his chair was changed to 'social science' without further qualification (the designation 'pedagogy' was dropped, though Durkheim continued to teach those courses).¹⁴ Lévy (doctor of law), was *chargé de cours* at the law faculty of Toulouse, Bouglé *maître de conférences* at Montpellier, Richard and Lévy were the only doctors besides Durkheim, but Richard was still waiting for an appointment, and the rest were just *agrégés*, most of them with *lycée* positions. The main common trait among the founders of the *Année* was thus the *agrégation*: this initial group contained 12 *agrégés*: 8 in philosophy, 2 in history (Hubert and Milhaud), one in grammar (Muffang) and one in law (E. Lévy).¹⁵

¹⁴ The title of his chair would revert to 'Science of Education' when he was called to the Sorbonne in 1902.

¹⁵ Philippe Besnard, 'La formation de l'équipe de l'*Année sociologique*', *Revue française de sociologie*, 20 (1979), 17.

The *Année sociologique* was a discipline building enterprise: it was a collective undertaking, it discussed a wide variety of material, and it organized the intellectual division of labor around a number of fields, effectively defining the discipline of sociology by its choices of authors and books. As Terry N. Clark has argued, the *Année* was far more than a journal: 'It shared many goals and performed many functions of a modern social research institute.'¹⁶ In his preface to the first volume, Durkheim stressed that the journal was not a personal venture: 'Science, since it is objective, is essentially an impersonal matter and can develop only from collective effort.'¹⁷ He hoped the new undertaking would help sociology move beyond its philosophical phase and take its rightful place among the sciences. Sociology had started as a form of philosophical speculation that tried to embrace all of social life in a synthetic formula. It must now turn to special research—research that demanded precision, objectivity and specialization.

Durkheim appreciated the fundamental importance of teamwork in developing sociology as a true science and moving it away from amateurism.¹⁸ As far back as 1886, in one of his first reviews for the *Revue philosophique*, he wrote: 'sociology, like other sciences, and perhaps even more than other sciences, cannot progress without team work and a collective effort.'¹⁹ And in 1893, in *De la division du travail social*, he explained the backwardness of social sciences as due to the fact that scholars following their 'natural [and individual] inclinations, ... have remained too distant from one another to be aware of all the bonds that unite them'.²⁰ The 'unity of science' was indispensable to achieve true scientific progress; progress presupposed a clear realization of the collective character of all scientific enterprise, and the solidarity necessary to achieve it. Therefore, it is very likely that Durkheim started to think about ways of creating the collective dynamic necessary to truly found a scientific sociology many years before the foundation of the *Année sociologique*, and even before Durkheim met his future collaborators. Given Durkheim's ideal for sociology, much was at stake in achieving a groundwork of common ideas among the group that would produce the journal.

¹⁶ Clark, *Prophets and Patrons*, 183.

¹⁷ Émile Durkheim, 'Préfaces to *L'Année sociologique*', in Yash Nandan (ed.), *Émile Durkheim: Contributions to L'Année sociologique* (New York, 1980 [1898–1899]) 51.

¹⁸ Besnard, 'La formation de l'équipe', 16.

¹⁹ Émile Durkheim, 'Les études de sciences sociales', in J.-C. Filloux (ed.), *La Science sociale et l'action* (Paris, 1970 [1886]), 214.

²⁰ Émile Durkheim, *Division of Labour in Society*, trans. W.D. Halls (Basingstoke, 1984 [1893]), 306.

The general movement in European academia towards large, impersonal collaborative research exemplified by the *Année* group started in the humanities rather than in the natural sciences.²¹ Examples are the large research projects of the Prussian Academy of Sciences at the end of the nineteenth century, such as the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* or the great German historical and philological editorial projects of the nineteenth century, such as *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* and *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, founded in 1819 and 1863. These projects demanded large-scale organization, the collaboration of many specialized contributors, and needed substantial financial support.²² They required scholarly teamwork and demonstrated the effectiveness of the division of academic labor. Big ‘humanities’ like ‘big science’ put the importance of the individual scientist or scholar into question. Enterprises like Lord Acton’s *Cambridge Modern History*, with its ambition that the contributions of its different specialists should be so uniform ‘that nobody can tell, without examining the list of authors, where the Bishop of Oxford laid down his pen, and whether Fairbairn or Gasquet, [...] took it up’,²³ sought to make its authors invisible. Acton wished for what Lorraine Daston has called ‘aperspectival objectivity’.²⁴ The contributors should avoid ‘the needless utterance of opinion, and the service of a cause’. As we will see, the *Année* group—despite their emphasis on objectivity, the division of labor, and the need of collaborative work for the advancement of science—were at work in the service of a cause.

When recruiting members for the journal, Durkheim emphasized the need for them to believe in the project of establishing an independent,

²¹ As was also the case of that other innovation: the research seminar. See, on the seminar, Bernhard vom Brocke, ‘Wege aus der Krise: Universitätsseminar, Akademiekommision oder Forschungsinstitut; Formen der Institutionalisierung in den Geistes und Naturwissenschaften 1810–1900–1995’, in Christoph König und Eberhard Lammert (eds.), *Konkurrenten in der Fakultät: Kultur, Wissen und Universität um 1900* (Frankfurt am Main, 1999), 191–218; and Gert Schubring, ‘Kabinetts-Seminar-Institut: Raum und Rahmen des forschenden Lernens’, *Berichte zur Wissenschaftsgeschichte*, 23 (2000), 269–85.

²² Kasper R. Eskildsen, ‘Commentary: Scholarship as a Way of Life: Character and Virtue in the Age of Big Humanities’, *History of Humanities*, 1 (2016), 390. See also Rudiger vom Bruch, ‘Mommssen und Harnack: Die Geburt von Big Science aus den Geisteswissenschaften’, in Alexander Demandt, Andreas Goltz, and Heinrich Schlange-Schoningen (eds.), *Theodor Mommsen: Wissenschaft und Politik im 19. Jahrhundert* (Berlin, 2004), 121–41. Also, Carlos Spoerhase, ‘Big Humanities: “Große” und “Großforschung” als Kategorien geisteswissenschaftlicher Selbstbeobachtung’, *Geschichte der Germanistik*, 37/38 (2010), 9–27; and Torsten Kahlert, ‘Große Projekte: Mommsens Traum und der Diskurs um Big Science und Großforschung’, in Harald Müller and Florian Eßer (eds.), *Wissenskulturen: Bedingungen wissenschaftlicher Innovation* (Kassel, 2012), 67–86.

²³ Cited by Eskildsen, ‘Commentary’, 391.

²⁴ Lorraine Daston, ‘Objectivity and the escape from perspective’, *Social Studies of Science*, 22 (1992), 597–618.

scientific sociology. As he wrote to the young philosophy *agrégé* Paul Lapie, they must all agree on the need to do ‘sociology sociologically’, meaning ‘without referring that science to something other than itself’.²⁵ Lapie was doubtful but responded that he granted sociology as much independence from psychology as he did to biology from physics or chemistry, and yet he believed that sociology’s ties to psychology had to be affirmed. Similar exchanges would take place between Durkheim, Bouglé and Lapie all through 1897. Durkheim did his best to be conciliatory, writing Lapie that he saw ‘in sociology nothing more than a *psychology*, but a *sui generis psychology*’.²⁶ Lapie was quite satisfied with this formula. A minimum consensus was eventually reached around the possibility and the need of making sociology an independent science in its object, method and theoretical conceptualization.

Interviewing a potential collaborator, a friend of Henri Hubert, Durkheim emphasized that the young man should only join the *Année* if he believed in the project and wanted to help: ‘If he does not believe, it is better if he abstains; when I saw him, he did not have faith.’²⁷ Durkheim was willing to put work into persuading recruits to share his particular sociological views, but a broad consensus on the aims of the enterprise was a requirement, as was intellectual seriousness. As he wrote Hubert about his friend, ‘I am not looking for collaborators at all costs [*quand même*]. Our common work presupposes a common faith and great mutual trust.’²⁸

Durkheim thus seems quite comfortable with the seemingly ‘perverse’ claim that people and their virtues matter to the making and authority of ‘late modern’ science.²⁹ Despite expressing the credo of the ‘impersonality’ of science—the notion that science has ‘nothing to do with personal characteristics and patterns of familiarity’ and that it enjoys its ‘special authority through *being understood* to have no such dependencies’³⁰—he also clearly valued specific personal virtues such as intellectual seriousness or trustworthiness without recognizing a tension between these two statements. Durkheim repeatedly wrote that he was impressed by the

²⁵ Émile Durkheim, ‘Documents: Lettres de Durkheim. Durkheim candidat et patron. Lettres à Parodi, Fournière, Lapie et Haver’, *Revue française de sociologie*, 20 (1979), 37.

²⁶ *Ibid.*

²⁷ Letter of Durkheim to Hubert, April 28, 1898, in Émile Durkheim, ‘Lettres d’Émile Durkheim à Henri Hubert, présentées par Philippe Besnard’, *Revue française de sociologie*, 28 (1987), 495.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 494.

²⁹ For Steven Shapin, late modern is ‘from roughly 1900 to the present’. Steven Shapin, *The Scientific Life: A Moral History of a Late Modern Vocation* (Chicago and London, 2008), xv.

³⁰ Shapin, *The Scientific Life*, 1.

dedication of his collaborators, which ‘also puts me under an obligation.’³¹ Bouglé and Lapie were ‘full of ardor’, ‘full of devotion and very zealous’; Hubert was the most ‘selfless’ member of the team.³² He writes Bouglé of the *Année* group that ‘you have all shown such dedication that it would be very surprising if we cannot do something good’.³³ As Daston and others have highlighted, epistemic virtues were important to the pursuit of collaborative research both in the sciences and in the humanities. Projects that relied on the work of others required that they be knowledgeable, credible and reliable, not only internally to the group members, but also externally to the world.

Creating Sociology Through Book Reviewing

When instructing his young colleagues, Durkheim argued that there was no point in reviewing a book for the *Année Sociologique* only to itemize or describe the contents. The review had to be a theoretical contribution as well. The commentary, he said, should reflect and advance the wider agendas of the sociological discipline that they were pioneering. ‘Playing the role of the sort of judge who passes sentence and rates talent’, was not good enough. ‘Our role’—Durkheim wrote in a preface to the *Année*—‘must be to extract the objective materials from the works we are studying, namely suggestive phenomena and promising views. . . [F]or however slight a book’s substantive value, it is a corresponding gain for science’.³⁴

Durkheim gave his nephew specific, detailed instructions on how to write his reviews:

As for the reviews, it will be necessary not only to analyze each work individually, but to develop a general plan of review [*plan d’ensemble*] in order to avoid repeating points and to present things in the most interesting form. Extricate and place all the residue in the light, everything that can be utilized, facts or ideas; in order to do that, keep to the important works. Above all do not forget that the readers are, for the most part, not aware of anything and try, without being unnecessarily lengthy and monotonous [*sans longueurs inutiles*], to dot the i’s. It will be an excellent exercise for you.³⁵

³¹ Letter of Durkheim to Mauss, June 1897, in Émile Durkheim, *Lettres à Marcel Mauss*, presented by Philippe Besnard and Marcel Fournier, with the collaboration of C. Delangle, M.-F. Essyad and A. Morelle (Paris, 1998), 67.

³² Letter of Durkheim to Hubert, March 1898, in Durkheim, ‘Lettres à Hubert’, 490.

³³ Letter of Durkheim to Bouglé, July 6, 1897, in Victor Karady (ed.), Émile Durkheim, *Textes 2: Religion, morale, anomie* (Paris, 1975), 402.

³⁴ Durkheim, ‘Préfaces to *L’Année sociologique*’, 51.

³⁵ Letter of Durkheim to Mauss, Bordeaux, July 3, 1897. Durkheim, *Lettres à Marcel Mauss*, 75.

The reading of the works reviewed should be constructive, positive, but at the same time critical.³⁶ The fact that this work was a form of training for the younger participants was made explicit, as in the letter above ('an exercise') and Durkheim saw it as preparatory to more independent and original work such as articles and theses.

Many years later, Davy explained the general effect of the reviews of the *Année*: 'Those reviews were in fact systematic: they aimed to report, not on all books, but [...] on books whose subject was of sociological interest; they aimed to bring out, often unbeknownst to the author, this interest, *thus affirming a point of view and teaching a method*.'³⁷ Through this work, the *Année* group was demonstrating a method of sound analysis and progressively increasing the treasury of facts and ideas available for the construction of sociology.

Durkheim and his collaborators treated reviewing and classifying their material for the *Année* as a creative task. The Durkheimians used their journal to present an overall view of the science of society as they envisaged it. One of the main purposes of the *Année* was to gradually work out the natural divisions of sociology. The classifications underwent considerable changes during the first five years of the journal. Thus, to trace the changes in the organization of the various sections of the *Année* is at the same time to trace the development in the theoretical grasp of the various areas in question. Various sections grew and others disappeared, together, in some cases, with the collaborators who supplied them.

This organizing work started from the moment of selection of books for review. Durkheim wrote Hubert about the principles that should guide their choices of books and journals in some detail: 'We are a Sociological Review not a Review of erudition. We should only highlight those works that appear to us liable to be used by sociologists.'³⁸ This meant eliminating all critical and exegetical literature from the reviews—such works could be mentioned in the bibliography, which should be as complete as possible. Durkheim argued that the line of demarcation between what was useful

³⁶ Durkheim gave Bouglé the same advice: 'Basically, it is the residue of either things or ideas—and its extent may vary—that should determine the length of the analysis. . . We must, don't you think, abandon the current critical practice of concentrating on the author at the expense of the book and of rating talents rather than noting the findings and their importance. When it comes to science, shouldn't rating authors be less important than rating the things (opinions or documents) we owe them?' Letter of Durkheim to Bouglé, Bordeaux, June 20, 1897, in Durkheim, *Textes* 2, 398.

³⁷ Georges Davy, 'Émile Durkheim: l'homme', *Revue de métaphysique et de morale*, 26 (1919), 195. My emphasis.

³⁸ Letter of Durkheim to Hubert, March 30, 1898, in Durkheim, 'Lettres à Hubert', 493.

for sociology and the rest would be difficult to establish at first (would 'fluctuate') but would become progressively clear over time:

In sum, keep all the books that may be of interest for the sociologist. Among those, make a second triage and devote to those that seem sufficiently important a study of a certain length. As for the others, short notices. What is not analyzed should receive a bibliographic mention. Here are, I believe, the rules that should guide us.³⁹

Unlike his contributors, who specialized in one or another domain of sociology or the social sciences, Durkheim acted as both a general coordinator and as a specialist.⁴⁰ Given that the contributors to the *Année* were dispersed throughout France in various universities and lycées, Durkheim formed the necessary link between them. The group seldom met in person as a group and some of the contributors never exchanged correspondence except through the mediation of Durkheim or, in some cases, Durkheim's nephew and 'alter ego', Mauss.

Durkheim encouraged his collaborators to specialize across a wide range, though within the framework and the methodological principles laid down in *The Rules of Sociological Method* and in various methodological notes in the volumes of the *Année*.⁴¹ He regarded these principles as specifying the conditions for scientific and impersonal achievement. Durkheim kept firm control over the editorship of the journal, revised almost all the copy and even supervised the setting up of proofs. Davy has recorded that Durkheim would send back even the smallest reviews to their authors, with suggestions for revision and that he 'insisted on examining everything in the smallest detail'.⁴² Durkheim's suggestions were often specific: shorten the article, cut the repetitions, and so on. 'I'm getting involved in the smallest details', he told Bouglé. He made certain cuts himself. He was generous with his encouragement and congratulations: 'Very lively, very interesting analysis.' 'Clear and interesting exposition.'⁴³

Besnard has pointed out that Durkheim's strong editorial hand produced some tensions among the collaborators⁴⁴ and that, despite the fact that he delegated the ordering of the books for review to Hubert, he still had the books come to him [Durkheim] before passing them on to his helper, thus retaining control of the book ordering. This, however, was not due to a desire for control for its own sake, but, as Durkheim explained to

³⁹ Ibid. ⁴⁰ Fournier, *Émile Durkheim*, 457.

⁴¹ Lukes, *Émile Durkheim*, 293.

⁴² Davy, 'Émile Durkheim: l'homme', 188. This is supported by letters to Bouglé, Simiand and Mauss.

⁴³ Fournier, *Émile Durkheim*, 267.

⁴⁴ Philippe Besnard, *L'Anomie, ses usages et fonctions dans la discipline sociologique depuis Durkheim* (Paris, 1987), 484.

Hubert, was due to the particular nature of the work done through the ordering of the books. As he reviewed the book orders, Durkheim would organize them into the existing sociological sub-sections of the journal and try to evaluate whether they formed a coherent enough whole or whether he needed to look for more books for that particular part of the journal. He could not do this simply by looking at the list of titles, he needed to see the books themselves. In time, he told Hubert, this task could be delegated but, for the moment, Durkheim felt the coherence of the journal depended on it too much for him to give it up: an entire process of organization and conceptualization was at stake in this task.⁴⁵ As he wrote his nephew: 'The *Année* is a whole, and that is its great merit. So someone has to look after everything.'⁴⁶ Durkheim did not yet trust his young recruit to single out books in the way he would; he had not yet acquired the particular patterns of attention Durkheim had cultivated in himself. Mauss later wrote of the *Année* that:

In that kind of atelier, great abnegation of self is necessary. A laboratory is only good if it has a leader [*chef*], but also if it is filled with good people, that is to say, young and old people, who have work hypotheses, numerous ideas, extended knowledge, but who are above all ready to share all those in common, to participate in the work of the old [*anciens*] and to launch the work of the new [*nouveaux*], in the same way that all participate in theirs... [Durkheim's] work would have been impossible, if we hadn't devoted ourselves... and if I did not devote myself still.⁴⁷

The sense of participating in a meaningful collective enterprise was widely shared among the members of the group and helped them overcome various crises over the years. This ideal of common work is illustrated by the frequency of joint or unstated authorships of review articles and by the pattern of exchange of scientific principles among the Durkheimians that constituted the basis of their intellectual communion.⁴⁸ In this way, the *Année* group produced among themselves the moral solidarity they wished to see arise on a larger scale in French society. As Durkheim had argued in his doctoral thesis, the real social function of the division of labor was not economic but moral: it was to create solidarity among individuals. By making each member of the group dependent upon the others, the *Année*

⁴⁵ Letter from Durkheim to Hubert, March 15, 1900, in Durkheim, 'Lettres à Hubert', 505.

⁴⁶ Letter of Durkheim to Mauss, Friday, February 1900, in Durkheim, *Lettres à Marcel Mauss*, 253.

⁴⁷ Marcel Mauss, 'L'oeuvre de Mauss par lui-même', *Revue française de sociologie*, 20 (1979[1930]), 210.

⁴⁸ Victor Karady, 'Stratégies de réussite et modes de faire-valoir de la sociologie chez les durkheimiens', *Revue française de sociologie*, 20 (1979), 49–82.

had made them ‘an integral part of the whole...’⁴⁹ In *Suicide*, Durkheim had advocated for the creation of professional groups that would be intermediaries between the individual and the state and produce meaningful connections among their members. The *Année* generated—on a small scale—the kind of community united by significant (and attainable) goals that Durkheim envisaged. Durkheim hoped it would have an impact upon a broader public as well: ‘The sight of a group of workers with a common purpose and working towards the same goal will be a spectacle of considerable interest.’⁵⁰ ‘It could have a considerable moral effect.’

Initially, Durkheim’s extensive work of editing gave form to the style of professional review writing of his collaborators. Just as aspiring scientists first honed their skills by repeating exercises that were part of the repertoire of their discipline, the young members of the *Année* developed certain habits of mind by working at book reviews before taking on original articles for the *Année*. Durkheim encouraged and directed the research work of his younger teammates, providing them with guidance in creating original articles in the field of sociology, offering models of scientific research in the field, and helping them obtain academic appointments, as we shall see below. Much of this guidance was offered via correspondence due to the physical dispersal of the *Année* group but there were periodic meetings among members of the inner circle, when Durkheim visited Paris, for example, or when he invited members of the group to stay at his home in Épinal during the summer academic vacations. Later, the ‘inner’ members of the team, such as Mauss, increasingly took on training and professionalizing roles themselves.

Another Aspect of the Strategy: Original Papers

The *Année* was fundamental in establishing the research and publication credentials of its participants—a central aspect of the project to reform higher education and professionalize its faculty. Durkheim’s letters to his younger *Année* collaborators reveal his great concern that their personal work would suffer due to the weight of the collective work of reviewing material for the journal. Durkheim was acutely aware of the increasing importance of the doctorate and of publications for a successful academic career, and advised his collaborators accordingly.⁵¹ As he wrote Mauss, ‘I reckon that we must produce, that we will only count to the extent that

⁴⁹ Émile Durkheim, *De la division du travail social*, 6th ed. (Paris, 1932[1893]), 394.

⁵⁰ Letter of Durkheim to Mauss, April 10, 1897, in Durkheim, *Lettres à Marcel Mauss*, 54.

⁵¹ Karady, ‘Stratégies de réussite’, 81, used the growing size and later age of defense of dissertations as an indicator of this greater importance of research.

we produce, and that we must head in that direction.⁵² The *Année* contained not only an annual survey of all works that could be seen as pertinent to the construction of sociology, but also original papers (*Mémoires originaux*) that contributed directly to this construction—and to the publication record of the contributors.

Durkheim worked in collaborative manner not only on the *Année* reviews, but on his own books and articles and those of his team members. The most intense example of this collaboration was his relationship with his nephew. As Mauss wrote later, 'I have perhaps worked too much in collaboration with others. . . I contributed to Durkheim's *Suicide* (quantitative method, classifying 26,000 suicides individually arranged on cards and distributed in 75 cases). I worked on everything he wrote as he also did with me; often he even rewrote entire pages of my work. I published two monographs with him, including *Primitive Classification* in which I provided all the data.'⁵³ Mauss also had an intense collaborative relationship with Hubert, of which Durkheim was also sometimes a part. In Mauss's words: 'With Hubert, I published a monograph on *Sacrifice* and another on *Magic*, and the preface to our *Mélanges*. Generally, I took part in everything which he did which was not strictly criticism or archaeology. He always read over everything I wrote.'⁵⁴

Mauss, Hubert and Durkheim were all involved in writing the essay on *Sacrifice*, whose creation can be followed through their correspondence. Hubert and Mauss worked on the plan, exchanged index cards, discussed various points, added information and corrected drafts. They were learning to work together. Durkheim inserted himself in their collaboration, writing his nephew: 'Once done with the research, you will quickly write a draft which you will send me [...]. In a short time, I will see what corrections or remarks are necessary, *desiderata* of all sorts. I think I have an aptitude for this job of patching, which is at bottom my old job as a professor.'⁵⁵ Mauss completed the very last version; he and Durkheim only had time to send Hubert 'those passages in which we are afraid we might have disfigured your thought'.⁵⁶ Durkheim made some last minute changes: 'I have tried to get inside your minds. If I've distorted your argument, I have done so quite unintentionally. But it's only a matter of detail.'⁵⁷

Similar working arrangements between Mauss and Hubert continued over time. Sometimes they resented Durkheim's editorial intervention.

⁵² Letter of Durkheim to Mauss [1899], cited by Fournier, *Marcel Mauss* (Paris, 1994), 138.

⁵³ Mauss, 'L'oeuvre de Mauss par lui-même', 140–1.

⁵⁴ Ibid, 141.

⁵⁵ Letter of Durkheim to Mauss, n.d. [1898], cited by Fournier, *Marcel Mauss*, 156.

⁵⁶ Letter of Mauss to Hubert, Épinal, n.d., [1898], Ibid, 157.

⁵⁷ Letter of Durkheim to Hubert, 8 February 1899, in Durkheim, 'Lettres à Hubert', 500.

Writing to Mauss about their 'General theory of magic' article, Hubert wished he and Mauss had been able to collaborate more closely and criticized Durkheim's interference with their work: 'I believe that our collaborative work would have been better without Durkheim's revisions, as they seem to me to exaggerate the flaws in our own work.'⁵⁸ But, over all, they felt they gained from each other's expertise and interventions. Hubert, the historian, countered Mauss's philosophical tendencies towards abstraction and warned him against formulas and clichés. Durkheim kept Mauss, who tended to be overly ambitious and late in completing all projects, on task. Durkheim claimed to be 'charmed' to 'collaborate with you two'.⁵⁹ In fact, Durkheim was pleased with his interactions with all *Année* collaborators: 'My relationships with my collaborators have been very pleasant for me and I have found in them all a very touching devotion to the communal project [*chose commune*].'⁶⁰

The Durkheim-Hubert-Mauss 'trinity'⁶¹ was not the only active collaboration in the *Année*. Mauss also wrote, for instance, a defense of sociology in *La Grande Encyclopédie* with Fauconnet, 'aided by Durkheim.' The fruit of their collaboration was ultimately subdivided into three articles; the original encyclopedia article comprised less than a third of all they wrote. A second part was published under Fauconnet and Durkheim's name in the *Revue philosophique* (1910) as 'La sociologie et les sciences sociales.' The third part, 'Les divisions de la sociologie', was to have been published under their three names, but was lent out for a while, misplaced, and later rediscovered by Mauss (1938).⁶²

The homogeneity of the group has been a subject of debate among historians of sociology. From the perspective of insiders to the group, the 'Durkheimians' were loosely integrated. As Durkheim wrote to Bouglé, 'it is neither necessary nor desirable that everyone should adopt exactly the same formula'.⁶³ Davy wrote of the 'clan of the *Année sociologique*', whose unifying spirit Durkheim 'created and maintained... without the least tyranny, leaving each to his entire liberty. He exerted influence only through the immense superiority of his mind and his method. Everyone liked to go and see him and, while receiving his advice, experience the affectionate interest he had for all. But there were no committee meetings, no gatherings, no watchword'.⁶⁴

⁵⁸ Letter from Hubert to Mauss, 1905, cited by Fournier, *Émile Durkheim*, 454.

⁵⁹ Letter Durkheim to Mauss, beginning of January 1898, in Durkheim, *Lettres à Marcel Mauss*, 100.

⁶⁰ Letter Durkheim to Mauss, Bordeaux, December 22, 1897, in *Ibid.*, 97.

⁶¹ Letter of Durkheim to Hubert, January 9, 1901, in Durkheim, 'Lettres à Hubert', 512.

⁶² Fournier, *Marcel Mauss*, 243.

⁶³ Lukes, *Émile Durkheim*, 294.

⁶⁴ Davy, 'Émile Durkheim: l'homme', 195.

The original *Année* group included several distinct factions: a sizeable sub-group headed by Bouglé (Bouglé-Lapie-Parodi) that had significant intellectual differences with Durkheim (having criticized him in print in the 'Année' rubric of the *Revue de métaphysique et de morale*, and, in the case of Bouglé, in his *Les sciences sociales en Allemagne*); an important but isolated contributor in Richard, who was also critical of Durkheim at times; and a significant subgroup of young men connected to Durkheim through Mauss, who would eventually become the core animators of the journal.

Outsiders, however, viewed the group as having a unified doctrine and were critical of it.⁶⁵ Alfred Espinas, for example, saw the group as a 'militia' and a 'secret society' which 'used its mysteries to conceal its ambitions' and operated with 'its police, its reports, its admissions, its white and black lists'.⁶⁶ But insiders, such as Bouglé, who had not been trained by Durkheim, as was the case of younger members of the group such as Davy, also saw the group as united around an ideology he did not share. In letters to his friend Halévy, Bouglé called the group formed by Mauss-Durkheim-Hubert the 'tabu-totem clan' and the 'United Sociological Party.' Bouglé and his friend Halévy were critical of what they saw as the excessive importance given to primitive religion (and religion in general as 'playing a capital role in social life'⁶⁷) in the *Année*.

Bouglé had particular trouble with his book on castes, which he had sent to Durkheim, who passed it on to Mauss for review. Durkheim had a lot of criticisms of Bouglé's manuscript, generally around what he saw as Bouglé's insufficient expertise on India and its caste system and the lack of attention given to the religious aspects of the institution of castes. Mauss added a series of detailed comments of his own, intercalating a page of comment to every page of Bouglé's text.⁶⁸ Durkheim noted that Mauss's letter to Bouglé 'at my insistence, made a lot of demands'. Durkheim refused to publish the book in the new 'Travaux sociologiques' collection of the *Année*: 'I am not prepared to give it my seal of approval.'⁶⁹ At first Bouglé resisted the demands, but he eventually gave in and corrected his

⁶⁵ For example, Henri Berr, 'Le progrès de la sociologie religieuse', *Revue de synthèse historique*, 12 (1904), 43; *Revue de métaphysique et de morale*, 1904.

⁶⁶ Quoted in Hubert Bourgin, *L'École normale et la politique. De Jaurès à Léon Blum* (Paris, 1938), 91

⁶⁷ Émile Durkheim, 'Letter to the director of the *Revue néo-scolastique*', in Durkheim, *The Rules of Sociological Method and Selected Texts on Sociology and its Method*, ed. Steven Lukes and trans. W. D. Halls, (New York, 1982 [1907]), 259–60.

⁶⁸ Fournier, *Émile Durkheim*, 526–7.

⁶⁹ Letter of Durkheim to Mauss, October 1, 1907, in Durkheim, *Lettres à Marcel Mauss*, 387.

manuscript sufficiently to make it acceptable to Durkheim. It was then published as the first volume of the new collection.

Bouglé never left the group but became more peripheral over time, as was the case of all those who could not fully embrace the research program and views of the 'inner circle'. The *Année* team moved toward greater intellectual unity from its inception until the end of the period considered here, 1914. While they may not have adhered to a single 'formula', the collaborators became less eclectic as time went on and a stronger, more cohesive team formed mostly by former students of either Durkheim or Mauss emerged. Durkheim's own views can be gleaned from this letter to Simiand, to whom he writes that the original articles of the *Année sociologique* should be

... our work or the work of people still entirely in agreement with us. ... This last principle seems to be altogether excellent. I have no need to tell you how much it has cost me to publish certain things. I did it in the first place because at the beginning I did not dare to hope for the friendly [intellectual] homogeneity that has been established amongst us, and because I only thought of making the *Année* a collection, into which the only qualification for entry would be scientific honesty. I acted in this way because there was no means of acting otherwise. But it is clear that this eclecticism, however limited it may have been, harms the impression of the whole. I might add that in what has been published, *it is only what comes from us that is of value.*⁷⁰

Placing Group Members in Faculty Positions

Part of the *Année* group's success was due to its capacity to bring people into the group and to eventually place them in prestigious academic or research positions.

Marcel Mauss arrived in Paris in 1895 and remained an important resource, obtaining information, borrowing books, visiting other academics on his uncle's behalf and acting as a 'recruitment agent' for the *Année*, until Durkheim's arrival in Paris in 1902. Having completed his philosophy *agrégation* under his uncle's direction, Mauss turned to the study of religions on his advice. Rather than going directly into secondary level teaching, Mauss decided to enroll at the EPHE, where he signed up for the fourth and fifth sections (historical sciences and philology, and religious sciences, respectively). Mauss's choice was decisive for both nephew and uncle, as Durkheim was to find supporters and collaborators amongst Mauss's teachers and friends. The EPHE had a decisive influence

⁷⁰ Letter to Simiand, 15 February 1902. Quoted by Lukes, *Émile Durkheim*, 295. My emphasis.

on the birth of sociology in two ways. In intellectual terms, it made possible the study of religions of 'primitive' peoples, and in social terms, it led to the creation of a multidisciplinary research environment that welcomed the new discipline. Many important members of the *Année* team were part of the EPHE, including Hubert, Antoine Meillet and Robert Hertz.

In 1901, the deaths of two professors at the EPHE opened positions for both Mauss and Hubert. With the support of Sylvain Lévi and Durkheim, who provided references and advice, they were both successful in their candidacies. Durkheim interceded with various faculty members and even with the director of higher education. This set a pattern that was often repeated on behalf of other members of the *Année* group, who mobilized their contacts to place their own in academic positions. When Durkheim was promoted to the Sorbonne from Bordeaux, the team immediately strategized on how to fill his vacant position, which went to Gaston Richard, nominated *chargé de cours*. He was promoted to the rank of professor of social sciences in 1906, releasing the position of *chargé de cours*—the chair originally created for Durkheim—to Paul Lapie. In the same way, when Bouglé was promoted from a chair in social philosophy in Toulouse to the Sorbonne,⁷¹ Durkheim, Bouglé and Lévy-Bruhl orchestrated a strong campaign to have Paul Fauconnet appointed—which succeeded, despite his not having completed his doctorate.⁷² Durkheim and his associates were consolidating their position in academic circles and the intellectual field. Their journal dominated the social sciences and a new generation seemed poised to continue and take over from the founders.

Sociology, however, remained a subspecialty of philosophy. The academic legitimacy of Durkheimian sociology was heavily dependent on the approval of the philosophical establishment—a situation that resulted in sociology's failure to fully institutionalize itself. Durkheim's efforts to advance sociology were both furthered and crippled by his membership in the philosophical profession. He recruited his collaborators, to a large extent, from the ranks of philosophy *agrégés*. The academic credentials of the *Année* team opened to them prestigious journals and societies where they could propound their sociological views. Durkheim's choice of centering sociology upon themes that were traditionally part of the self-definition of philosophy (such as social morality or the categories of thought) was both a result of his (and his collaborators') philosophical background and a factor in maintaining sociology inside the field of

⁷¹ To a chair of history of social economics, which had been Espinas's, created by an endowment of the Comte de Chambrun.

⁷² Fournier, *Émile Durkheim*, 516.

philosophy. The privileged position of Durkheimian sociology as the accepted interlocutor of philosophy produced the exclusion of other competing sociologies from academia, such as that of René Worms and the *Revue internationale de sociologie*; but Durkheimian sociology remained locked in a dialectic of definition by opposition with philosophy—and thus dependent upon it.⁷³

As I outlined in my introduction on the university system in France, there were not many possibilities open to the Durkheimians in creating a new discipline. Individual chairs could be created or renamed given sufficient administrative support, but the institutionalization of training for research remained difficult in a system geared towards the preparation of secondary school teachers and the perpetuation of a series of national examinations. The would-be sociologists were forced to go through a double training, becoming *agrégés* in philosophy or another discipline (history, law) and pursuing their sociological training as a sideline under the guidance of one of the few mentors available. Hubert and Mauss eventually developed courses that trained students in the study of ethnography and religion at the EPHE, but the future of all these graduates could not be guaranteed by sociology itself, which remained without a clear career path. The only clear career path open to them was that offered by their previous training in the traditional disciplines, which allowed them to obtain *lycée* positions. Most of the successful members of the group worked their way from jobs in secondary education to more specialized positions later in their careers.

In 1907 there was a crisis in the *Année* that was symptomatic of the contradictory pull between traditional faculty positions and a shared research agenda, in which the members of the group were almost unable to meet the deadline for the current issue of the journal. Durkheim himself had already been periodically overwhelmed trying to fulfill his teaching and other duties and directing the *Année*. As the other members of the group in turn attained teaching positions, they experienced the same stresses. Bouglé called the journal 'the Sociological Olympiad' and Fauconnet complained about how much of their time was taken up by the work of reviewing. This crisis highlights the structural problem of a university system that required—for the acquisition of academic legitimacy

⁷³ The dependence was mutual, although sociology was certainly the weaker member of the partnership. See Pierre Bourdieu, 'Le champ scientifique', *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales*, 2–3 (1976), 88–104, on the complicity of antagonists inside a scientific field. For the interdependence of Durkheimian sociology and academic philosophy, see Daniela S. Barberis, 'Moral Education for the Elite of Democracy: The *classe de philosophie* Between Sociology and Philosophy', *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, 38 (2002), 367.

and power—the attainment of faculty positions whose teaching and other requirements made it impossible for the newly minted faculty to pursue their research agenda at their former pace. This crisis was resolved by the separation of the reviews and the original articles into two separate publications and by publishing the reviews only every three years (1910 and 1913). The pace of the *Année* was slowed, but the work went on. A younger set of contributors—Bourgin, Halbwachs, Bianconi and Hertz—who worked on volume ten, gave the journal a new impetus. The ‘old hands’ were very pleased, as Fauconnet wrote to Mauss.⁷⁴ Sociology seemed well on its way toward the achievement of academic institutionalization: important positions in Paris and in provincial universities (Bordeaux, Toulouse) were occupied by members of the group; it had a significant presence in the most prestigious research institutions (EPHE) and a new generation was in training. The future seemed bright.

Although the Durkheimians had gained the upper hand over other competitors who did not reach academic ‘canonization’, the fragility of their approach was revealed by the carnage of the Great War. Many of the best and brightest died,⁷⁵ including Durkheim’s son, André, soon followed by his heartbroken father, Hertz, David, Bianconi, Reynier and others. Mauss remained, an ambivalent heir to the enterprise.

With the death of the *Année* participants, chairs reverted to other disciplines and it was difficult to maintain the sheer amount of work required to continue the *Année* in its previous form. The tension between faculty positions and research work noted above meant that research work inside this system required abnegation—large amounts of work received little formal academic reward—but there were no alternatives to this approach. In the interwar years, the leading members of the *Année* branched out beyond sociology and exerted widely recognized and significant influence over many fields: the French ethnological school of Marcel Mauss; the historians of the *Annales d’histoire économique et sociale* led by Marc Bloch and Lucien Febvre; the comparative studies of Indo-European mythology of Georges Dumézil; the structural anthropology of Claude Lévi-Strauss, and others.⁷⁶ But despite the considerable and continuing intellectual prestige of Durkheimian sociology, by the middle of the twentieth century, French sociology had almost disappeared as a discipline.

North Central College

⁷⁴ Quoted by Fournier, *Émile Durkheim*, 530.

⁷⁵ Over half of the students in the class that entered the École Normale in 1913 were killed, as were eighteen of the class of 1911. See Clark, *Prophets and Patrons*, 209.

⁷⁶ See Alice L. Conklin, *In the Museum of Man: Race, Anthropology, and Empire in France, 1850–1950* (Ithaca and London, 2013); Simonetta Falasca-Zamponi, *Rethinking the Political: The Sacred, Aesthetic Politics, and the Collège de Sociologie* (Montreal and London, 2011).