

William G. Martin

## 2. OPENING GRADUATE EDUCATION: EXPANDING THE HOPKINS PARADIGM<sup>1</sup>

*A “sociology” of social inquiry is needed, not as still another subfield of study (whose “boundaries would merely legitimate ignorance of what is beyond them), but as an integral part of the method informing our research and, as far as possible, being consciously developed and used in the conduct of our studies and in our commentaries on each others’ work.*

— Hopkins (1979: 45)

### I. BINGHAMTON IN REFLECTION: “HOW DID TERRY DO IT?”

It is a question that I have asked myself many times over the past decade since I left Binghamton. It became most pertinent and pressing when I found myself the Director of Graduate Studies for the Sociology Department at the University of Illinois, forcing me to confront not just many more relationships with young graduate students but also the

---

1. My apologies to Professor Hopkins for expanding below several citations of his work to other contexts.

administrative structures and tasks associated with a well-established graduate program at a large public university.

Some things seemed easily imitated. Recalling the communal effects of his grand fall party, I too stocked my larders, opened my house, and poured forth music until the early morning hours. Lacking the noble and all-too-patient support of Gloria, I could neither match nor maintain such generosity. Day-to-day tasks proved more unrelenting, daunting, and distracting from larger agendas. How might one encourage colleagues to create more flexible, individually-designed programs to address graduate students needs—and demands? How could one massage admissions procedures to ensure our acceptance of a wider, broader stream of students? How might one redesign often inflexible core requirements, expand sources and criteria for funding, and shorten the dreaded time-to-degree?

The flood of day-to-day administrative and individual problems left little time for reflection. Recalling Binghamton provided, moreover, few immediate answers. Indeed, as I have heard it expressed by many of my fellow Binghamton students who also ended up in U.S. institutions, Binghamton seemed a world apart. We had been thrown into a far colder climate whether it was the flat maize fields of Illinois, the balmy shores of southern California or Hawaii, or the snow-blown climes of the Northeast. Everywhere, it seemed, I heard of fellow graduate students confronting the hegemony, even if declining, of a core group of positivist and U.S.-centric social science scholars and scholarship. Our graduate program admission standards, core requirements, course offerings—and need I say, standards for tenure?—all dictated grappling with far more limited prospects and perspectives than we had expected. Even more crippling were the effects of the Reagan retrenchments and the demise of the discipline within the academy. We felt, at times, beleaguered, isolated, and ill-prepared for such a fate.

Yet as we move toward the next millennium we may, I believe, be much more optimistic, and draw much more heavily upon the lessons of Binghamton. For even in the most harsh fiscal or intellectual settings it has become evident that the academic institutions we have

entered are facing the prospect of a wholesale restructuring in the coming generation. University presidents, chancellors, and deans know this, as do those who fund advanced research. This offers us, I believe, significant opportunities—if we can seize them. In no area is this challenge greater, and potentially more rewarding for world scholarship, than in the restructuring of how knowledge is produced and scholars nourished. And it is here, in order to seize these opportunities, that we so desperately need to capture and consider deeply the lessons Terry has provided us. I speak not only of the specific mechanics of constructing an environment for young scholarship to flourish, but of how they coalesce into a nascent paradigm for creating the conditions for restructuring on a world-scale, the institutions of knowledge production.

I will proceed in three parts. First, I want to sketch—as Terry would say, an interpretative sketch—the transformations before us, to establish the opportunities we face. Secondly, I want to illustrate with specific examples the avenues we can pursue, drawing on Hopkins's innovations as set against more traditional sociological settings. And finally, I want to open up very briefly for consideration and discussion the even greater possibilities afforded us in the coming generation, possibilities that were not available in the even chillier environment when the Binghamton program was established.

## II. THE COLLAPSE OF THE ACADEMY, AND THE POSSIBILITIES FOR WORLD-HISTORICAL STUDIES

*Why are these matters up for discussion? Why do we have the kinds of issues we have? What is our intellectual world—in that sense our consciousness—which leads us to be concerned, now, with these kinds of discussions?*

— Hopkins (1978: 199)

These are perplexing and stressful times for many scholars (see e.g., Bérubé & Nelson 1995; Cole, Barber & Graubard 1993). Within the mainstream of sociology cries of distress abound, as faculty and departments confront the falling academic and public reputation of the discipline (Collins 1986, Gans 1989, Glenn 1995), and the withering

away of faculty lines, graduate student support, and research resources. As state support for higher education recedes, an increasingly competitive struggle for academic resources has erupted, with North American sociologists finding themselves with few defensive weapons, and even fewer allies within and without the academy. A widespread reaction has been to extol and promote the contribution of sociologists to the “scientific” study of U.S. “social problems” (the “underclass,” the welfare state, “race relations,” crime, etc.) and to try to maintain the status of a “core” discipline by drawing disciplinary boundaries ever tighter still. Huber’s 1995 *American Journal of Sociology* essay makes this case in the extreme, arguing for a less democratic, less interdisciplinary and less “politically partisan” discipline, and a more “rationalist,” “scientific” discipline with a narrower “core” of subject matter and methods.<sup>2</sup>

Such a strategy for the discipline as a whole is bound to fail and is, I would argue, intellectually and institutionally disastrous. The most obvious pitfall is that it commits us to ever more parochial visions, research, and graduate and even undergraduate programs. Even more importantly, it ignores the opportunities presented by current ruptures in the paradigms and institutional organization of higher education and research. And these are considerable for those whose work is not defined and contained within one of the endless sub-specializations of the discipline, but is given coherence by a transnational or world-historical perspective.

As an increasing number of studies now document, the conceptions we inherit and the institutions we inhabit are legacies of the creation of the disciplines in late nineteenth century Europe, and, after World War II, the global expansion of education fostered under the rubric of U.S.-led modernization programs. Distinctive among the latter

2. For Huber the core is “demography, social organization, and social stratification” (p. 204), to which Bill Gamson argued in his reply to the original “Report of the ASA Task Group on Graduate Education, March 1992” (from which Huber’s article paraphrases select sections): “the core of sociology is political sociology, social psychology, and sociology of culture ... my principle here is the same one used by the report: the core of sociology is defined by the particular interests of the definers” (1992: 4). The ASA did not endorse the 1992 report.

effort was the linking of disciplinary structures to the creation, amidst the propagation of Cold War fears and anxieties, of “area” and “development” studies (see Berger 1995, Martin & West 1995, West & Martin 1999, Palat 1996). None of these programs and institutions are likely to survive the decline of U.S. hegemony, the demise of welfare and developmentalist states, and the structural adjustment being imposed upon educational institutions everywhere. However, simply decrying the belt-tightening and corporate budgeting programs being imposed upon the academy ignores the real opportunities that this conjuncture offers us. For scholars engaged in world-historical studies these are numerous. By comparison to the mid-1970s when programs like that at Binghamton were created, there is far more awareness across the historical social sciences of the need for new conceptions and methods suited to the relational processes that cut across national and disciplinary boundaries. While we may be appropriately critical of the ahistorical and U.S.-centric forms by which these are often advanced in the new cultural, postmodern, information technology, diaspora/migration, or “globalization” studies, there can be little doubt that transnational or world-economic imperatives are now surging within and across disciplinary and area studies boundaries. No longer are world-relational phenomena pinned within, for example, the narrow boxes of development, area, or ethnic studies.

The necessity of moving forward along related lines is, moreover, widely recognized by those who wield power and resources in North America. Their agendas and priorities, it must be stated at the outset, directly touch upon ours only in selected areas. Yet neither do they match the priorities of those who are retreating into a defense of the provincialism and overspecialization of the core disciplines or the old forms of “area,” comparative, or international studies. If one examines the recent outpouring of “strategic planning” documents by university administrators (e.g., at Rutgers, Michigan State University, and my own University of Illinois, among others) it is quite evident that a central priority is to “internationalize” the university and its educational offerings—and that this cannot proceed by investing in either the core disciplines or area studies centers. From this understanding has

emerged an exploratory search on the part of university administrations for new modes of advancing “global” perspectives. These have taken the form of new research programs, new transnational/international/diaspora majors, and, in a few select cases, the establishment of new research centers.

An even more distinctive and visible movement is being pursued by the major foundations and research consortia. New graduate training and research programs launched in the last several years by the Ford, Rockefeller, Mellon, MacArthur, and Carnegie foundations, among others, are explicitly posed against narrow disciplinary and area studies frameworks. And, as in the case of the Social Science Research Council, these initiatives match an internal administrative restructuring which has seen the outright abandonment of area and international studies/relations divisions. This has, especially in the case of the SSRC, led to much angst and protest, in private and in print, on the part of area and international studies scholars who are feeling abandoned by the very agencies which created their programs in the midst of Cold War agendas of the 1950s and 1960s and sustained them ever since (see among others Heginbotham 1994, 1995; Heilbrunn 1996; Prewitt 1996; Huber et al. 1995; Katzenstein 1995; Williams 1994).

Adding even further cause for distress on the part of defenders of the academy’s institutional division of labor is the open pursuit of such global or transnational educational priorities on the part of capital. As the 1994 Rand survey of the CEOs of leading universities and global corporations revealed (Bikson & Law 1994), both corporate and university officers now believe that the disciplines, wedded as they are to domain knowledge, and area programs, focused as they are upon isolated and unrelated geographical sites, are an obstacle to generating the most needed element in higher education: competence in global and cross-cultural knowledge.

In short: whether one examines the university, foundation, or corporate world, a shared understanding is beginning to emerge that new institutional forms suited to a transnational world must be pursued as part and parcel of the reordering of the institutional structures of higher education and research.

### III. TOWARDS A TRULY WORLD-HISTORICAL GRADUATE PARADIGM

*Once one begins to work from the premises of world historical studies, it does become necessary to rethink, rather carefully, most of the conceptions and methods we have learned to work with.*

— Hopkins (1979:44)

#### *A. The Situation of the Social Sciences, Sociology, and Graduate Education*

Even if my assessment of this trend is acceptable, there is no guarantee of course that scholars engaged in world-historical research will benefit from it—for quite obvious intellectual and programmatic reasons. Yet we may well be far better situated than most other social scientists to seize and shape the opportunities that this global opening offers. Certainly most scholars in sociology, much less the other social sciences, remain inveterately parochial in their disciplinary and world outlook. As I have summarized the evidence elsewhere (Martin 1996), U.S. sociologists like their fellow social scientists rarely cite much or even read any but English-language, primarily U.S., scholarship; rarely teach, even at the undergraduate level, about the world beyond the borders of the United States; and have few if any international interests (e.g., sociologists' representation in all the major area studies associations, as an indicator of international interests, is abysmal).

This state of affairs does contain, however, blessings in disguise for world-historical scholars and research: we represent a significant group of those with broader world experience and interests, and are less burdened by past forms of institutionalizing “international/areas” studies. At the same time, for those of us in sociology, we inhabit a discipline where the definition of proper scholarship remains wider and more open to debate than by comparison to most of the other social sciences.

These attributes may well have served sociologists badly in defending the discipline versus others with more focused and narrow boundaries (e.g., political science, economics, and even history) and a less fractious faculty. We are nevertheless well-placed to respond better or more aptly than colleagues within the discipline or others across the social

sciences and humanities, to the ongoing restructuring of the academy charted above. To date, most discussions of this new academic climate have, as might well be expected, focused upon the conceptual, subject-matter, and, to a lesser degree, methodological implications of the “global challenge.” This has resulted, for example, in the blossoming of new texts and programs dedicated to the construction of images and conceptions of the non-Western “other,” democratization and the end of the nation-state, national and transnational identities, or even global development. Far fewer have sought to unearth emerging and potential patterns of institutional organization. The most notable statement is the seminal and remarkably temperate Gulbenkian Report, *Open the Social Sciences* (Wallerstein et al. 1996). Acknowledging the realities of limited opportunities and especially resources, *Open the Social Sciences* recommends quite modest and very specific modes of bridging across disciplinary, area, and national boundaries as part of the effort to crack open rigid disciplinary compartments (1996: 94-105).

While these recommendations impinge upon how young scholars might be nourished in a more open and equitable global academy, they do not, given the report’s focus, carry us very far forward in the reconceptualization of the process of the nurturing of young scholars and scholarship. It is precisely in this critical area that the hitherto hidden example of Terence K. Hopkins bears so much import. While others at this colloquium will appropriately focus upon his scholarly and especially methodological contributions, I want now, very briefly, to suggest how we might address the opportunistic anomalies before us as the social sciences are reordered, and move towards expanding the nascent Hopkins paradigm as part of the restructuring of graduate education on a worldwide scale.

### *B. Restructuring Graduate Education Organizations*

*[T]he methodological directive with which we work is that our acting units or agencies can only be thought of as formed and continually reformed, by the relations between them.*

— Hopkins (1978: 204-05)

The starting point for this endeavor rests upon the conjuncture sketched above: tumult within the social sciences and humanities, a turn towards global and transnational studies on the part of those who control resources and power within the academy, and the temporarily advantageous situation of world-historical scholars within this context. As in the case of method and movements, we move outward from the relational orientation so well taught by Hopkins: above all we need to search out and build relations that not simply link graduate study in one discipline or world area with another, but instigate new relationships beyond geographically-and disciplinary-bounded subject matters and procedures.

There is little guidance here. Discussions of the state and reform of graduate education are even sparser than those addressed to undergraduate education, and remain primarily concerned with raising the status of the discipline and such specific topics as how to improve the hiring prospects of students (e.g., insert more teaching, writing, and applied corporate courses while curtailing Ph.D. production and time-to-degree) or resolve faculty disputes over core course and especially methodology requirements.<sup>3</sup> No one to my knowledge has seriously addressed how graduate programs might be reformed in parallel with the restructuring of the social sciences and the demand for more “global” curricula and research.<sup>4</sup> Almost completely absent from discussion is any awareness of how inequality in academic resources

---

3. In addition to the “Report of the ASA Task Group on Graduate Education, March 1992,” see for example the essays, including those by Dowd, Plutzer, and Schwirian and McDonagh, in the Special Issue on Graduate Education of *Teaching Sociology* (XIX, 3, 1991). One should note that adding simply the voices of “others” (even women and so-called minorities), as Lemert proposes in the conclusion of his 1995 monograph, does not necessarily address, as we do below, either the need for transnational/world-historical perspectives or the global inequalities in the production of knowledge.

4. In relation to undergraduate education see the contrasting essays by Lie (1995) and Martin (1996). Huber (1995) proposes of course that sociologists become less interdisciplinary and admit fewer foreign students—although sociology awards a smaller percentage of its Ph.D.’s to foreign students than the presumably “more scientific” fields of economics, statistics, econometrics, demography, etc. (see National Research Council 1995, 52).

serves to reproduce a hierarchy of graduate education in the United States and worldwide.<sup>5</sup>

*C. Learning and Applying Hopkins's Insights: From the Abstract to the Concrete*

*As to the ways in which to choose a problem for inquiry, we are just beginning to learn them.*

— Hopkins (1978: 213)

To proceed, we need but to recall and then extend specific characteristics of the program Terence Hopkins constructed with his colleagues at Binghamton. I have coalesced, very briefly, some guiding pointers under three imperative headings.

*Imperative One: Create a World-Embracing Faculty and Student Community*

One of the most striking characteristics of the Binghamton program was the catholic [small “c”] character of its faculty and student body. Faculty came from throughout the world and held degrees in all the social sciences (and some, such as Perry Anderson were, as I recall, without a Ph.D. or its equivalent). Students, as a glance around this room indicates, were similarly representative. The intellectual vigor and excitement that such a community creates may be the surest step to moving beyond the conceptual and disciplinary narrowness, provincialism, and Euro-North American centrism of the social sciences.

Most of us are situated at far more parochial institutions than the Binghamton of the mid-1970s, and many would protest: Surely we cannot hire on such a wide and diverse scale. Imagine sociology departments hiring historians, or, God forbid, political science and history departments hiring sociologists! Yet if faculty demographic projections hold, we will shortly be engaged in a small wave of replacement hiring. As we proceed to hire in the next decade, we will

---

5. See Plutzer (1991) as an illustration of sociologists' inability and unwillingness to think self-reflexively over these matters.

need to impress upon our colleagues the necessity of incorporating scholars most suited to the new transnational fields of inquiry that are emerging—and not be prevented from considering applicants whose formal credentials originate in another discipline. If I were searching for someone versed in conceptual and theoretical work, scholars in philosophy might well be on the top of my list. Or for global racial issues: political science and anthropology. To pursue such a strategy one might well, as the Gulbenkian Report suggests, pursue joint hires—an especially effective strategy in this climate of fiscal constraint. Zero time appointments which are not just courtesy appointments, but facilitate the incorporation of new courses and collaboration, are even easier.

Narrow admissions criteria present, of course, the major obstacle to creating a student body of a similar character. Central here is the use of criteria that privilege students from a dominant, upper-middle class, English-only cultural and national background. GRE scores, so widely used as cut-off points by admission committees, illustrate the problem all too well.<sup>6</sup> Even our quantitative colleagues refuse to acknowledge the lack of quantitative evidence that GREs are a predictor of “intelligence,” much less of scholarly success. Indeed one study shows that for Black students the correlation between GRE scores and success in graduate school is negative, i.e., the higher the score, the less chance of success (Scott & Shaw 1985). Reliance upon such measures only serves to narrow the academy, as in the failure to increase the number of Black (U.S. and foreign) Ph.D.’s between the mid-1970s and 1990 (National Research Council 1995: 52, 78, 79) and the highly uneven recruitment of foreign students which follows the rise and fall in the wealth of semiperipheral states.<sup>7</sup> As with faculty so

---

6. Thus, for example, Joan Huber’s (1995: 206) complaint, in tracing the demise of the discipline, that “by the early 1980s, sociology GRE scores were the lowest in the social sciences.” Such sentiments lead to the kind of policy posed to me by one Director of Graduate Studies: “My aim is to increase the GRE scores of our graduate student entering class, year after year.” Needless to say, this results in a Whiter, more U.S.-centric student body.

7. Despite a slight upturn in the early 1990s, the number of African-American male Ph.D.’s in 1994 is still a third below the absolute figure of 1975; in the category

too with students: we will need to recruit students from ever wider disciplinary as well as world backgrounds.

If we are to have any chance of creating programs and classrooms that reverberate with the vibrancy of multiple, contending, world perspectives, we will have to move sharply to open the doors, on both the faculty and student fronts, to scholars and scholarship that do not simply reproduce the current dominance of Euro-North American perspectives. Hopkins of course knew the benefits of this well, pointing out to his colleagues almost forty years ago the necessity of pursuing conceptions with “relevance for a broader set of problems than those bounded by the Western economy of the nineteenth century” (Hopkins 1957: 304).

*Imperative Two: Create Graduate Programs that Demand World-Historical Engagements*

One of the most constraining, and in my experience most contentious, aspects of graduate programs is the “core” curriculum. Like the discipline as a whole, it is excessively fragmented and specialized (see e.g., Gans 1989), with tight boundaries between even separate programs of study within individual departments. To break such compartmentalization requires not simply greater openness within the discipline wherever world-historical studies are pursued, but demanding our students take courses outside the department, that they emerge with multilingual skills, and conduct research that moves beyond areal international specialties to relational processes that cut across disciplinary and area

---

of “U.S. and Permanent Visa Ph.D. recipients,” Black Ph.D.’s in the Social Sciences grew between 1980 and 1994 from 4.0% to 4.6% of all Ph.D.’s, and for Sociology from 3.6% in 1980 to 3.8% in 1994. The real gains were in the rise of women from one-third of Ph.D.’s to equivalence with men in the social sciences and sociology (see National Research Council 1981, 27 and 1995, 52, 78, 79). Such figures reflect the discipline as a whole and participation at ASA meetings. In 1994 ASA’s general membership (1990/91) was 41% female, 7.5% Asian, 3.9% African-American/Black, 2.4% Latino/a, 0.6% Native American, and 85.6% White. Participation at the 1994 Annual Meetings (calculated from a low response rate) was 53% female, 3.7% Asian, 4.1 % African-American/Black, 2.7% Latino/a, 0.0% Native American, and 90.5% White (Schuchert 1995).

compartments.

As difficult as these changes may be to implement, we will have to consider in coming years greater innovations, such as joint Ph.D.'s across the social sciences and humanities—a process made all the more necessary by the growth of transnational and transdisciplinary subjects as well as faculty and departmental retrenchments. Indeed we need to be even bolder, and create new institutional sites of collaborative research. If we cannot create the transdisciplinary faculty and student body that Hopkins achieved at Binghamton, we will need to implement these features with colleagues in other departments. The new transdisciplinary and non-area studies graduate research seminars being funded by the Ford, Rockefeller, and Mellon foundations are but one indicator of the possibilities before us. In given subject areas it is certainly possible at almost all campuses to create research working groups, if not credited courses, that bring together faculty and students from several disciplines around a common subject matter that no single department on our campuses can address alone.

*Imperative Three: Move Towards a More Objective, Global Process of Graduate Education*

I have not addressed here the very conception of graduate education, a topic we need to pursue collectively at greater length. But it follows from my remarks above that the model of graduate “training” we have inherited is a highly constrained, unequal, and polarizing one. Most universities and scholars in North America tend to view themselves as the center of the educational universe, bringing in overseas scholars for advanced training and dispersing them back to the peripheral world to carry out applied research. North American students are similarly sent overseas, most often through area study programs, to conduct field research and mine foreign environments and scholars—with no expectation that foreign, indigenous scholarship may provide any theoretical or methodological guidance. It is, even in its late post-World War II form, an excessively colonial model. It is also one that runs directly counter to the guiding principles of world-historical research methodology.

If we are to move beyond such entrenched paths we will have to rethink vigorously and redesign all our models of scholarship for both ourselves and our students. Concretely, we need to begin to explore the refashioning of transnational intellectual linkages, most notably international relationships. We need nothing less than a radical inversion of existing institutional linkages. Should we not be sending our students to the blossoming research centers in Africa, Latin America, and Asia as part of their graduate curriculum? Should not their dissertation projects (and our own research) be designed in collaboration with the best scholars outside the narrow boundaries of our discipline and the nation?

My own experience, in sending students to work and study under colleagues at leading African research centers (as part of a Ford Foundation grant designed with colleagues in history and political science), suggests extraordinary benefits of such a strategy. Can we go further, and imagine joint Ph.D. programs, joint research working groups, and collaborative scholarship embedded across the substantive boundaries of core, semiperipheral, and peripheral zones? Can we afford not to, given the accelerating vitality and assertiveness of, indigenous social science in the world beyond the borders of Western Europe and North America?

#### IV. REPRISE: PROTEST AND PROGNOSIS

*[T]he job of someone commenting ..., is to raise questions ... about how we think as we proceed.*

— Hopkins (1978: 199)

*There are no detached observers in world-systems studies. All observers are participants as well. ...*

— Hopkins (1979: 45)

Surely many would again protest: we have not the means, in this age of the imposition of structural adjustment upon educational institutions, to envisage such grandiose strategies. Hence the importance of my opening remarks: We need to pay close attention to the *longue durée* of the academy and those who wield power and resources within and

over it. Unlike the situation of the mid-1970s, university, foundation, and even corporate officers recognize all too well the banality and parochialism of contemporary graduate (and undergraduate) education and advanced research. At the same time sociologists, and other social scientists, have far less hubris than in the mid-1970s regarding the distinguished character of their programs and research.

For those of us moving forward from a world-historical perspective we have an even greater advantage: the scores of graduate students who have passed through the graduate program Terry fashioned have been inspired by his leadership and intelligence and now reside in the multiple comers of the world educational system. Might we not, in recalling and pondering the lessons of his example, draw upon ourselves in order to create greater and more equitable scholarly relationships from many, related sites? Might this not be the best use of the Hopkins legacy: to pursue a more relational, equitable, and collaborative world of scholarship, for our students and ourselves?

#### REFERENCES

- Berger, Joseph (1989). "Sociology's Long Decade in the Wilderness," *New York Times*, May 2, p. 6.
- Berger, Mark T. (1995). *Under Northern Eyes: Latin American Studies and US Hegemony in the Americas, 1898-1990*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana Univ. Press.
- Bérubé, Michael & Cary Nelson, eds. (1995). *Higher Education Under Fire: Politics, Economics and the Crisis of the Humanities*. New York: Routledge.
- Bikson, T. K. & S. A. Law (1994). *Global Preparedness and Human Resources: College and Corporate Perspectives*. Santa Monica: Rand Corporation.
- Cole, Jonathan R., Elinor G. Barber & Stephen R. Graubard, eds. (1993). *The Research University in a Time of Discontent*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press.
- Collins, Randall (1986). "Is 1980s Sociology in the Doldrums?" *American Journal of Sociology*, XLI, 6, 1336-55.
- Dowd, James J. (1991). "Revising the Canon: Graduate Training in the Two Sociologies," *Teaching Sociology*, XIX, 3, 308-21.

- Gamson, Bill (1992). "Reactions to Report of the Task Group on Graduate Education," unpubl.
- Gans, Herbert J. (1989). "Sociology in America: The Discipline and the Public," *American Sociological Review*, LIV, 1-16.
- Glenn, Joshua (1995). "Sociology on the Skids," *Utne Reader*, Nov.-Dec., 28-30.
- Heginbotham, Stanley (1994). "Rethinking International Scholarship," *ITEMS*, XLVIII, 2/3, June-Sept., 482-83.
- Heginbotham, Stanley (1995). "Toward a Moratorium on Litmus Tests," *ITEMS*, XLIX, 1, Mar., 35-38.
- Heilbrunn, Jacob (1996). "The News from Everywhere," *Lingua Franca*, VI, 4, 48-56.
- Hopkins, Terence K. (1957). "Sociology and the Substantive View of the Economy." Pp. 270-306 in K. Polanyi, C. M. Arensberg & H. W. Pearson, eds., *Trade and Market in the Early Empires*. Chicago: Henry Regnery.
- Hopkins, Terence K. (1977). "Notes on Class Analysis and the World-System," *Review*, I, 1, 67-72. [Reprinted in T. K. Hopkins, I. Wallerstein, and Associates, *World-Systems Analysis: Theory and Methodology*. Beverly Hills: Sage, 1982, 83-89.]
- Hopkins, Terence K. (1978). "World-Systems Analysis: Methodological Issues," in B. H. Kaplan, ed., *Social Change in the Capitalist World Economy*. Beverly Hills: Sage, 199-217. [Reprinted in T. K. Hopkins, I. Wallerstein, and Associates, *World-Systems Analysis: Theory and Methodology*. Beverly Hills: Sage, 1982, 145-58.]
- Hopkins, Terence K. (1979). "The Study of the Capitalist World-Economy: Some Introductory Considerations," in W. Goldfrank, ed., *The World-System of Capitalism: Past and Present*. Beverly Hills: Sage, 21-52. [Reprinted in T. K. Hopkins, I. Wallerstein, and Associates, *World-Systems Analysis: Theory and Methodology*. Beverly Hills: Sage, 1982, 9-38.]
- Hopkins, Terence K., Immanuel Wallerstein, and Associates (1982). *World-Systems Analysis: Theory and Methodology*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Huber, Joan (1995). "Institutional Perspectives on Sociology," *American Journal of Sociology*, CI, 1, 194-216.

- Huber, Robert T., Blair A. Ruble & Peter J. Stavrakis (1995). "Post-Cold War 'International' Scholarship: A Brave New World or the Triumph of Form over Substance?" *ITEMS*, XLIX, 1, Mar., 30-35.
- Katzenstein, Peter J. (1995). "Alternative Perspectives on National Security," *ITEMS*, XLIX, 4, Dec., 89-94.
- Lemert, Charles (1995). *Sociology After the Crisis*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Lie, John (1995). "American Sociology in a Transnational World," *Teaching Sociology*, XXV, 136-44.
- Martin, William G. (1996). "Toward a 'Global' Curriculum and Classroom: Contrasting Comparative and World-Historical Strategies," *Teaching Sociology*, XXIV, 2, 135-47.
- Martin, William G. & Michael West (1995). "The Decline of the Africanists' Africa and the Rise of New Africas," *ISSUE*, Winter/Spring, 24-27. [An expanded version published in 1999 in William G. Martin and Michael West, eds., *Out of One, Many Africas: Reconstructing the Study and Meaning of Africa*. Champaign IL: Univ. of Illinois Press.]
- National Research Council (1981). *Summary Report, 1980: Doctorate Recipients from United States Universities*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- National Research Council (1995). *Summary Report, 1994: Doctorate Recipients from United States Universities*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Palat, Ravi (1996). "Fragmented Visions: Excavating the Future of Area Studies in a Post-American World," *Review*, XIX, 3, Sum., 269-315.
- Piccone, Paul (1989). "The Reuniversalization of the University?" *Telos*, No. 81, 122-29.
- Plutzer, Eric (1991). "The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Academia: An Essay on Graduate Education," *Teaching Sociology*, XIX, 3, 302-07.
- Prewitt, Kenneth (1996). "Presidential Items," *ITEMS*, L, 1, Mar., 15-18. "Report of the ASA Task Group on Graduate Education, March 1992," unpubl.
- Schuchert, Michael (1995). "1994 Annual Meeting Survey Analysis Report," *ASA Footnotes*, April, p. 7.

- Schwirian, Kent P. & Edward C. McDonagh (1991). "Sociology PhDs in the 1990s," *Teaching Sociology*, XIX, 3, 424.
- Scott, Richard R. & Marvin E. Shaw (1985). "Black and White Performance in Graduate School and Policy Implications of the Use of Graduate Record Examination Scores in Admissions," *Journal of Negro Education*, LIV, 1, 14-23.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel et al. (1996). *Open the Social Sciences: Report of the Gulbenkian Commission on the Restructuring of the Social Sciences*. Stanford: Stanford Univ. Press.
- West, Michael & William G. Martin (1999). "Through Three Paradigms: The Rival Africas of Africanists and Africans at Home and Abroad," in W. G. Martin & M. West, eds., *Out of One, Many Africas: Reconstructing the Study and Meaning of Africa*. Champaign IL: Univ. of Illinois Press.
- Williams, Cynthia (1994). "Fundlers Rethink Priorities. New Era Requires Innovative Approaches to Area and International Studies," *Communiqué*, IV, 2,1-3.
-

# CONTENTS

**Immanuel Wallerstein** ix

*Introduction*

## I. GRADUATE EDUCATION: THE FORMATION OF SCHOLARS

**Walter L. Goldfrank** 3

*1. Deja Voodoo All Over Again: Rereading the Classics*

**William G. Martin** 9

*2. Opening Graduate Education: Expanding the Hopkins Paradigm*

**Ravi Arvind Palat** 27

*3. Terence Hopkins and the Decolonization of World-Historical Studies*

**Immanuel Wallerstein** 35

*4. Pedagogy and Scholarship*

## II. METHODS OF WORLD-HISTORICAL SOCIAL SCIENCE

**Reşat Kasaba** 43

*5. Studying Empires, States, and Peoples: Polanyi, Hopkins, and Others*

**Richard E. Lee** 51

*6. Thinking the Past/Making the Future: Methods and Purpose in World-Historical Social Science*

**Philip McMichael** 57

*7. The Global Wage Relations as an Instituted Market*

**Elizabeth McLean Petras** 63

8. *Globalism Meets Regionalism: Process versus Place*

**Beverly Silver** 83

9. *The Time and Space of Labor Unrest*

### III. SCHOLARS AND MOVEMENTS

**Rod Bush** 89

10. *Hegemony and Resistance in the United States: The Contradictions of Race and Class*

**Nancy Forsythe** 101

11. *Theorizing About Gender: The Contributions of Terence K. Hopkins*

**Lu Aiguo** 115

12. *From Beijing to Binghamton and Back: A Personal Reflection on the Trajectory of Chinese Intellectuals*

**Evan Stark** 127

13. *Sociology as Social Work: A Case of Mis-Taken Identity*

**Terence K. Hopkins** 143

14. *Coda*

**Mohammad H. Tamdgidi** 145

*The Utopistics of Terence K. Hopkins, Twenty Years Later: A Postscript*

*Colloquium Photos* 169

*About the Contributors* 193

*Terence K. Hopkins Bibliography* 205

*Index* 309

Copyright © 1998, 2017, by Immanuel Wallerstein; The Fernand Braudel Center for the Study of Economics, Historical Systems, and Civilizations; Mohammad H. Tamdgidi, Ahead Publishing House; each chapter or part by its contributor

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any informational storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher (representing copyright holders) except for a reviewer who may quote brief passages in a review.

Published by:  
Ahead Publishing House (imprint: Okcir Press)  
P. O. Box 393 • Belmont, MA 02478 • USA • [www.okcir.com](http://www.okcir.com)  
For ordering or other inquiries contact: [info@okcir.com](mailto:info@okcir.com)



---

Library of Congress Catalog Number (LCCN): 2016920666

For latest and most accurate LOC data for this book, search [catalog.loc.gov](http://catalog.loc.gov) for the above LCCN

---

#### Publisher Cataloging in Publication Data

Mentoring, Methods, and Movements: Colloquium in Honor of Terence K. Hopkins by His Former Students and the Fernand Braudel Center for the Study of Economics, Historical Systems, and Civilizations / Immanuel Wallerstein and Mohammad H. Tamdgidi., eds.

Twentieth Anniversary Second Edition

Belmont, Massachusetts: Ahead Publishing House, 2017

334 pages • 6x9 inches

Includes bibliographical references, photos, chronological bibliography, and index.

ISBN-13: 978-1-888024-98-2 • ISBN-10: 1-888024-98-4 (hard cover: alk. paper)

ISBN-13: 978-1-888024-88-3 • ISBN-10: 1-888024-88-7 (soft cover: alk. paper)

ISBN-13: 978-1-888024-91-3 • ISBN-10: 1-888024-91-7 (PDF ebook)

ISBN-13: 978-1-888024-92-0 • ISBN-10: 1-888024-92-5 (ePub ebook)

1. Hopkins, Terence K., 1929-1997—Congresses. 2. Historical sociology—Congresses.
3. Sociology—Study and teaching (Graduate)—New York (State)—Congresses. 4. Social movements—Congresses. I. Wallerstein, Immanuel, 1930– II. Tamdgidi, Mohammad H., 1959– III. Title

Photo Credits: Sunaryo • Gloria N. Hopkins

Cover and Book Design and Typesetting: Ahead Publishing House

Printed by Lightning Source, LLC. The paper used in the print editions of this book is of archival quality and meets the minimum requirements of ANSI/NISO Z39.48-1992 (R1997) (Permanence of Paper). The paper is acid free and from responsibly managed forests. The production of this book on demand protects the environment by printing only the number of copies that are purchased.