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Introduction

This article is about the rise and fall of radicalism among intellectuals during the 1960s and 1970s, using the case of sociologists, or, to be more precise, of a group of scholars associated with what is today known as New Urban Sociology (NUS). The theoretical frame to be tested in the discussion is Gouldner’s sociology of intellectuals, and, to some extent, the sociology of sociology, as developed in The coming crisis of western sociology (1970) and The future of intellectuals and the rise of the new class (1979).

The case illustrates the changes of position that occurred among urban scholars associated with the NUS and involved with the Research Committee on the Sociology of Urban and Regional Development (RC 21) of the International Sociological Association and its International Journal for Urban and Regional Research (IJURR). This was a relatively small, international group of scholars working within closely related fields of social sciences. The story of this group begins with the ‘calling’ of a generation of social scientists during the turmoil of the 1960s, who developed a distinct critical/radical discourse and eventually created a niche for themselves. In order to tell that story, which is also the story of who those intellectuals are and under what circumstances they became radicalized, I will firstly outline the social and theoretical developments of this period and demonstrate the novelty of the questions that the new urban sociologists posed. Secondly, I will examine the features of the practical engagements and motivations of the group under consideration and show how they changed. Thirdly, I will discuss the institutionalization of this group.1

* This paper is the result of an invitation by the Foundation for Urban and Regional Studies to Aleksandra Sasha Milicevic to use the archives of the ISA Research Committee for Urban and Regional Development and of IJURR as source material for a ‘sociology of sociology’ study of the development of the ‘New Urban Sociology’. The fact that she was supervised by Ivan Szelenyi, a leading figure in this development, and had access to whatever material remained meant that she was in a particularly good position to make such a study. She presented her work at a meeting of ISA Research Committee 21 (Urban and Regional Research) at the World Congress of Sociology in Montreal in 1998 where she received comments. But it should be stressed that she expresses her own views in this article and that neither IJURR nor FURS want to impose a particular view of the past. The IJURR is keen to encourage a lively debate about urban sociology and its dynamics. This piece is a welcome contribution to the debate. FURS appreciates the extensive work she put into this study and the willingness of IJURR to publish her unusually long article.

1 This article derives from a master’s thesis in sociology, written at UCLA with Ivan Szelenyi, and financed by FURS. See Appendix 1 for the methodology.
Radical academics according to Gouldner

The main questions that this article contends with are: What makes a radical? Who becomes radical? What happens to radicals? Most studies of radicalism deal with ‘radical social movements’, but instead of theoretically conceptualizing the notion of radical, the majority merely describe different social-change-oriented movements that occurred during the 1960s (Stark, 1988; Burns, 1990; Fink et al., 1996). Another stream of writing on radicalism derives from personal accounts of engagements during the 1960s, which implicitly equate radicalism with political activism (Brown, 1988; Frye, 1988; Goertz, 1988). The few, more theoretically-oriented studies that analyze the position of radical intellectuals, such as Gouldner (1970; 1979; 1980) or Eyerman (1994), also leave radicalism undefined. Though unspoken, it can be inferred that radicalism here is understood as a combination of leftist orientation and a critical approach to society. 2 Gouldner interpreted a critical approach as a profound dissatisfaction with the status quo and a desire for something new insofar as it ‘does not rely upon an objectified history, on social structures, or on nature, but on people’s will and consciousness, to overcome the deficiencies of nature, history, and economic structures’ (1980: 47).

The creation of a general definition of radicalism raises problems. A radical position is only possible vis-à-vis some ‘established’, moderate position, hence it will have different meanings in different contexts. The common feature, regardless of the specific context, will be a view that drastic (radical) social changes are needed if a better society is to be achieved. Radicals, however, do not have to be totally opposed to society as a whole; they can support radical ideas in one or a few spheres. If we talk about radicalism among scholars, their radicalism can be expressed in terms of theory, as a ‘rebellion’ against the dominant paradigm of their field, or in terms of methodology, as in the use of non-conventional research techniques. Political radicalism among academics will depend on the links between university life and political life, and it will very often be articulated in opposition to the dominant ideology. Hence, if being radical in the West in the 1960s meant being Marxist, being radical in eastern Europe meant being skeptical towards dominant Marxist ideology. As radicalism is also a matter of self-definition, radical intellectuals develop different interpretations of their own radicalism. Radicalism can thus be considered as an emergent category-in-context. Consequently, this analysis looks at the contextual differences that shaped the radicalism of the group under consideration, and only after that emphasizes their commonalities.

Gouldner’s theory of radicalism among academics is not presented in any systematic way. References to radical academics and the causes and implications of radicalism are scattered throughout his discussions on the crisis in sociology. Hence, it will be reconstructed here. Gouldner (1970; 1979; 1980) analyzed the relationship between power and knowledge. He criticized academic professionalization and the developing symbiosis between academia and the state, which leads to the privileging of economic self-interest rather than traditional intellectual values among academics. The ideology that develops among the majority of intellectuals is the ideology of professionalism, whose main objective is the extension of political and economic power (under the pretext that the distribution of power and income should be based on the possession of cultural capital). Some intellectuals, however, develop an ideology of radicalism ‘as a result of alienation’ — caused by the blockage of their opportunities for

---

2 This does not necessarily mean that radicalism has to be leftist radicalism. Like beauty, or charisma, radicalism is ‘in the eye of beholder’ and can be used as a label for various ideas. Radical views and actions (if understood, broadly, as opposition to the dominant ideas, values or opinions of a particular society at a particular time), as Nelson et al. (1972: 5) warn, can come from ‘either end of a spectrum of social and political ideas’.
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upward mobility, a disparity between income (and power) and their cultural capital and self-regard, their commitment to the whole of society, or obstructions to their technical interests.

Radicalism may also develop as a result of the gap between the experiences that intellectuals have and existing theories. More specifically, as Gouldner puts it, it is born out of a discontinuity between ‘the newly emerging structure of sentiments among young radicals and the older ‘languages’ of theories, a gap that has not yet been bridged by the development of a new theoretical language in which young radicals might more fully express themselves and their own conception of reality’ (1970: 7). The motivations of radical sociologists do not simply derive from encountering exclusion or marginalization. They are the expressions of the lives of those who have moral concerns about the system, those who are part of the system but want to get out of it. Those experiences are collective ones, often intrinsic to a cohort of age peers, members of the same generation, a new generation that is ‘raised in a new and yet common way, under new but common conditions, and confronting new problems in common’ (ibid.: 405). Not only do members of the younger generation develop a protective sense of generational solidarity, even if no new discourses have been formulated, but the radical activity itself, because of its self-transforming effects for the participants, activates new sentiments that will eventually lead to new theoretical developments.

Gouldner believed, moreover, that there is a strong affinity between sociology and radicalism deriving from the position that sociologists have as market researchers for the welfare state (they accept the limitations of the welfare state, but have to face its failures). So, as he puts it: ‘Even if it is the special business of such sociologists to help clean up the vomit of modern society, they are also sometimes revolted by what they see’ (Gouldner, 1970: 439).

Returning to our case study, the following analysis of the ‘space of discourses’ will encompass both theoretical and political engagements, or what Gouldner calls cognitive reasons, whereas the analysis of the ‘space of works’ will consider the institutional developments relevant to the new urban sociology, or, in Gouldner’s terms, the influence of structural factors on radicalization and de-radicalization (obstacles to upward mobility and self-interest). The field of New Urban Sociology, like any other university field, is ‘the locus of struggle to determine the conditions and the criteria of legitimate membership and legitimate hierarchy’ (Bourdieu, 1988: 11), and once those hierarchies are established they influence further developments of the field. According to Gouldner, it follows, first, that radicalism should develop among sociologists who are members of the same generation, as a result of their dissatisfaction with social conditions, as well as with the dominant theoretical explanations of those conditions, and, second, that radicalism will develop among young sociologists early on in their careers (because their channels for advancement are blocked, hence they have little to lose), and will fade away as they became more established (because more established academics involved in state-sponsored programs have more at stake, they are more likely to hold conservative opinions).

Research and politics within the New Urban Sociology

The conditions of the 1960s

Following Gouldner, one would expect that members of the same generation, who develop radical theories as a way to develop a new theoretical language that corresponds to their understanding of reality, will also be politically active trying to change that reality. Once they grow older, their theoretical and political radicalism should decline. The political and theoretical development of the new urban sociologists can be divided
into two main periods, with the dividing line falling in the mid-1980s. Characteristics of the first period were as follows: 3

- Sharp criticism of existing urban sociology and a call for reinterpretation of concepts like urban, urbanism and urbanization;
- Emphasis on relationships of production, consumption, distribution, exchange and power;
- Designation of social conflict and change as issues of special importance; concern with patterns of exclusion, patterns of inequality and the institutions that produce them; criticism of planning and planners;
- Stress on the need for interdisciplinary and comparative studies.

The second period is more difficult to summarize as the approach became much more heterogeneous. It is a period in which scholars previously involved with the NUS moved in two different directions: the first group remained ‘faithful’ to the approach developed in the previous period, and continued investigations along the same lines or brought in new questions which later became included in the body of literature associated with the NUS (such as Pahl’s [1988] work on social polarization and informal work), while representatives of the second group moved from the positions they previously held, either by abandoning urban sociology altogether and starting to work in different fields (as did Szelenyi or Musil), or by abandoning the Marxist approach and moving towards postmodernism (as, for example, in the case of Castells, 1991 or Harvey, 1992). 4 It is also a period in which most of the members of both groups ceased to be politically active and had to redefine their radicalism (as most of them still consider themselves radical). 5

The conditions of the late 1960s shaped the NUS. For instance, the social climate in France had been transformed and funds were given by the French government to research universities and independent research institutions such as the Centre de Sociologie Urbaine. These not only helped the development of numerous empirical studies, which further led to the development of a new critical approach, but also gave rise to new forms of political action related to urban issues. 6 In the USA, civil rights movements, anti-war movements and feminist movements influenced the ways that society was theorized. For Harvey Molotch, being radical helped him ‘to take a stand’, because even if he departed

---

3 I draw here both from the important texts on the development of the NUS (for example Pahl, 1970; 1975; Harvey, 1973; Castells, 1976a; 1977b) and numerous analyses of the NUS (Harloe, 1977a; 1977b; Pickvance, 1978; Szelenyi, 1978; Zukin, 1980; Lebas, 1982; 1983; Mingione, 1985; Topalov, 1989; Walton, 1993).

4 As it is impossible to cover all the authors of this period, I am using the works of Castells and Pahl as representative of the two main approaches (since they are the most commonly cited authors). However, one has to bear in mind that the work of those two authors provoked critical responses and considerable debate. In fact, much of the writing that comes under the rubric of NUS developed as a critical response to the works of those two authors, so one cannot think of either of the two main streams as monolithic (for example, Jan Lojkine, who greatly influenced the development of French urban research, shared Castells’ concern about collective consumption but came to completely opposite conclusions about the function that it has in relation to the falling rate of profit). For more detailed analyses of Marxist approaches, see Pickvance (1976) and Lebas (1983). For a comparison of the works of Castells and Lojkine, see McKeown (1987). For a comparison of Castells and Harvey, see Zukin (1980). For a study of the influence of Marxist theory within the United States, see Fainstein and Fainstein (1979).

5 Individual trajectories are not analyzed here.

6 A curious relationship between government funding and the results of that funding developed. According to Pickvance: ‘I think it was really quite paradoxical. At the same time that the French group of researchers was saying that the government is like a brick wall and that we cannot work through political parties, we’ve got to work through movements, they were carrying out funded research which was from the same government, so that was the paradox there. In Britain, too, I mentioned community development projects, and again government funding was leading to analysis and interpretations that were radically anti-government. There has been quite an interesting connection between government funding and government policy and the field’ (Pickvance, interview).
from mainstream American sociology, which he thinks he did by believing ‘in class domination in a much more mechanistic, simple way than I now do’, he would still be ‘in a supportive community’, a community forged in action. When asked to define what his radicalism was about, Molotch gave the following explanation:

You want the substance of my beliefs? I was very attracted to SDS’ participatory democracy idea. The thing that made me feel most radical was that I was an activist fighting the war, and an activist for civil liberty and in the civil rights movement. I marched, I got arrested, and that’s what marked you, rather than your ideology. Or, at least marked me in my own mind … It got physically dangerous, I got threatening phone calls. That makes you feel you are radical, if people threaten your life (Molotch, interview).

The Vietnam War also motivated scholars from Britain, for example Chris Paris and Michael Harloe, but the scope of the engagement went beyond the anti-war movement and was brought to extreme positions (which, as in the following example, may seem paradoxical or even suggestive of radical action for it’s own sake):

The Vietnam war made me, at that stage, anti-American. I saw the Vietnam War as a wicked war, colonial oppression. And I sided with the Viet Cong. I wished them well in their struggle. During my undergraduate and postgraduate days I was involved in anti-war protests. And when I was at Glasgow we occupied the Vice Chancellor’s rooms … It was believed there were secret files on students. We were desperate for a sit-in. It was a liberal, generous, progressive university. But we wanted to have a sit-in (Paris, interview).

In other cases, political radicalism was a result of a commitment to studying social inequalities, as in the case of Miller, who was ‘concerned with poor people in cities’, or Preteceille, who believed that inequalities would result in the collective action of the working class. For eastern European scholars, however, even the term radical had a different meaning. Radicalism and radical solutions were associated with the Communist regime; hence, although their activities corresponded to the notion of radicalism (understood as opposition to the dominant views, values and ideologies), they did not label themselves radical. To take a ‘centrist’ political position was, in fact, radical in the context of socialist countries. When asked if he thought that he was radical, Jiri Musil almost got offended:

No, I was never radical! I am a man of the center … I was never Communist, as many young people were. After the war, I was 18. I returned from a concentration camp. I never moved to a radical position, maybe because I saw what else it meant, these extreme positions; because all radical solutions will lead to radical disaster, so to speak. So, I believe in step by step improvement … I was involved [with the NUS] because, for us, it was one of the things which eroded the regime. We were systematically, quietly, considering what is important. Step by step eroding that regime, and this communication with the people, I mean, in the Committee, was part of an ideological erosion of the situation there … I was not alone, many people, step by step, were changing the definitions, the terms, the semantics, which we were convinced would eventually have to dismantle the regime.

Most of the radical sociologists also became members of political parties in that period — Harloe, Pickvance and Paris, for example, were actively involved in the Labour Party; Lojkine and Preteceille were members of the French Communist Party; Castells was involved with the Spanish Communist Party (according to Preteceille); and even those who were never members of political parties thought of themselves as sympathizers of the Left, for example Valladares or Lebas.

What is common in all these examples is a desire among urban scholars to change the status quo in their respective societies. For eastern Europeans change meant the fall of the communist regime; for participants from the West it meant opposition to war, oppression and poverty. What brought them together was a sense of social responsibility and a belief that change was not only possible, but was about to happen. Unlike earlier radicals, they were not satisfied with simply taking an active part in the changes, but attributed a critical
role to the intellectuals, that is, to themselves. A different kind of inspiration came from
the field itself. Prevailing social conditions had revealed some of the inadequacies of the
existing body of literature:

What lots of us felt was that in the society that existed in the late sixties and early seventies, we
wanted an approach that could really make some of these connections. For example, from 1973,
with the economic crisis, suddenly the whole question of government spending could not be left
only to economics departments; it had such widespread effects on every aspect of our society
that we felt that this has to be part of us (Pickvance, interview).

Theoretical developments
The gap between the experiences of the new generation and the language of the old
theories was about to be bridged by the development of a ‘new theoretical language’.
Manuel Castells gives the following reasons for the new theoretical developments: ‘The change
[in theoretical direction] stems in part from a general disillusionment among urban
scholars with the inability of many current and dominant theoretical approaches in urban
studies to give a satisfactory explanation for the critical events in American cities in the
last ten or fifteen years’ (Aiken and Castells, 1977: 7). Castells goes on to attack traditional
urban sociology by disputing the scientific status of its traditional concepts, such as urban
phenomena and urbanization. He calls for ‘a critical revision of the traditions of the urban
social sciences in order to detect the distorting ideological mechanism and to reread in a
new light the empirical discoveries made’ (Castells, 1977b: viii).

How did the emerging new theory (or, rather, theories) differ from the existing urban
sociology? Urban sociology in the 1960s had been dominated by functionalism and major
‘Chicago’ themes, themes of urban ecology and urban ways of life, and sharply separated
from urban economics. This situation started to change with Gans’ article on ‘Urbanism
and suburbanism as a way of life’ (1962) in which he was the first to argue that lifestyles
were not caused by the size, density and heterogeneity of urban settlements, but by
people’s social class and life-cycle characteristics. A couple of years after that study,
research by Rex and Moore on Race, community and conflict (1967) was published. Even
though the focus of the study itself was rather in line with the traditional ecological
approach (being a study of an inner-city community), new perspectives were introduced
through a view that the central process of the city as a social unit was a class struggle over
access to housing. Their work on the zone of transition, which also stressed the power of
city councils and of professional groups, established a framework for British urban
studies, which developed more in line with the Weberian argument.7

Pahl, like Castells, criticized traditional urban sociology, but the reasons for his criticism
were different: ‘Paradoxically, the fundamental error of urban sociology was to look to the
city for an understanding of the city. Rather the city should be seen as an area, an
understanding of which helps in the understanding of the overall society which creates it’
(Pahl, 1975: 234–5). His main approach can easily be contrasted to the one taken by Castells:
whereas the core of urban sociology for Castells was collective consumption, as we will see,
the core of urban sociology for Pahl was the distribution of resources in local areas.8

7 That stream of urban research is represented by the work of Ray Pahl, who had drawn attention to the role
of ‘urban managers’ and their ideologies in shaping the urban environment. In his analysis, Pahl employed
some of the central concerns and methods of Weberian sociology, such as the role of bureaucracy and the
distribution of life chances.

8 Pahl’s stand can probably be explained to a large extent by the fact that he had first-hand experience of
planning and distribution. He had spent several years working for the government on the South East
England Project (an area which included over 17 million people, 7.6 million of whom lived in London) as
a sociologist adviser to the interdisciplinary South East Joint Planning Team, which reported in A
Strategic Plan for the South East (1968–1970), the most comprehensive official publication on the
sociological aspects of regional planning in the UK at that time. He had also worked as an assessor on the
Greater London Development Plan Inquiry in his role as sociologist adviser to the Ministry of Housing
and Local Government.
I was at the time working for the government. I was a planner, in fact, for the largest panelak [high-rise] settlement outside of eastern Europe. And we were thinking that we were very, very avant-garde to be doing planning, and so for four years my personal history was that I was much more involved with planning, first with the South East of England, then with London. And I got disillusioned, and that turned me right off. It was the practice of it, not the research (Pahl, interview).

Working for the government was not necessarily incompatible with being radical. In Pahl’s view working for the government actually enabled him to be radical, by giving him a chance both to stand against business interests (to be on the side of ordinary people) and by providing him with the opportunity to be involved in the processes of planning itself.9

As a result of such engagement, Pahl, in a first edition of Whose city? (1970: 221), concluded that ‘a truly urban sociology should be concerned with the social and spatial constraints on access to scarce urban resources and facilities as dependent variables and managers or controllers of the urban system, which I take as the independent variable’. In the late 1970s, Pahl (1975; 1977) reconsidered his original thesis on managerialism, viewing urban mangers as mediators in conflicts and demands between diverse social groups. Castells (1977a; 1977b), however, argued that class relations and conflicting class interests were behind the unequal access to scarce urban resources (see also Szelenyi, 1978), and put those at the center of the analysis. Since the term urban often represents an ideological construction, its theoretical object should be redefined and stated as the production and transformation of social space. Principal components of social space (production, consumption, exchange, management and symbolic elements) are determined by the means of production and the reproduction of the labor force in any given social formation. So the predominant forces in the urban space (seen as an instance of capitalist development) are class interests and class struggle:

Space as social product is always specified by a definite relation between the different instances of social structure, the economic, the political, the ideological, and the conjuncture of social relations that result from them. Space, therefore, is always an historical conjuncture and a social form that derives its meaning from the social processes that are expressed through it (Castells, 1977b: 430).

According to Pickvance, the appeal of Castells’ approach was the result of:

a) his attempt to integrate study of the sociological, economic and political aspects of the city which had until then been fragmented and b) the fact that it was part of a broader theoretical framework which appeared to grasp how society was evolving and which identified the scope for action (by urban movements) to affect its evolution (Pickvance, 1994: 2).

His theoretical frame, according to Szelenyi (1978: 87), broadens urban class analysis as ‘we were not limited to stratificational description, to the pure measurement of inequalities; rather, we were offered theoretical tools to understand the dynamism of the inequalities’. Marxist theorizing in the urban field had been successfully developed and had been most firmly established in the countries where the social struggles of the 1960s and 1970s were most advanced, namely France and Italy, whereas the neo-Weberian model flourished in Britain.

The main point where these two approaches converged (and also intersected with the ideas of eastern European scholars) was in their rejection of the possibility of rational
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9 ‘The idea that planning must be social was really radical at that time. It was a thing done by engineers at that stage, and the idea that planning was social was radical, and I was one of the most important people at the time because of my position in developing social planning. But, of course, I got disillusioned after a very short time. But it . . . gave me a great deal of knowledge of how the system works and made me see the power of local managers. So that’s probably why I came to my perspective, because I had these five years or so of working within the government’ (Pahl, interview).
planning as the solution to urban problems, since the latter are inherently related to class conflict.

The NUS not only refuted ‘old’ approaches to urban sociology, but suddenly widened its scope. New sorts of issues were raised, such as the evolution of capitalism, the role of the state in urban and regional development, the relationship between the growth of monopoly capital, collective consumption, the rise of urban social movements and so on. The questions that urban sociologists asked were motivated and related to their political practices and interests, and sometimes even directly influenced by their political activity. Thus, the politicized side of the intellectual project of this generation of sociologists, and the practical engagements towards the realization of change, is what makes the NUS project different from the projects of other generations of sociologists, such as the Chicago School or the functionalists.

Changing political climate in the 1980s

The general social climate of the 1980s was marked by the rise of the ‘new right’. It was the era of Ronald Reagan and Margaret Thatcher in the USA and Britain, in which funding from governments declined, university budgets were cut and research grants became more difficult to obtain. One of the institutions which was closed down in Britain was the Center for Environmental Studies, the place where the Urban Change and Conflict Conference began and where many scholars of the new approach had found shelter, such as Michael Harloe, founding editor of the IJURR, or Chris Paris, Secretary of RC 21, at the beginning of the 1978–82 period.

As far as the radical sociologists themselves are concerned, the late 1970s and early 1980s were a period of a decline in terms of their political activism. Preteceille left the French Communist Party in 1977, while British sociologists distanced themselves from the Labour Party mainly because it was perceived to be increasingly right-wing oriented. Consequently, it was necessary to redefine the essence of radicalism, as they still considered themselves to be radicals (and continue to do so). If political activism was an essential part of the radical identity they had created in the earlier period, that identity had to be recreated and the notion of radicalism had to be changed for them to still identify themselves as radical. Instead of being concerned with effecting changes in society, radicalism is now equated with taking a critical distance from society, being concerned with questions of social justice, or believing that social inequalities exist and that the ‘dominant class accumulates resources’ (Preteceille, interview). Mingione defines himself as ‘intellectually critical, in favor of advanced welfare reforms and against neo-liberalism’. But perhaps Harloe’s answer is the best illustration of the change that this group went through, namely, from the position of radical intellectuals actively involved in changing society, to the position of scholars who critically approach society, but who have given up hope of making a political difference themselves:

Oh no! I’d be happy with some social democracy if only we could get it. However, I still think that capitalist development is central to urban change and that it is fundamentally inegalitarian and exploitative, my academic work still reflects this. But how that can translate into practical politics is another matter (Harloe, email correspondence).

10 For example, the discussion among French scholars on the nature of the state and state monopoly capital was to a large extent shaped by the debate in the French Communist Party.

11 ‘The leadership changed its policy entirely, by 180 degrees, moving away from all the democratic developments of Europe, and getting back to a very traditional worker tradition. I didn’t quit immediately, I tried to fight against that. It proved useless, so I quit’ (Preteceille, interview).

12 This is probably a place where biased answers were most likely to occur in the interviews, as the respondents had to create a coherent story and resolve the contradiction between political inactivity and proclaimed radicalism.
The strongest setback for the theoretical development of the New Urban Sociology came from the fact that the inferences of the new urban sociologists did not come about. As Michael Harloe said: ‘We were simply wrong’ (interview); or according to Pahl: ‘It did not happen. The burning cities, the riots, it just didn’t happen. There wasn’t any kind of pan-city awareness of common goals. And that actually ruins the neo-Marxist position in my view, because it shows that it is the workplace that is still the main source of conflicts’ (interview). Some of the key players have, as a result, developed new interests (Pahl started work on the informal economy), or changed their viewpoints significantly, like Castells in *The city and the grassroots* (1983). In this book, in order to construct a theory of social movements as part of a theory of urban change, Castells analyzed different case studies of urban movements (the Paris Commune, the Glasgow rent strike, the San Francisco Mission district and gay movements, Latin American squatter movements and Madrid citizens movements). Here he places more emphasis on actors and the class dimension loses its central importance. Although the city is still viewed as ‘social relations of collective consumption’, the meaning of urban is now seen as emerging from the conflict between social groups, class being only one of several structuring dimensions of society (others being gender and ethnicity).

*The city and the grassroots* turned out to be a highly controversial book. On the one hand it received the C. Wright Mills Award, delivered by the Society for the Study of Social Problems of the American Sociological Association. On the other hand it has been heavily criticized by European urban scholars associated with the New Urban Sociology (Pahl, 1983; Pickvance, 1985). Heavy words were exchanged on all sides, both in public and private correspondence.

Nonetheless, the line of research summarized at the beginning of this article continued to grow, covering a wide range of themes such as urbanization (Musil, 1980), third-world urbanization and the urban poor (Walton and Ragin, 1990, Walton, 1998), global cities (Sassen, 1991), cities after socialism (Andrusz *et al.*, 1996), social movements and democratization (Pickvance, 1999), the informal economy (Pahl, 1988) and social exclusion (Buck and Harloe, 1998). The questions raised were not as novel as those asked in the first period but, rather, built upon the foundation which had already been laid.

The new urban sociologists posed a coherent set of questions in the late 1960s and early 1970s, which most of them have continued to develop. If these questions do not seem as radical now as they were 20 years ago, perhaps the reason is simply that they have become commonplace and we have lost the context to even think about the time when they seemed revolutionary.

### New urban sociology — institutional development

This section is about the boundaries of this group. It provides an overview of the developments of the institutions that were created by the new urban sociologists. Representatives of the NUS did not only want to find ways to explain society and to change it, but to create opportunities for upward mobility by starting their own institutions.

The term ‘new urban sociologists’, as used in this paper, stands for those scholars who identify themselves as proponents of the New Urban Sociology. However, the research program that developed in the 1960s and early 1970s was not restricted only to sociology. Scholars who were writing under this umbrella came from diverse backgrounds: political economy, history, sociology, geography etc. Although most of them eventually became members of the newly created Research Committee on the Sociology of Urban and Regional Development, the fact that the ‘territory’ of the NUS and that of the RC 21 were closely related but not identical has to be taken into account.
Some of the scholars whose work was in line with the NUS never became members of the RC 21, like Doreen Massey, who wrote about the relationship between capital and land in Britain (1978), or Harvey Molotch, whose book (co-authored with Logan) *Urban Fortunes: the Political Economy of Place* (1987) was said to be ‘the most celebrated research synthesis to be published in the United States in several decades’ (Walton, 1993: 306). However, the two ‘territories’ did overlap to a great extent and being a member of the RC 21 in most cases also meant an intellectual commitment to the NUS. The size of the population inhabiting those territories can only be roughly estimated. Appendixes 3 and 4 list members of the Board of RC 21 and the editorial board of the *IJURR*, which have 67 names. Data for the membership of RC 21 is incomplete, covering only the first decade of RC 21’s existence. What is clear is that after the first couple of years the number of members stabilized at around 100 (see Table 1).

Table 1  Membership of the RC 21, including members of the board of IJURR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. of Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>53*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This is really the number of people who supported the creation of the RC 21 at the Varna Congress, 1970.

A proposal to form the Research Committee on the Sociology of Urban and Regional Development (RC 21) was considered at the Seventh World Congress of Sociology at Varna in 1970. The first proposal that was submitted to the International Sociological Association (ISA) was to form a Research Committee on Comprehensive Regional Development and Planning. The stimulus came from the deliberation of the working group ‘Planning in Urban and Rural Development’. As the final decision was not reached in Varna, in a letter to Professor Scheuch, who was assigned by the ISA to make a final decision about the new committee, Professor Ziolkowski (chairperson of the aforementioned working group and future first president of the RC 21) wrote:

The Committee would be concerned with the sociological inquiry about the role and function of planning in the development of regions (i.e. areas on the sub-national or super-local level) — be it geographic, economic or socio-cultural . . . The notion “comprehensive planning” means that all aspects of planning — economic, physical and social will be considered . . . Our interest lies primarily in the social dimension of regional planning and development (RC 21 Newsletter, no. 1, 1971).

The fact that there was already an established Committee on Urban and Rural Sociology within the ISA highlights the internal struggle for institutional recognition of radical urban sociologists. For example, the spatial aspects of social phenomena, which had been neglected by the existing Committee, was a unifying conception for the members of the new generation, as Edmond Preteceille testified: ‘I think it was an underlying, common statement that space is important, both in the structuring of economic and political relations and in the structuring of the way of production etc. It was

---

13 They can be described as the institutional core of the group, the most prestigious members of which would hold the positions of President or Secretary.
very important. Although, space doesn’t necessarily mean the city as in the tradition’ (interview).

The fact that the president of the old Committee, Ruth Glass, ‘was leading her Committee with an iron hand’ did not bring much hope that change from within was possible:

It was very, very difficult because Ruth Glass had a very, very strong character. She would not accept the transformation of her ‘baby’. She would leave the room and discontinue her ‘baby’, but not accept transformation. She had never liked Manuel Castells. She was very selective with her British friends. She was never very close to Pahl . . . She would prefer to shut the old venture and perhaps then join the new one (Mingione, interview).

Even if there had been some hope of reforming the old Committee it seems that the radicals were already upset enough and were not interested in such an attempt. As Szelenyi put it, in almost the same words that Gouldner did, it was a ‘power struggle among generations — a new generation of urban sociologists wanted its own shop and did not want to accept Ruth Glass’ leadership’ (email communication).

Another difference between the two groups was the emphasis on planning (hence the initial proposal for a Research Committee on Comprehensive Regional Development and Planning). This was a result of the fact that the radicals in Varna were from both western and eastern Europe. These two groups shared a desire to reintroduce space into urban sociology, a desire to open critical debate (which they thought could not be accommodated by the ISA as it was then organized), and a critical stance towards planning (though planning was a major concern among sociologists from the countries of real socialism). Since the eastern European participation in Varna was very large, the planning-oriented people formed the majority of the original Research Committee, which the westerners accepted (reluctantly) at the time:

A large part of the group were young people like my colleagues, also a number of people from eastern countries who were for us ambiguous figures, not, as Jiri Musil said yesterday, because we would be Marxist and be unhappy with them being unhappy with the official Marxists. That wasn’t the reason . . . I had the feeling that these guys were technocrats . . . all their questions and discourse were about planning. That is, in a sense, accepting an intellectual statement of position of the sociologists which is being part of a process of the state management of the city. And we were criticizing that, we were saying that urban sociology has to stand aside, outside of that, and look at the city without being committed to those planning, operational, state objectives. Particularly, there was a Polish guy called Ziolkowski, the first chair of the Committee, who was particularly technocratic (Preteceille, interview).

That ‘marriage’ did not last too long. Urban sociologists from eastern Europe, according to Mingione, ‘had more need to create an institution. Radical western sociologists, or the critical western sociologists, were a bit cautious about institutionalizing’. However, once the institution was created it was ‘invaded by the western radical or critical scholars’. As soon as the Varna conference was over, planning became secondary. In 1974, at the Grenoble meeting, a final ‘takeover’ occurred in which the ‘technocrats’ were totally marginalized and Ray Pahl and Enzo Mingione were elected as the new President and Secretary of the Committee.

The Committee was officially constituted in April 1971 (for a two-year trial period at first) under its current name, Research Committee on the Sociology of Urban and Regional Development. As has been shown, the establishment of this Committee was a result of the new theoretical and political positions taken by a number of urban sociologists who challenged the ideological and uncritical role of sociologists in modern society. If urban sociology was to continue to exist and, moreover, to produce results of any practical and/or theoretical value, they thought, it had to radically transform the field of its study. Hence, the role of RC 21 was not only to stimulate the growth of new approaches, but also to reconnect urban studies with the central problems and theories of society.
In the Statement Prepared by the Board of the Research Committee on the Sociology of Regional and Urban Development, for its meeting in Budapest on 5th and 6th April 1972, 14 members of the new committee characterized the crisis of urban sociology and at the same time proposed a strategy on how to overcome the crisis — by studying the distribution of power and other resources, the limitations on life chances, and conflicts.

Few sociologists would deny that the branch of their field known as urban sociology is in a state of crisis. Partly, no doubt, this is a reflection of a general intellectual crisis which affects the subject as a whole as well as the other social sciences. However, in our field, we feel that this crisis follows from other factors as well. Urban sociologists have been too frequently turned into handmaidsen of those practical professions concerned with making physical changes in the built environment. As a result many urban sociologists have become more concerned with the human relations of the city rather than the sociology of the city: it is as if industrial sociologists have turned themselves into personnel officers.

We believe that urban sociology cannot advance when it has abandoned the central issues which form the central focus of the subject: only by a return to these issues can we see a possibility of moving forward in an intellectually fruitful way. It is our task to study society — its distribution of power and other resources, the structured limitations on life chances and the patterns and processes of conflict inherent in the nature of society.

Radicals also believed in an active approach to sociology. Value-free sociology had to be rejected. A stand had to be taken, a stand that very much corresponded with the role of ‘organic’ intellectuals, as developed by Gramsci. In the same document they wrote about the role of the sociologists in contemporary society:

The board felt that it was right for the sociologist to be critical and to explore wherever possible whose interests are served by the planning process. However the sociologist also has an innovative role in postulating new social forms. By helping to raise the consciousness of those suffering inequalities in the socio-ecological system the sociologist himself becomes part of the distributive process. Only if a sociologist refuses to communicate can he claim to be value free (Statement Prepared by the Board of RC 21, 1972).

For the first ten years of its existence the Committee held sponsored or supported meetings in West Berlin (1972), Delhi (1973), Grenoble (1974), Toronto (World Congress of the ISA, 1974), Messina (1976), Uppsala (World Congress of the ISA, 1978), Venice (1978), Warsaw (1978), Paris (1980), New York (1980), Jablona (1980), to mention only the most important ones. The number of members grew, at first rather slowly, but then took off and in 1977 there were 106 members, two-thirds of whom came from the USA, the UK or France.

Despite the fact that American members of the Committee were in the majority, their presence was not perceived as weighty. Plans to develop the North American Action Group were made as early as 1972, but things ‘started to work out’ only after Castells visited California in 1975 and started collaboration with John Walton. The views that respondents have about the reasons for the ‘lack of Americans’ differ to a large extent. According to Miller, New Urban Sociology was ‘a European venture, that hasn’t made any real efforts to reach out of the European continent’ (interview). Harvey Molotch, on the other hand, gave a different explanation as to why he was not involved in RC 21, despite the fact that he shared most of their intellectual positions:

They never asked me. These things operate through social networks and friendships, literally, and I wasn’t a part of that. I think, in part, because I was not a Marxist. Marxism was quite dominant, that’s my presumption of that group ... I never shared a number of beliefs. I never believed in the fiscal crisis of a state, I did not believe it empirically. I didn’t believe in the new social movements, that were supposedly freeing everyone. I just did not think it was empirically correct. And I never was a Marxist in a sense of believing, I was always skeptical that capitalism

14 The Statement was signed by Mackensen (FRG), Mingione (Italy), Musil (Czechoslovakia), Pahl (UK) and Szelenyi (Hungary).
is undone by virtue of its own contradiction. These were very fundamental Marxist ideas ... I never had any antagonism. They never invited me to the party. I would have loved to have gone. I went to their meeting in Calabria, I went there and I was quite ignored, but it was a wonderful place to be, so that was just fine. I don’t think they found me interesting (Molotch, interview).

Members of RC 21, however, did not feel that they excluded Americans, they thought that the reasons were of a practical and/or theoretical nature:

The American urban sociologists did not feel so keen, particularly the older ones, to have a new urban sociology which would be radically different and polemical towards the Chicago school. And in a way they had their own debate within the States, if you like. Gans wrote a critique against the Chicago school in 1966, in the American Sociological Journal, and that was very important also for us, even if we read it later on. But Gans has never been associated with the RC ... Amalgamation with the Americans has not been so easy, in a sense that the intellectual climate in the USA was different. They began their criticism of the traditional urban sociology before, they have kept with the ASA. The dynamics of the cities and the urban context was different, particularly from that in continental Europe ... They had the problem of the inner city, they had the problem of the minorities, and they had the problem of the corporate coalition that was intervening in the cities (Mingione, interview).

The mid-1970s, for new urban sociologists, were marked by Urban Change and Conflict Conferences, organized first by the Centre for Environmental Studies in 1975, where the problematics of Manuel Castells and other urban theoreticians were introduced to British scholars. The reason behind this series of conferences was the expressed desire of British urban sociologists to learn more and adopt ‘radical urban theory’, as well as the feeling that ‘urban sociology [had become] isolated from the wider development of sociology’ (Harloe, Introduction to UCC Conference Proceedings, 1975: 1). Visitors from abroad at the first conference were Castells, Harvey, Mingione and Preteceille. A description of the conference that came up again and again during the interviews was the radicalism of its participants:

I think that the Urban Change and Conflict Conference brought together a lot of young, radical people who were radical anyway. They were basically socialist individuals who were angry about the situation in British cities. So that was one of those early discussions that were not theoretical in this country, they were really about class inequalities in cities, or housing inequalities particularly. And the thing that brought everyone together was that they were socialists to start with. They were criticizing an older generation of urbanists in this country (Pahl, interview).

The UCC Conference became an inseparable part of the NUS story, according to Pickvance, not only because of its theoretical discussions but because most of the inputs came from ‘young activist people who were quite committed to change, [who had] been funded by government to do research and act in poor communities around Britain’ (Pickvance, interview).

Although the UCC Conference was not officially organized as a conference of any single organization, it was, according to Pickvance, ‘entirely this network of people who were involved in the journal and RC 21, and who were doing research on towns’. The Conference was held biannually for almost two decades, but it seems that its ‘lifecycle’ came to an end, as ‘none volunteered to organize it’ after the 1994 meeting.

The International Journal of Urban and Regional Research represented a means to spread the ideas of the NUS to wider audiences. The author of the idea to start a journal was Manuel Castells, during the early 1970s, but the IJURR appeared only in 1977. Most of the members of the editorial board were active members (and/or ‘founding fathers’) of RC 21, but there were some additional elements of importance. According to Ray Pahl:

15 The members are listed in Appendixes 3 and 4.
Three elements [that were important for the creation of new journal]: there was a lot of new and fresh thinking about the urban that was taking place in the 1970s; we were increasingly becoming each other’s friends and the network was extended; there was a possibility American sociologists might be interested in new urban sociology (Pahl, interview).

The scope and perspectives of the journal were stated not so much as a concrete program, but rather as a critique of existing urban sociology. They stated where the emphasis would not be, and when an attempt was made to clarify where it should be, this remained rather general and abstract. Hence, the IJURR ‘would focus more on the critical analysis of ideologies of planning, trying to make the system of conflicting interests in urban and regional development transparent, to demonstrate the social and class interests behind the different forms and strategies of planning and state intervention’ (Scope and Perspectives of the IJURR, archival material). The predominant Marxist orientation was visible even from the structure of the journal; one of the sections, edited by Castells, was called Urban Praxis and was designed to bring in less theoretical (more activist) papers and debates with an emphasis on urban struggles. In 1979 this idea was abandoned and the Praxis section moved more towards ‘linking praxis with dominant issues in professional circles — emphasis on planning policies, housing reform, local government finance, management of urban crisis’ (minutes of the Editorial Board meeting, 1979).

The internationalism of the new journal was demonstrated by the fact that it was first published in English and French. Throughout this time the IJURR was becoming more and more established. Sales figures for 1980, when compared with 1979, almost doubled, and got close to 1,000 subscriptions, eventually mounting to 1,255 in 2000.

Finally, due to the economic success of the IJURR, a ‘spin-off charity’ of the journal was formed, the Foundation for Urban and Regional Studies (FURS), in August 1995. The purpose of the Foundation, according to Pahl, who held the position of Chair, is to give money ‘to people that fit with the ethos of the journal, which is to be radical, whatever that means, and to pass it to the non-developed world and more junior people. So, it’s a sort of redistributive thing’. As stated earlier, trustees of the FURS are mainly ex-members of the editorial board of the IJURR and the board of RC 21; hence, one can see how they have metamorphosed from radicals to patrons (although radicalism, defined in the manner discussed in the previous section, is still on the agenda).

This short retreat into the history of the institutions related to the NUS has shown some of the conflicts and struggles that occurred during the 1970s. RC 21 was formed in opposition to, and in competition with, the already existing Committee on Urban and Regional Sociology. Moreover, the struggle within RC 21 occurred almost as soon as it was formed as a struggle between (mostly western) radicals and (mostly eastern European) technocrats. Even if some of the Committee members were to some extent radical prior to their involvement with the ISA, blockage in mobility within the ISA was...
clearly an important factor. The case of RC 21 points to the relationship between formal organization and collective identities, that is, to the fact that membership in the formal organization reinforced collective identities. Urban scholars became members of the Committee if they considered themselves radical, but through that involvement they also created social ties with other scholars who shared their political and theoretical interests on a much broader scale than would otherwise have been possible (on the basis of informal networks only, for example).

Radicals became not only hegemonic within the RC 21, but also within the ISA, after they managed to convince Ruth Glass to ‘kill her baby’ (the old Committee) since it would have been difficult to justify the existence of two committees on urban sociology within the ISA. Members of the Committee were proselytizers whose involvement in the organization of the Urban Change and Conflict Conferences unified radical academics and radical activists. With the passage of time, institutions that were founded on a critique and negation of the existing urban sociology not only gained hegemony within the ISA, but also created a respected academic journal and a charity. The group successfully created a niche for themselves and became part of the ‘sociological establishment’, and even though they aimed to keep a redefined version of their earlier radicalism, it is questionable how radical one can be while producing the second most important journal in the whole field, or when running a charity (hence, being in a position not of someone who asks for funding, but someone who decides what to fund).

**Conclusion**

The story of the new urban sociologists is the story of members of the same generation who, dissatisfied with developments in theory within their field, developed a distinct approach to urban problems. The project that they developed combined elements of both intellectual and political projects.

In terms of theoretical and political developments, radical sociologists were members of the same generation who shared the same sentiments, had similar origins, and were involved in similar political activities. Their radicalism was, as Gouldner predicted, caused both by dissatisfaction with the social realities of society and the existing explanations of those realities. They tried to make a difference and were politically active for a while, but faced disappointing results, both in terms of futile political activism and in terms of a theory whose predictions were not fulfilled. Consequently, they gave up political engagements, reconceptualized their own identities and continued with ‘normal’ science, developing already raised questions. Moreover, since their own theories successfully replaced the ‘old enemies’ in the hegemonic position in the field, they were no longer perceived as radical. Therefore, Gouldner’s first hypothesis, which establishes a connection between political and theoretical radicalism, can be accepted.

In terms of institutional development, the NUS, which, paradoxically, started out as a critique of the professionalization of the role of sociologists, turned out to be a professionalization project in and of itself. Although the representatives of the approach did not necessarily change all of their views, the positions from which those views were presented have changed (‘young and angry’ vs. ‘wealthy patrons’), which has left them open to different interpretations. In light of the hypothesis presented at the beginning of this article it may be concluded that even though the radical sociologists tried to retain their spirit of radicalism, they also became a part of the ‘sociological establishment’.

To conclude, the story about radicals involved with New Urban Sociology shows that the radical position is difficult to sustain over a long period of time. If radical projects, or ideas, are not successful, they will lose their followers and fade away after a while, just like the political activism of urban scholars. If, however, that project is successful, then it becomes institutionalized and part of the mainstream. Regardless of whether the project
itself has been transformed or not, people’s perceptions of the project, or idea, will change as it becomes dominant.

Aleksandra Milicevic (sasham@ucla.edu), Department of Sociology, University of California at Los Angeles, Box 951551, 2201 Hershey Hall, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1551, USA.

Appendix 1 — Methodological notes

In the spring of 1996 I was accepted onto two graduate programs in sociology at UCLA and the University of Essex. Simultaneously, Professor Ray Pahl offered me a chance to work on a project involving the archives of the International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, without really going into detail about what my job would be. Already having some background in urban sociology, I liked the idea, and even though I had made a decision to go to the UCLA, proposed that I should work ‘in the archives’ during the summer of 1997. In July of 1997 I went to Essex thinking there was specific work to be done, only to learn that I had been awarded a grant from the Foundation for Urban and Regional Studies to do research on New Urban Sociology.¹ So, when I began the project I still did not know what the focus of the paper would be. At the beginning, the plan was to frame it within the paradigm succession discourse, but in a subsequent development I decided to frame the question more broadly in terms of the role of the intellectuals and the historical context in which they radicalize.

During my visit to Essex I was reading both the archival materials of the IJURR and some of the personal correspondence which was made available by Ray Pahl and Chris Pickvance (the list of the most important documents is included in Appendix 6). I also decided to conduct several semi-structured interviews with the scholars involved with the NUS. At that time I managed to conduct only four interviews (with Ray Pahl, Michael Harloe, Chris Pickvance and Nick Buck), all of them scholars from the UK.

Nonetheless, I continued working on the paper and eventually got an invitation to present it at the World Congress of Sociology, which was held in the summer of 1998 in Montreal. Although all I had was ‘work in progress’, this was an excellent opportunity to conduct more interviews (twelve), to counterbalance the British bias of the first version of the paper and to obtain some additional information from some of the previously interviewed scholars (such as Harloe and Pickvance). By the time of the Congress, I had already identified the ‘key-players’, both in the theoretical development of the NUS and in the creation and institutional development of the field (defined by their presence on either the editorial board of RC 21 or that of the IJURR),² and I tried to talk to as many of them as I possibly could during the week in Montreal. I expanded the original list during the Montreal conference, using the snowball method, to include scholars who were mentioned as a good source of information and who agreed to talk to me (for example Anthony King and John Rex), even though they were not members of RC 21. All the

¹ This lengthy introduction is needed not only in order to disclose factors that may have influenced my analysis, but also to show that a specific need for self-analysis (both from within and from outside) developed among the members of this group. The board of the Foundation for Urban and Regional Studies consists mainly of the ‘new urban sociologists’ (such as Pahl, Preteceille and Pickvance — a complete list of the trustees is provided in Appendix 5), who also supported (or initiated) some of previous critical appraisals of NUS through RC 21 or IJURR (e.g. Lebas, 1982).

² Most of the scholars whose names are usually associated with the NUS would be on these lists. However, there are some limitations, as, for example, in the case of David Harvey, who is undoubtedly an important figure and who participated in several conferences organized by RC 21 but was never on either of these two boards, or Doreen Massey, who was never even affiliated officially with RC 21.
interviews were conducted in person and tape recorded. On average, interviews lasted around one hour, the shortest one around forty minutes, and the longest one around two hours. Finally, some of the information that I lacked I was able to obtain through e-mail correspondence or on the Internet.

The first methodological problem that I faced was related to the fact that some of the events and issues that I was interested in occurred almost thirty years ago. Consequently, the answers that I got were not always as clear as I would have liked them to be. Moreover, not only were respondents giving me information on themselves retroactively (hence, being able to recreate memories and reconstruct their past in light of their current interests, opinions or knowledge), I also had to bear in mind that I was interviewing sociologists, who would probably be more aware of the possibilities and importance of reinterpretations for the creation of coherent life stories than members of any other profession. Hence, I tried to conform to and confront various testimonies by comparing the presented stories with information from other sources (archival materials, personal correspondence, published interviews).

The position of the informants (with respect to the NUS), which should also be taken into account, was already framed when I determined who the informants were going to be, hence most of them were in the core group, and when that was not the case I try to make it clear (as in the case of Miller or Molotch, for example).

Second, unfortunately I was not personally able to interview Manuel Castells, who was one of the main figures in the development of the NUS. Hence, I rely upon three other sources: interviews that he gave for the journals City (1997) and Cities (1996), and a lecture (Castells, 1985), in which he explicitly addresses the reasons for the change in his theory.

Finally, certain aspects, although important for the understanding of this topic, cannot be sufficiently covered because of the length limitations of this paper. For example: (1) all of the scholars involved in RC 21 were able to develop different kinds of institutional and professional networks of their own in their respective countries (one could even argue that this is one of the reasons why they were able to cooperate within RC 21 without too much competition); (2) the sociohistorical circumstances in their respective countries not only differed but also had different political trajectories (for example, the early 1980s brought Reagan and Thatcher in the USA and the UK, but Mitterrand in France); (3) only limited theoretical analysis of the NUS is possible in this article; (4) finally, it would be impossible to analyze the institutional positions that each representative of the NUS had, although a glance at the list of the members of the boards of RC 21 and the IJURR (Appendixes 3 and 4) reveals that certain scholars were much more present, for the extended period of time, than others.

3 I conducted sixteen interviews with fourteen people, as I talked to Pickvance and Harloe both in Essex and in Montreal. The full list of respondents is provided in Appendix 2.

4 For more detailed discussion on the narrative practice and coherence of personal life stories see, for example, Gubrium and Holstein (1997; 1998).

5 These are some of the methods that Bertaux (1998) suggested as useful when determining the degree of truth of people’s accounts of their own life experience.

6 He declined to talk to me because, as he stated in an email to Professor Szelenyi, he did ‘not want to be associated with this topic’ (he never clarified whether ‘this topic’ meant my paper or New Urban Sociology in general).
Appendix 2 — List of interviewed scholars

Buck, N., University of Essex: Member of the Board\(^1\) 1998–2002.
Harloe, M., University of Salford: Member of the Board 1974–98 (ex officio); Secretary of the Board 1978–82; Editor of the *IJURR* 1977–97.
King, A.D., Binghamton University: Participant at the Varna Congress, loosely associated with RC 21.
Lebas, E., Middlesex University: Member of the Board 1978–86.
Miller, S.M., Boston College: Member of the Editorial Board of the *IJURR* 1977–85.
Mingione, E., University of Padova: Member of the Board 1970–74, 1986–90; Secretary of the Board 1974–78; President of the Board 1982–86; Member of the Editorial Board of the *IJURR* 1977–98.
Molotch, H., University of California, Santa Barbara: Considered one of the representatives of the NUS in the USA, never became a member of the RC 21, although he participated at the conference organized by RC 21 in Messina (1976); Member of the Editorial Board of the *IJURR* from 2001.
Musil, J., Charles University, Prague: Secretary of the Board 1970–74; Vice President of the Board 1974–78, 1990–94.
Pahl, R.E., University of Essex: Member of the Board 1970–74, 1978–82; President of the Board 1974–78; Member of the Editorial Board of the *IJURR* 1977–86.
Paris, C., University of Ulster: Secretary of the Board 1978–82 (his term was really shorter, as CES was closed and he had lost institutional support).
Preteceille, E., Institut de Recherche sur les Sociétés Contemporaines, Paris: Member of the Board 1974–82, 1990–94; President of the Board 1986–90; Member of the Editorial Board of the *IJURR* 1977–98.
Rex, J., Warwick University: Never officially associated with RC 21 but considered one of the predecessors of the NUS in Britain.
Valladares L., Instituto Universitario de Pesquisas do Rio de Janeiro: Member of the Board 1986–90, 1998–2002; Vice President of the Board 1990–94.

\(^1\) The ‘Board’ here refers to the Board of the Research Committee on the Sociology of Urban and Regional Development of the International Sociological Association (RC 21).
Appendix 3 — The Board of the Research Committee on the Sociology of Urban and Regional Development of the International Sociological Association (RC 21)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>President</th>
<th>Secretary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970–74</td>
<td>Ziolkowski, J.A</td>
<td>Musil, J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974–78</td>
<td>Pahl, R.</td>
<td>Mingione, E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978–82</td>
<td>Castells, M.</td>
<td>Paris, C./Harloe, M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982–86</td>
<td>Mingione, E.</td>
<td>Yago, G.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986–90</td>
<td>Pretceille, E.</td>
<td>Pickvance, C.G.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990–94</td>
<td>Pickvance, C.G.</td>
<td>Garcia, S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994–98</td>
<td>Logan, J.R.</td>
<td>Vicari, S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other members of the Board 1970–74:

**Vice Presidents**  | **Members**
--- | ---
Jenkins, T.H. | Kukawka, P.
Morsink, H. | Mingione, E.
Mackensen, R. | Nelson, J.
Pahl, R. | Szelemyi, I.

Other members of the Board 1974–78:

**Vice Presidents**  | **Members**  | **Co-opted Members**
--- | --- | ---
Castells, M. | Harloe, M. | Pickvance, C.G.
Musil, J. | Kukawka, P. | Pretceille, E.
Jenkins, T.H. | Szelemyi, I. | Yanitski, O.

Other members of the Board 1978–82:

**Vice Presidents**  | **Members**  | **Co-opted Members**  | **Ex Officio Members**
--- | --- | --- | ---
Mlinar, Z. | Aiken, M. | Lapple, D. | Pahl, R.
Walton, J. | Davidjuk, G. | Lebus, E. | Harloe, M.
Lojkine, J. | Lopes, J. | Mirowski, W. | Pretceille, E.
Sandercock, L. | Schteingart, M. | Pretceille, E. | Harloe, M.
Other members of the Board 1982–86:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vice Presidents</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Ex Officio Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mlinar, Z.</td>
<td>Aiken, M.</td>
<td>Castells, M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walton, J.</td>
<td>Cass, B.</td>
<td>Harloe, M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Godard, F.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lapple, D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kowarick, L.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lebas, E.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mirowski, W.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nunez, O.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rev, I.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zaslavskaya, T.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other members of the Board 1986–90:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vice Presidents</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Ex Officio Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kilmartin, L.</td>
<td>Fainstein, S.</td>
<td>Mingione, E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shkaratan, O.</td>
<td>Henderson, J.</td>
<td>Harloe, M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valladares, L.</td>
<td>Kowarick, L.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walton, J.</td>
<td>Leal, J.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lorrain, D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Panjwani, N.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rev, I.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schteingart, M.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seferagic, D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tonboe, J.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lungo, M.U.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other members of the Board 1990–94:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vice Presidents</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Ex Officio Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fainstein, S.</td>
<td>Berry, M.</td>
<td>Preteceille, E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leal, J.</td>
<td>Haüsserman, H.</td>
<td>Harloe, M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musil, J.</td>
<td>Haila, A.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valladares, L.</td>
<td>Jacobi, P.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jaramilo, S.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kos, D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lorrain, D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lungo, M.U.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tonboe, J.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other members of the Board 1994–98:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vice Presidents</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Ex Officio Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Garcia, S.</td>
<td>Fainstein, N.</td>
<td>Pickvance, C.G.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haila, A.</td>
<td>Gohn, M. da G.</td>
<td>Harloe, M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haüsserman, H.</td>
<td>Kos, D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lungo, M.U.</td>
<td>Le Gallés, P.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Machimura, T.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mullins, P.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sik, E.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tonboe, J.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4 — Members of the Editorial Board of the *IJURR*

*Editors of IJURR:*
Michael Harloe (1977–97)
Patrick Le Galès (1997–present)

*Original members:*
Castells, Manuel (until 1986)
Harloe, Michael (until 1997)
Miller, S.M. (until 1985)
Mingione, Enzo (until 1998)
Pahl, Ray (until 1985)
Pickvance, Chris (until 1997)
Piven, Frances Fox (until 1985)
Preteceille, Edmond (until 1998)

*Other members:*
Fainstein, Susan S.
Garcia, Soledad
Graham, Stephen
Harding, Alan
Machimura, Takashi
Mayer, Margit
McDowell, Linda
de Melo, Marcus
Molotch, Harvey
Rees, Gareth (until 1994)
Shkaratan, Ovsey (until 2000)
Szelenyi, Ivan (until 1993)
Walton, John (until 2001)
Appendix 5 — FURS Trustees

Initial Trustees of the Foundation for Urban and Regional Studies

Professor Ray Pahl (Chair)
Dr Linda McDowell (Treasurer)
Professor David Hall
Dr Margit Mayer
Dr Edmond Preteceille

Trustees of the Foundation for Urban and Regional Studies, September 2001

Professor Chris Pickvance (Chairman)
Professor Roger Zetter (Treasurer)
Professor Nick H. Buck
Professor Christian Kesteloot
Professor Linda McDowell
Professor Ray E. Pahl
Appendix 6 — Selected archival materials

Application for a Grant to Improve Comparative Research in Urban Sociology, from Castells to the ISA (not dated, but between 1978 and 1982).

Grant Application for Research Committee Newsletter Development, from Yago to the ISA.

Letter to the Board Members of RC 21, 26 October 1983, from Enzo Mingione, President of RC 21.

Letter to the Board Members of RC 21, 10 July 1984, from Enzo Mingione, President of RC 21.

Letter to Michael Harloe, 30 April 1984, from Manuel Castells.

List of Americans to be invited to the ISA conference (‘ranking by priority of their future usefulness in expanding network’), not dated.

Memorandum of Agreement between RC 21 and Edward Arnold (publisher), 4 May 1976.

Memorandum of Agreement between Editorial Board and Edward Arnold, 3 January 1978.


Notables Survey, 1997, American, French and German reports.


Pahl R.E., Personal Experience and Publications (not dated, but seems to be the early 1970s).


Draft Scopes and Perspectives of the *IJURR*, by Pahl and Szelenyi, 24 June 1975.

Statement Prepared by the Board of the Research Committee on the Sociology of Regional and Urban Development at its Meeting in Budapest, 5–6 April 1972.

Statutes of the Research Committee on the Sociology of Urban and Regional Development of the ISA, first draft, dated 8 October 1993.

---

1 In addition to the listed materials, there are several files with financial reports, administrative, personal and professional correspondence. However, only the letters mentioned in the article are listed here.
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