



Summer 2002  
Vol. 14. No. 3.

Contents  
& Gould  
Memorial

---

# Comparative & Historical Sociology

The newsletter of the Comparative and Historical Sociology Section  
of the American Sociological Association.

---

**Remembering and Honoring  
Roger V. Gould** - A memorial for  
our departed colleague.

**Other Contributions** - With  
essays by Keri Iyall Smith & Judith  
R. Blau, and Sam Winter.

## Note from the Newsletter Editor

This is the last issue that I will be editing. I looked at the six issues of the past two years ( volumes 13 &14 ) as posted on the web and realized that it has been much more of a learning experience than I had anticipated. Having been the editor of a newsletter on rural development for a number of years I thought this work would be relatively easy. I was mistaken! I wish to thank all of those who have contributed in various ways, especially: Edwin Amenta, Levon Chorbajian, Mathieu Deflem, Francois Depelteau, J. Heidi Gralinski-Bakker, Brian Gran, James Hollander, Anne Kane, Andrew McLean, Ewa Morawska, Aldon Morris, Michele Lamont, Bob Marsh, Bob Prus, Charles Ragin, William Roy, Ilana Friederich Silber, Neil Smelser, Peggy Somers, Ann Swidler, Behrooz Tamdgidi, Stephen Turner, Andrew Walder, and Emily Wilson. I wish to apologize for the various mistakes that I made, large and small. They were purely unintentional. Sometimes the typographical errors resulted from an effort to hurry things along at busy times in the teaching semester. Sometimes I did not copy edit the contributions carefully enough. Hopefully the new editors can make the newsletter even better.

--J. I. (Hans) Bakker

---

## Remembering and Honoring Roger V. Gould



Roger V. Gould died on April 29, 2002, at the age of 39. With his death, sociology lost one of our profession's most accomplished and honored scholars of collective action, social movements, and political, historical and comparative sociology. Many of us also lost a good friend, colleague, mentor and inspiration, though Roger will continue to inspire us for many decades to come. In memory and honor of Roger, the Comparative & Historical Sociology section invited people throughout ASA to contribute memorial messages, remembrances and thoughts about Roger to share with others in this special section of our summer newsletter. The editors also requested that Peter Bearman allow us to print the eulogy he gave at the memorial service for Roger. The text of the eulogy follows as it was delivered.

---

### ***Eulogy for Roger V. Gould*** **Peter Bearman, Columbia University**

To try to say something meaningful in the absence of meaning is an awesome task, and a responsibility I am not sure that I am capable of executing with any grace. If I have any legitimacy here, it comes from knowing Roger a long time --since he was a skinny kid enrolled in a junior tutorial I taught at Harvard. He was very earnest and serious and responsible even then.

Even then, he dressed better than I did. He was also cooler. In 1984, the same year my parents gave me a Chevrolet Cavalier, Roger got a sporty green Triumph spitfire XXXp17, the fastest sport car in human history. The fact that this car never actually worked wasn't exactly the point. It was a cool car, even if all you could do in it was park. And Roger was very serious about that car. For a serious guy, he had a great appreciation for the absurdity of life, and that was a great gift.

Now Roger was a very good sociologist. I want to say a great sociologist, but for rhetorical purposes I have to reserve the word "great" for just a

"great guy," as it would be awkward to say he was a great sociologist but a greater guy, when I can more easily say: he was a very good sociologist, of course, but more importantly, a great guy. So you will forgive me. Later I will correct this error. He was also my best friend.

In conversation, not everyone can talk at the same time, except, to borrow David Gibson's joke, in Italy. And here as well, not everyone for whom Roger was their best friend will be speaking. Roger worked on status and one of the determinants of status is asymmetry in nominations. And it is not trivial to note that many of us lost our best friend, but as Roger would have been sure to point out, mathematically speaking, we could not actually all have been his best friend.

But it was one of his special gifts that when we were with him, we felt as if we were. So here I have also the responsibility of speaking for the other best friends in sociology, who could not speak today, because they could not be here, or because I occupied the vacancy, by virtue of proximity. I will come back to the discipline a little bit later.

Roger was a great theorist. As I was thinking about what to say today, I tried to approach the problem theoretically, in the way Roger might have. But the reality is, we can only be who we are, and so the empiricist in me took over. I decided to collect some data by reading speeches read at other memorial services. I won't say that I took a representative sample, but I poked around a bit. I noticed that a lot of eulogies contain the sentence:

The sad truth is that death comes too soon to every man and woman.

Suddenly I was involved in a conversation with Roger.

Peter: Hey, Roger, I discovered a weird fact. Most memorials contain the sentence "The sad truth is that death comes too soon to every man and woman."

Roger: That's not weird. It could be that this sentence appears because it is a truth. Or alternatively, it appeared once, and was subsequently copied because it appeared to be a truth.

Peter: I think it is probably the truth.

Roger: Maybe the first time it was said there was only the word "truth" and that over time the word "sad" was added.

Peter: That's possible.

Roger: So, sad should disappear and be replaced with harder adjectives --"horrible", "unique", "incommensurate". That would be the real test. Did you get dated observations?

Peter: No, I could have gotten dates, I just didn't bother to.

Anyway, I think it is the sad truth.

Roger: Maybe, but you have no evidence.

And then, as always with Roger, we would go off to the races; the next sentence would as likely be:

Have you thought about the fact that the peanut was invented in Georgia but is a staple of Thai food?

As

What has gone wrong with a discipline where people can actually publish books like: "Growing up Jewish in a small farm community outside Des Moines, Iowa: Six lives in turbulent times."

Some people have no tolerance for small talk, and that was true of Roger, if small-talk is just that kind of talk that one has that is divorced from thinking. But Roger would talk about anything because he thought about everything. Because at heart he was a theorist, though he pretended to be an empiricist, he would attack any problem with whatever facts seemed handy --even if he just made them up on the spot as the product of some weird thought experiment. So we would talk intensely about anything, and I am sure this was also the case for everyone who knew and worked with him.

And I will miss that intensely.

I have only a few more comments to make. Roger would come up with a great idea. Most of us would be happy enough. But not Roger.

He would have to generate five arguments against his idea and then five arguments against those arguments. Roger always got it exactly right in his work. He was the most promising sociologist of my generation and his generation. His loss is absolutely devastating for the discipline.

This is not because work that might have been done will now not be done. Roger would have agreed with me that it will get done, some day. He would have also agreed that when it got done, it wouldn't be as good. But that is not exactly as important as the fact that his was the strongest voice in the discipline --in our generation-- for discipline in thought, commitment to sociology as a scientific project, and seriousness of intent.

Roger didn't play with sociology. He took it seriously. Roger was always earnest and serious about his work and about our work and the sociologists assembled today are here in sadness and grief, for Roger, our best friend and a great guy, and Roger Gould, a truly remarkable sociologist.

We will miss him.

Sociology has always had a prescriptive moment. The idea is to

understand the world to make it a better place. We have a lot of work to do and Roger would want us to get on with it. So we will, but we will miss him.

A lot.

---

***In Memory of Roger Gould***  
**Bill Axinn, University of Michigan**

Roger and I became close friends as starting Assistant Professors at the University of Chicago. Our common circumstances, the intimidation of our surroundings, and our fears of failure brought us together. We were both trying to learn what it meant to be a Professor of Sociology. I will forever cherish those years we had together, and the things Roger taught me during that time, and for the rest of my life I will endeavor to live up to the standards that Roger set - something I know I will never actually accomplish.

After I left Chicago, Roger and I only saw each other occasionally, but remained close whenever we were together. Then Roger got sick. I knew I needed to be with him - more for me than for Roger. I never thought he would die. I still don't really believe he died. I still imagine I will find him at ASA, we will have dinner together every night we are both there, and it will be the happiest part of Sociology for me. When I learned Roger had died I began to feel a loss I can barely describe. I feel lost in a professional wilderness without my guide, and without my friend. I continue to feel lost, but I am beginning to take some solace in the fact I was fortunate enough to know Roger, to spend time with Roger, to learn from Roger, and to grow close to Roger. The time we did have together is one of my greatest treasures. So, although I am still angry, sad, and deeply grieved at the loss of my friend, I would like to take this opportunity to be thankful for the time I was able to share with Roger.

---

***On Roger Gould***  
**Andrew Abbott, University of Chicago**

Roger Gould was my colleague for nine years at the University of Chicago. And yet there is much about him I never knew. His mind I knew well; but the rest of him was carefully guarded and I do not presume to speak of it. Roger's most striking quality as an intellectual was his relentless abstraction. His first instinct - in conversations social or professional, personal or abstract - was to challenge any general statement. He thought nothing of subjecting conventional truisms and conversational platitudes to serious analysis. "People usually find reasons to account for their behavior," you might say, or "Absolute power corrupts." And Roger would take you up - "Do you really think so? What's really the evidence for that?" And he would launch into an argument, always coherent but often just slightly absurd, which would put you off your balance by pulling the supports of convention out from under you. He did this sometimes in seriousness, sometimes very much in fun, and sometimes a little

maliciously. Usually, it was a mix of all three.

Roger was not given to piffle, to small-talk, to badinage. He always went straight at an argument - formally, theoretically, rigorously - like a winning football coach with a strong faith in his "system." He seemed uncomfortable with the kind of reflective reverie that some others find so productive of insight. Perhaps there were funds of these things - badinage and reverie and small-talk and reflection - that he spent on others. To me he never showed.

What else of Roger as an intellect? Smart, first and foremost. A man of forceful and formidable mind, of wide reading and profound education. A man of careful intellectual habits, courteous to arguments with which he disagreed, although occasionally exasperated by people who seemed to him deliberately to miss the point. Did you have a theory? Roger would argue it. Did you have an idea? Roger would worry it around with you, like a cat playing obsessively with a ball of yarn. Did you have a disagreement with him? Roger would fight it out with you - carefully, thoughtfully, graciously. Almost too graciously, for despite his ambitions he never seemed to abandon himself to the overt passion of intellectual life. But the good side of this was that he never descended to rage nor ever lost his dignity.

We know from the obvious evidence of Roger's conversation that he was a man who lived his theories. He lacked small talk because he lived his sociology. And when he died, he was working on a brilliant book demonstrating that conflict arises in social relationships where rank or dominance is unclear. I think that this question of rank was probably where the passion of Roger's intellectual life was bottled up, producing the peculiar mixture of penetrating insight with sudden reticence, of rigorous argument with quiet sarcasm, that was his conversation and, in the last analysis, his writing. The sociological world seemed to him dominated by soft minds and facile ideas. There was indeed confusion of rank. And Roger - with his crystal clear insights and his great ambitions - suffered that confusion in a personal way every time he heard a bad argument in an eminent place or watched the triumph of silliness in sociology's corridors of power. He had not the equanimity nor quite the arrogance to set such things aside.

Roger Gould was a remarkable man. It is perhaps his greatest credit as an intellectual that we cannot say what he would have done. Only that it would have been astonishing. And that we shall be the less because he is not here to do it.

---

### **Ron Suny, University of Chicago**

Roger Gould was my colleague at the University of Chicago and someone who immediately impressed as a serious and original intellectual, that is, someone driven by ideas and their consequences. Most vividly I remember his lecture to the opening session of a workshop on organizations in which he managed in about forty minutes to cover the literature on groups and conflict with complete authority and conviction. I have shamelessly borrowed from this lecture for my own lectures and truly regret that, first,

Chicago lost him and now we have all lost him. When I heard of his death, I biked over to the bookstore and ordered his book on the Paris Commune. I had always meant to read it. Now I have.

---

### **Doug McAdam, Stanford University**

Aside from all the insights, inspiration, and yes, even pleasure, I derived from Roger's work, I have very special personal memories as well. When Roger's mentor, Harrison White, came to Arizona from Harvard, Roger came with him, but he stayed on after Harrison went to Columbia. Roger brought his interest in networks with him, but I'd like to think that at least some of his concern with collective action came from his time in Arizona. I remember LOTS of stimulating --and characteristically serious-- conversations with him during those years.....so much so they all blur together. In contrast, my last extended conversation with him stands out in clear relief. It took place just last summer on the shores of Loch Lomond where he and I were attending a conference on "Network Perspectives on Collective Action." He had written an inspired paper for the conference comparing structural/network and rational choice perspectives on the origins of collective action. It was, in my view, far and away the best contribution to the conference. And yet, in characteristic fashion, he wanted to talk more about the underlying ideas and how he might formalize the model implied in the paper. This all started as a short conversation on the way to our rooms at the close of dinner. It ended some two hours later, near midnight, when I finally begged off due to the cold and lateness of the hour. Finally alone, I remember thinking that Roger was the exemplar of what academics should be: scary smart, but more important, driven by fundamental issues, serious, open, searching. Indeed, we are definitely the poorer for his passing, but the richer for the model he affords.

---

### **James Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschemeyer, Brown University**

Who else other than Roger Gould could have received genuine admiration from all sides in the debate over rational choice theory in historical sociology (ranging from Edgar Kiser to Jack Goldstone to Margaret Somers)? This was likely possible because, like Max Weber himself, Roger's scholarship brought together a remarkable combination of traits that are often in tension with one another: a deep appreciation for both theoretical generalization and historical specificity, an acute ability to speak to both micro foundations and macro phenomena, and a richly analytic mind that was capable of both daring imagination and scientific rigor. Roger's ability to straddle different sides and see the merits of seemingly opposed stances reflected a deeper scholarly fairness and an open-mindedness that is only rarely found in our field.

On several occasions over the last couple years, we discussed among ourselves in a slightly envious fashion Roger's fabulously vivid yet thoroughly analytic writing style. One example from the volume on rational choice theory and historical sociology just for illustration: "This

introduction, you will have noticed, takes advantage of the recursive nature of the structure I am describing: the present paragraph is a metadiscussion of metatheoretical debates, and the present sentence is a level beyond that. But let us not get carried away . . . ." Roger could communicate clearly on the most complicated matters, and do so in a way that made readers feel as if they were chatting with him over coffee. Of course, there was another reason for the slightly envious part of our reaction: we strongly suspected (though we were never positive) that Roger was able to crank out these gems of prose with very little effort.

Less than a week before he died, Roger sent us the final corrected page proofs for an edited volume chapter on "Uses of Network Tools in Comparative-Historical Research." We were shocked to learn of his death and stunned to think that he had continued to work so late into the illness. It still brings us great sadness to realize that Roger will never see the final product in print, and that we will never have the opportunity to thank him for it. Indeed, it is a tragedy for the discipline as a whole that Roger will not be around to forward the agenda and participate in the debate that his writings will surely stimulate in the years to come. Yet we are grateful for that which Roger has left behind, including not only the many elegant printed words and ideas but also the memories of a colleague and friend so deeply committed to scholarship and human understanding.

---

**Chuck Tilly, Columbia University**

Roger Gould knew what he was doing, and did it with finesse. He pursued his work with sassy seriousness, aware that he was setting standards that others would admire but not always be able to emulate. Reading the manuscript of Roger's forthcoming *Collision of Wills*, for example, brings home how much we have lost with his departure. In plain, well-crafted prose the book lays out an original, persuasive account of social processes that generate small-scale lethal conflicts. It accomplishes much more than that, presenting a forceful view of good and bad social science, offering a serious challenge to the (widely prevalent) attribution of uniform propensities to collectivities, and fashioning a remarkable theory of group differences in past-, present-, and future-orientation. It was just like Roger to leave such a monument: inscribed on one side with reports of his crisp, vigorous analysis of well ordered evidence, on the other with strongly stated precepts for the conduct of social inquiry. We will keep listening for his voice.

---



## **Abigail C. Saguy, UCLA**

I fell in love with Roger Gould's book *Insurgent Identities* long before meeting Roger and was thus extremely pleased and a bit intimidated to meet him in person a few years later. A few things about Roger struck me during the first dinner we shared at the Yale faculty club with a few other colleagues. First, he seemed so young for such an accomplished scholar! Second, as thought-provoking and incisive as Roger Gould was in his written work, in person his energy and intellectual curiosity was contagious. The few lunches, coffees, and strolls we shared over two years in New Haven and New York were both intellectually challenging and personally warm. Roger's humility and kindness was striking. One incident stands out in my mind. During lunch at a sidewalk café on a hot day in New Haven, a homeless man asked Roger for money to buy a glass of lemonade. Rather than ignoring the man, as most people would have done, Roger got up and walked inside the restaurant to buy a drink.

The last time I saw Roger, we met at a Starbucks on the upper west side of Manhattan. I didn't immediately recognize Roger without his thick dark hair, although I should have expected him to be bald, knowing he was undergoing chemotherapy. Roger calmly explained that his strand of leukemia was rare in people his age and rare in general, and how little we know about the disease. He told me that the success rates for chemotherapy were quite good and that he was hopeful. He spoke without anger or bitterness about his illness and with love and appreciation for his wife Erin who first told him he needed to see a doctor. We also spoke about the physical aspects of pregnancy (I was ten days away from giving birth) and leukemia.

I remember feeling so inspired and energized by Roger that day, as on every other day I had the fortune to interact with him. We planned on getting together again in January, after the current round of "chemo" and after the birth of my baby. As it turned out, it took me a little longer – a little too long – to get back in touch. I never got a response to the email I sent but learned the following day that Roger had died. Although not in Roger Gould's inner-circle, I feel a terrible sense of loss, sadness, and disbelief when I think of his death. I would like to send my deepest, most heartfelt condolences to Roger's wife, close family and friends whose agony over their great loss must be intolerable.

---

## **Richard Lachmann, SUNY Albany**

Roger entered the graduate program at Harvard just as I was finishing, but our shared interests kept us in occasional touch in the years since. In every encounter, personal and written, with Roger I was impressed with his enthusiasm for ideas, both his and those of others. He was a true intellectual, who enjoyed and deservedly took pride in his capacity to reach new understandings of how humans come to achieve the degrees of trust or obligation in one another that allow them to take action. Roger made a further contribution to sociology as a critic and editor. His comments on my work always were insightful and pushed me to refine and deepen my analyses, and I know that others gained from his guidance

as editor of AJS and in less official interactions. Roger had a gift for finding the pearl (often deeply hidden) in the work of others. In so doing, he encouraged us to persevere in our work. His example and the memory of his friendship will continue to inspire and guide me.

---

### **Ivan Szelenyi, Yale**

I first met Roger in 1999, at the ASA Annual convention in Chicago. We knew each other only for thirty short months, but it was thirty intensive months which offered me a good chance to learn a lot about Roger and learn to like him.

I read his work well before we met in person and I admired it for the combination of uncompromising standards and rigor with the broad theoretical. He was therefore the first scholar Yale offered a senior position to after I became the chair of the sociology department starting during the fall of 1999 with the charge to rebuild it and he was the first to accept our offer. In 1999-2000 Roger was the "hottest item on the market" arguably the most desirable person to appoint or retain. Being in such a position is quite a test of character. And Roger came through beautifully. He negotiated with four leading universities about academic positions and he acted with exceptional honor and unusual modesty. I always knew where we stood with each other, and I am sure the institutions which competed with us were in the same situation. He was low key, a realist on the pessimistic side. His modesty was not fake either, he did not pretend to be modest, just to be praised by others. He was truly a man of understatements, more "British" than "American" in this sense.

During the year we overlapped at Yale, in 2000-2001, we spent a lot of time together and finally we had an opportunity to interact with each other in intellectual matters as well. He was absolutely wonderful at our weekly colloquia series and at the dinner table, which followed the colloquia every Thursday. He was gentle, but at the same time intellectually merciless in his critical comments of colloquia presentations and sparkling at dinner conversations. In no time he emerged as a major inspiration for our graduate students and was on his way to become a major trainer at Yale. The style of our scholarly work was as different as it gets, nevertheless when it came to judge the quality of work by others – be they students or colleagues - we rarely disagreed.

During our 30 months of acquaintance he broke his word once. When I met him the fall of 2001 for the first time after he fell ill he reassured me: "Do not worry, I am not about to check out and let you alone with rebuilding the department." Well, he checked out within six months and let us alone. That was not nice Roger. We needed you.

---

### **Jack Goldstone, UC Davis**

Unfortunately, I really knew Roger only professionally; I don't think our meetings exceeded three or four occasions, most for a couple of hours or

less. However, I had the highest admiration for his work. All I can say is that sociology has lost a brilliant, innovative, and unique scholar -- a tragic loss for all of us who learned so much from his work.

---

### **Theda Skocpol, Harvard**

I served on Roger's thesis committee while he was at Harvard, and remember the joy of many conversations with him. He dived into difficult historical archives, immersed himself in rich details, and came up with elegant, rigorous analyses. Roger leaves vivid impressions behind, and enough brilliant work to inspire many others.

---

### **John R. Hall, UC Davis**

I remember Roger for his brilliance, and his dogged and stoic struggle against postmodern relativism as a threat to objective social science! We have lost a great practitioner of our craft, and an energetic participant in our discussions.

---

### **Paulette Lloyd, UCLA doctoral student**

I met Professor Gould when I was part of a student group funded by the department to invite scholars whose work was of interest to give a department talk and meet with graduate students. I first encountered Professor Gould's work as part of the reading for a graduate class in social network methodology at UCLA. It both inspired me to combine political sociology and social network analysis in my dissertation work, and to suggest him as a department speaker. He accepted our invitation and was gracious and open with the graduate students. We had hopes of making him a part of the UCLA faculty. I was stunned and saddened by the news of his death. I admired him a great deal and had hopes of sharing my work with him. I think we have lost a great scholar, not only for his research but also for his accessibility and support of graduate students and colleagues.

---

### **Anne Kane, University of Texas**

When I learned last summer that Roger had leukemia I didn't want to believe it because I had lost my sister to it two years earlier. In fact, I blocked it out. I wish I had been braver and contacted Roger, who had always been gracious and generous to me. I was devastated when I learned he died, and heartbroken for his family and close friends. His work has always and will remain a model and inspiration for me. As with my sister, the only solace I find is that as a person and scholar Roger touched so many lives in such a positive way and in that he lived a fine and rich life.

---

## **Jaesok Son, University of Chicago**

Because Prof. Gould left the University of Chicago when I entered the Ph. D. program there, I did not get a chance to know him personally. Nevertheless, his book *Insurgent Identities* led me to the field of collective action and social movement, and inspired me how to approach to these issues. A very great loss to sociology and to this field.

---

## **Gabriel Acevedo, Yale doctoral student**

When rumors surfaced of Professor Gould's possible arrival at Yale, many of us interested in the study of collective action were elated. Once assured that he would be joining our faculty, I made it a point to speak with him at a Yale gathering in Chicago. My first impression was simply that this guy really knew how to dress. When he walked in the room, I recall thinking to myself, "this guy really is a star." If he were a baseball player he would be like a Babe Ruth --one of those rare individuals who matches the highest level of proficiency and talent in their given field with an unadulterated sense of style and grace.

But as we all know, Roger Gould was not a baseball player and in our only conversation about Chicago's finest summer pastime, he immediately laid out a fascinating theory about baseball as a cultural representation of social life that amazed me.

I am privileged to have attended Professor Gould's last graduate student seminar before he left us. It would be an exaggeration to say that I got to know him very well during the semester because he was, or at least it seemed so to me, a guarded man who seemed to carefully think through every aspect of his life --and this, I am quite sure, included the choosing of close friends. He was, however, an extremely social and hospitable man who rarely passed up an opportunity to acquaint himself with students and to take time out of his busy life to attend our inconsequential little gatherings at local bars, pizzerias, and in our homes. I recall fondly how Professor Gould and his wonderful wife Erin had all of us to their new home in New Haven as an end of the year get together. It was a splendid evening full of good cheer, hospitality, and of course, Professor Gould's perceptive theorizing on issues great and small.

Early in the semester of his last Social Movements course, I realized quickly what it was about him that set him apart as a social scientist. On the one hand, he had a complex and penetrating mind that worked like the mind of a mathematician or a physicist but that only served to highlight the tension between this side of him and the part of him that Peter Bearman so eloquently alluded to at Professor Gould's funeral: that is, in the final analysis, Roger Gould was a theorist. It seems to me that this part of him will stand out as the great part of his legacy, and that his work on violent interactions --particularly in light of current world tensions and hostilities-- will stand as a sociological landmark.

Professor Gould took social action seriously and had an amazing ability to

break social facts down into their most basic elements. He then slowly built all of the components back up into a sort of mosaic of social interaction. Furthermore, he was not judgmental. Although he clearly had personal political commitments, in the classroom he was an objective social scientist who felt it important to assign concrete categories to particular situations without falling into the trap of "politicizing" those categories. I recall how once, during a discussion on the tactics employed by so-called "radical" social movements, he wanted the class to grasp the concept of "terrorism" from an analytical perspective and not as a term to be used solely within the context of politically charged situations. One aim of theory building, he insisted, was to develop a conceptual scheme that is-- at least for the purposes of social science --free of political bias, thus enabling the concept to shed light on many instances of empirical phenomena. This was not only a social scientist at his peak, but also an artist at work.

Finally, Professor Gould could be both critical of sociology done in a careless manner and a passionate admirer of high quality work. In this, he was able to overcome a problematic trend in our field that I liken to a form of methodological trench warfare. For Professor Gould, it did not matter if it was ethnographic, anthropological, cultural, or quantitative, as long as it was work that was rigorous, creative, and done with the aim of increasing our knowledge of the social world. He could appreciate both quantitative and qualitative approaches, and dissect either with precision. He analyzed formal mathematical models with his own brand of logical reasoning and also developed complex network theories that were not only precise but that also spoke to empirical reality. He was able to show in his work that networks are not just a series of symbols on a page but rather empirical phenomena that occur in real world settings, like union halls, pubs, and town halls. His genius was in carefully modelling complex social phenomena, but always at the level of real lives as they are lived by real people.

I never got to know Professor Gould personally, but I do know that he was a man with a brilliant mind. He was a humanist at heart. He was also a gifted teacher whose love of sociology was only matched, and possibly may have been a logical reflection of, his love of all living things. I am sure his legacy will live on as part of the discipline he so cherished and that the influence of his work will continue to inspire us all.

---

### **Sidney Tarrow, Cornell University**

I remember Roger as someone who gave a good name to place-based historical knowledge among the methodologically sophisticated and a good name to methodology among area specialists. He will be missed both in historically-based sociology and in sociologically-oriented political science and history.

---

*Roger Gould is survived by his wife, Erin Graves Gould and a brother, Anthony.*

Contributions in memory of Roger Gould can be made to the **Roger Gould Memorial Fund**. Checks can be sent to Peter Bearman, Professor and Chair, Department of Sociology, SIPA Building 814, Mailcode 3355, 420 W. 118th ST., New York, NY 1007. Donations in his memory and honor can also be made to the Leukemia and Lymphoma Society.

---

**Note:** Our website had earlier posted the following [Memorial](#) prepared by Peter Bearman, which has also appeared in [Footnotes](#).



Go to [Part II](#) of the newsletter.

