whose rural and/or tribal roots create special problems for them as a result of urbanisation.

The authors are predominantly psychologists of some kind, but the others have been selected from a suspiciously wide range of disciplines including history, comparative literature, education, sociology, anthropology and mathematics! One is a journalist. Most have a special interest in cross-cultural research relating to women. The chapters are generally well-written and contain useful information for anyone wishing to review data on women in a range of societies quickly and conveniently. However, there is very little of theoretical interest to a sociologist, and little attempt by the editor to analyse the contributions in a consistent manner.

In scholarly terms the book is very uneven and is curiously silent on the impact of feminism on research and analysis given the topic. I am more than uneasy about any book in which the similarities about women's situation in a range of societies is attributed to "the biological prerogative of motherhood".

Whatever the readers' theoretical or political predilections, I think most will find the selection of photographs quite strange. Some are simply unnecessary, others are embarrassingly inappropriate (e.g. Women in Latin America shows a blonde barefooted tourist [?] lying on a beach examining an iguana).

Department of Sociology
Victoria University of Wellington
Wellington, New Zealand
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Over twenty years ago Alvin Gouldner argued, "The sociologists' task today is not only to see people as they see themselves, nor to see themselves as others see them; it is also to see themselves as they see other people" (p. 25, *The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology*). In the book under review, twenty American sociologists provide some insights into the ways in which they see their lives and careers. Each reader must rely on his or her knowledge to decide the extent to which the authors meet Gouldner's challenge. Such an analysis is beyond the scope of this review. Although Berger does not insist that the authors meet the Gouldner challenge, he does argue that one of the aims of this volume is "to render the presence of the person in the work, the author in the authored, ...." (p. xv).

A sociologist will approach this collection with the following question: Who are the twenty authors? Berger anticipates this, and briefly describes his sample and sampling or lack of sampling procedure ["I did not think at all about sampling", "The selection of authors is in no way a careful sampling"] (p. xxvii). Based on his knowledge of who writes well, who is likely to write candidly and who is likely to have had an interesting life, Berger sent letters to 50 to 60 colleagues asking if they would like to contribute to a volume of autobiographical essays. He then selected from among the "too many" manuscripts a number appropriate for a publishable collection. In spite of his lack of attention to sampling, Berger is right in pointing out that the authors represent a fairly good distribution of age (4 born before 1920, 13 from 1921-40, and 3 born since 1940), and that they include a number who were just attaining national reputations and others.
who have well-established international reputations, several schools of thought, qualitative and quantitative sociologists, men and women, natives and foreign-born. The major limitation is also recognized by Berger; there are no sociologists of color. Several sociologists of color were asked, and although some said yes, none delivered a manuscript. Were the sociologists of color too busy? Did they view this as a low priority activity? How many sociologists of color were asked? Given the delay of almost two years between receipt of manuscripts and manuscript selection, did Berger consider a second sample of sociologists of color? It is surprising that a sociologist as sophisticated as Berger would find himself in a position in which he laments that, "It was only later that I wished I had sampled systematically so as to be able to claim more for the evidence contained here" (p. xxvii).

Given the central role of graduate departments in professional socialization, in the development of professional contacts, and in the opening of professional opportunities, it is worthwhile to add this dimension to the collective portrait. Columbia (5) and Chicago (4) are the departments most represented; Pierre L. van den Berghe is the only Harvard Ph.D. In his contribution, "Columbia in the 1950s," James Coleman divides his life into two parts; the first twenty-five years and the resocialization he underwent when he first entered Fayerweather Hall at Columbia. Although Andrew Greeley's relationship with the Chicago Department is far from a positive one, his essay is instructive concerning the folkways of academic sociology. Finally, David Riesman does not disappoint in his broad essay, "Becoming an Academic Man".

Two of the reasons I believe that this book should be recommended reading to all sociology graduate students are the high quality of the writing and the sense of reality that it brings to our collective history. For instance, in terms of the ideology concerning the high value we place on open and shared communication, students will learn that Herbert Gans recalls, "virtually sneaking into the campus bookstore (at Chicago) for my copy of Merton's Social Theory and Social Structure ...." (p. 449), and that Coleman recalls that at Columbia there was an "effective absence of a discipline west of the Hudson River ...." (p. 79). Gary Marx's essay on academic success and failure should be read by all graduate students and young faculty members. His seven characteristics of success will help each of them and many of us to cope better with success and failure. The essays by the late Donald Cressey and by Alice Rossi are exceptional in their ability to transcend the personal and the professional. Cressey depicts the life struggles of growing up in small town America during the depression and Rossi makes a contribution to the sociology of aging.

The theme of the twenty essays is the sociologist as outsider. The outsider status is in terms of national origin, religion, class, and gender. Although there is not a perfect fit, Berger's division of the collection into five parts reflects this theme. The parts are: "Academic Men"—Dennis Wrong, David Riesman, James S. Coleman, Joseph Gusfield; "Doing It Their Way"—Andrew M. Greeley, Bennett M. Berger, Dean MacCannell, Nathan Glazer; "Mobility Stories"—John Gagnon, Donald R. Cressey, Gary T. Marx, Barbara Rosenblum; "Three Generations of Women Sociologists"—Alice S. Rossi, Jessie Bernard, Cynthia Fuchs Epstein, Pepper Schwartz; and "The European Emigration"—Guenther Roth, Pierre L. van den Berghe, Herbert J. Gans, Reinhard Bendix.

The first two contributors, Dennis Wrong and David Riesman, present deviant cases in terms of the accepted wisdom concerning the sociologist as outsider. It is true that there are a number of examples of the immigrant, the ethnic, the Jew, the woman, and the working class youth who became a sociologist. However, in the cases of Wrong and Riesman, we have the scions of patrician families. Wrong's father was the first