


1988

## Research by Bureaucracy: Hattie Plum Williams and the National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, 1929-1931

Michael R. Hill

*University of Nebraska-Lincoln*, michaelhilltemporary1@yahoo.com

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/sociologyfacpub>

 Part of the [Family, Life Course, and Society Commons](#), and the [Social Psychology and Interaction Commons](#)

---

Hill, Michael R., "Research by Bureaucracy: Hattie Plum Williams and the National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, 1929-1931" (1988). *Sociology Department, Faculty Publications*. 442.

<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/sociologyfacpub/442>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Sociology, Department of at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Sociology Department, Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

Hill, Michael R. 1988. "Research by Bureaucracy: Hattie Plum Williams and the National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement, 1929-1931." (Special Issue on the History of Nebraska Sociology). *Mid-American Review of Sociology* 13 (2): 69-84.

# RESEARCH BY BUREAUCRACY: HATTIE PLUM WILLIAMS AND THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON LAW OBSERVANCE AND ENFORCEMENT, 1929-1931<sup>1</sup>

Michael R. Hill  
*University of Nebraska-Lincoln*

Mid-American Review of Sociology, 1988, Vol. XIII, No. 2:69-84.

## INTRODUCTION

This paper explores the bureaucratized research activities (1929-1931) of the National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement (NCLOE) from the perspective of Hattie Plum Williams' sociobiographical experience. Williams was a doctoral student of George E. Howard and earned her Ph.D. in 1915 -- the first doctorate in sociology awarded by the University of Nebraska. That same year, she joined the Nebraska faculty and eventually became Chair of the Department (1922-1928).<sup>2</sup> In 1931, at age 53, this full professor was called upon to be an unpaid fieldworker, gathering data according to rigid protocols stipulated by the NCLOE. Archival reconstruction of Williams' "view from the bottom" of the university and NCLOE bureaucracies is the special focus of this paper. This perspective purposefully opens the disciplinary record to examine a neglected woman's work in sociology (Long 1987).

Max Weber (1958) astutely saw that bureaucratic organization gives maximum instrumentality to occupants of top positions in hierarchical structures. Universities and national crime commissions are not exempt from this insight. Weber also asserted that modern bureaucracies move increasingly toward legal-rational norms of conduct. Rosabeth Moss Kanter (1979) observes, however, that Weber's thesis was true for men but not for women. Women in bureaucracies, she demonstrated, were more likely to be treated under paternal norms.

This result is doubly problematic for women scholars conducting sociological investigations in large, patriarchal, bureaucratically-organized universities. Hierarchical structures shape not only their day-to-day experience as researchers, but also pattern the subsequent historical accounts (if any) of their scholarly labors. Too frequently, women's experiences in educational bureaucracies -- and the published disciplinary accounts of their work -- follow anything but legal-rational norms. The story of Hattie Plum Williams' efforts on behalf of the NCLOE is a dramatic illustration of bureaucratically-generated slights and inequities in the everyday lives of many women sociologists.

## A NATIONAL CRIME COMMISSION

In 1929, at the behest of President Herbert Hoover, the NCLOE undertook a multi-faceted national investigation of crime as the United States wrestled with the Great Depression and widespread, flagrant noncom-

pliance with the 18th Amendment. Hoover was concerned that disrespect for law (evidenced in social tolerance of prohibition violations) might spread to threaten the social order as a whole. He appointed eleven Commissioners, including George W. Wickersham (after whom the Commission was nicknamed) and Roscoe Pound, a former Nebraskan and founder of the American school of sociological jurisprudence. The Commission began work in 1929, concluded its investigations in 1931, and published a series of major reports (for list, see Setaro 1942: 79-81). This was "until recent times, the major experiment with a crime commission on the national level" (Quinney 1970: 306). The NCLOE adopted sociological perspectives in several of its investigations, of which the most often cited report is the ecological study by Clifford Shaw and Henry McKay (1931).

### NEBRASKANS AND THE NCLOE

The NCLOE enlisted three Nebraska-trained scholars to serve in various capacities: Hattie Plum Williams, Edith Abbott, and Roscoe Pound. All earned bachelor's degrees at the University of Nebraska, all were Phi Beta Kappa. Williams and Pound earned doctorates at Nebraska, and Abbott earned a doctorate at the University of Chicago. All three joined and participated in the American Sociological Society.<sup>3</sup> The experiences of these outstanding Nebraska social scientists was differentially structured by bureaucratic features of the NCLOE and the university settings in which they separately worked.

Roscoe Pound was then Dean of the Harvard Law School. Edith Abbott, a former Pound student at Nebraska, was Dean of the Graduate School of Social Service Administration at the University of Chicago. Their experiences, situated in positions of prestige and advantage at Harvard University and the University of Chicago, differed sharply from the research milieu of Hattie Plum Williams who was then a Professor of Sociology at the University of Nebraska. A comparative analysis of these hierarchically-distributed experiences is found in Hill (Forthcoming).

George E. Howard directed Williams' doctoral dissertation, encouraged her to pursue an academic career, and actively supported her work until his death in 1928.<sup>4</sup> And, conversely, Williams (1929) was an appreciative colleague. Williams resigned her departmental Chairship in 1928 and returned full-time to the classroom. Teaching and research, rather than administration, were her primary interests. In 1931, she agreed to participate in the NCLOE studies. As a former Chairperson, Williams was no stranger to the bureaucratic milieu, but she now worked for the NCLOE through the auspices of the University of Nebraska without the mantle of the Chairship and without George E. Howard's invaluable backing. Unfortunately, as the record below demonstrates, Howard's egalitarian support was not institutionalized in a lasting framework of legal-rational norms.

Whereas the names of the interdisciplinary Abbott and Pound are relatively well-known nationally, Williams' history as a scholar-teacher has been forgotten. This is due in part to the fact that her professional career

centered wholly within the discipline of sociology. She chaired a major department of sociology, trained hundreds of graduate students, and shared much in common with Pound and Abbott. Nonetheless, she became invisible. In fact, all three -- Pound, Abbott, and Williams -- suffered at the hands of sociology's historians, but Pound is warmly remembered by jurists and Abbott is admired by social workers. When Williams is not remembered by historians of sociology, there is no other disciplinary group to preserve and remember her dedicated contributions to her chosen profession -- or to the NCLOE's Cost of Crime study.

### THE COST OF CRIME

The NCLOE's many projects included a national study on the fiscal cost of criminal justice in the United States (Simpson, *et al.* 1931). Professor Williams was one of many investigators who contributed to this project. She completed two studies on the cost of crime incurred by two municipal governments (Omaha and Lincoln) in Nebraska (Williams 1933a, 1933b). Her unpublished studies were abstracted and integrated with similar reports from across the country to form the empirical basis of a published NCLOE report on "The Cost of Administration of Criminal Justice in American Cities" (Simpson, *et al.* 1931).

Clarence Shenton (1932: 782) succinctly outlined the scope of the project in his review of the study:

This report represents an effort to learn what crime costs the United States in dollars and cents. It includes studies of the cost of criminal law administration to the federal government and to 300 of 365 cities of over 25,000 population; of the published material on state and municipal costs of administering criminal justice; of the cost of state police, state penal and correctional institutions, and parole agencies; of private expenditures from crime prevention; and of private and community losses from crime.

The directors of the study, said Shenton, "are to be congratulated upon the courage with which they went through with an enormous and perplexing task." As one of hundreds of fieldworkers, however, Williams's contribution received no mention in Shenton's (1932) favorable review. An understanding of Williams' contributions cannot be gained from published sources, but must be reconstructed from archival records.

### BUREAUCRACY, DATA COLLECTION, AND STATE CONTROL

The NCLOE appointed Sidney Simpson to direct the Study of the Cost of Administration on Criminal Justice. Simpson's project is a classic example of bureaucratically-organized data collection in modern nation states. Such studies rationalize and materially facilitate increased state control of internal affairs under the rhetoric of science, efficiency, and economy

(Giddens 1985). Upon review of the data amassed by the NCLOE, the Commissioners concluded:

One of the most important conclusions reached, and one with which we thoroughly agree, is that the cost of administering the criminal law, while large, is of less economic importance than the losses inflicted by the criminal, so that it is much more important from an economic standpoint to increase the efficiency of the administration of criminal justice than to decrease its cost. True economy in administering the criminal law may well require in many instances the material increase of expenditures for enforcing the law in order to secure increased efficiency and in order to deal adequately with new types of crime and "improved" methods of criminals (NCLOE 1931d: 4).

Their recommendation, to increase expenditures "for enforcing the law" while simultaneously recommending further data collection, i.e., "nation-wide thorough and scientific studies of racketeering and organized extortion and of commercial fraud" (NCLOE 1931d: 7), is compatible with Foucault's (1979) conception of a "carcerel society" in which the state increases its panoptic, bureaucratically-organized surveillance capabilities specifically to increase internal discipline and conformity (Giddens 1985).

Simpson enlisted legions of willing field investigators who (without Federal remuneration) collected, tabulated, and reported specified data in predetermined formats on the costs of crime incurred by municipal governments in 300 cities. University-based sociologists were among those specifically targeted for recruitment as "cooperative" investigators.

#### THE SUBSTANCE OF WILLIAMS' INVESTIGATIONS

The content of Williams' NCLOE contribution is found in two, unpublished typescripts (Williams 1933a, 1933b) in the University of Nebraska library. Her studies of the cost of criminal justice in Omaha and Lincoln were modeled, as bureaucratically required, chapter for chapter, table for table, on an NCLOE (1931b) pilot study of Rochester, New York. Williams' studies incorporated data from the U.S. Census; state and local statutes; and other local sources, including clerks of court, police departments, and county treasurers.

In each report, the assembled data outline the social and economic conditions in each city, followed by detailed description of the cost of operating police services. An accounting of the cost of prosecution in the criminal justice system is provided, as is specification of the cost to operate the criminal courts (including the county court and the juvenile court). Williams also analyzed the comparative costs of trials in criminal and civil cases. The costs of penal and corrective treatment (including probation, county jail, and juvenile detention) are shown. The final portion of each study presents a summary and discussion of the collected data.

The Omaha and Lincoln studies were completed in a month and a half of frenetic work, necessitated by rapidly-approaching, bureaucratically-created deadlines. Locating a field investigator to conduct the studies in Nebraska was a time-consuming, bureaucratic process. This process resulted in the unreasonably compressed time period within which Williams successfully executed the Nebraska studies.

### LOCATING AN INVESTIGATOR IN NEBRASKA

Sydney Simpson began his search for investigators by sending letters of inquiry to the presidents of major universities and other research organizations. To secure studies of Lincoln and Omaha, Simpson wrote on October 16, 1930, to request the assistance of Edgar A. Burnett, Chancellor of the University of Nebraska.<sup>5</sup> Simpson's letter, from one bureaucrat to another, from the institution of politics to the institution of education, set in motion the chain of events that ended ultimately in Hattie Plum Williams' unheralded contributions to the NCLOE report.

Simpson proposed that graduate students could become unpaid field-workers who would be granted permission to use their own data for their theses:

It is felt that the making of these studies should be of real value to students who make them, in that an opportunity will be offered to take part in a cooperative research project on a national scale, and at the same time to come into direct contact with the practical operation of each city studied under the auspices and with the assistance of the Commission.<sup>6</sup>

Gratis faculty supervision was also assumed. In fact, Simpson's "assistance" was largely rhetoric, as was the notion that making the studies was of "real value" to the data collectors. Simpson asserted that the Commission "greatly appreciates" university cooperation. In this instance, two bureaucrats "co-operated" with each other, constructing a framework wherein university subordinates were cajoled to adopt a rigid timetable for an externally-determined research agenda. Chancellor Burnett passed Simpson's request to a subordinate, J.O. Hertzler, Chair of the Department of Sociology.

Professor Williams was identified -- most likely by Hertzler -- as a faculty member who might cooperate, and Simpson was notified. Simpson, however, misread this as a firm commitment by the University of Nebraska. He responded happily to Hertzler:

I am glad to note from your letter of October 22, that Dr. Hattie Plum Williams is directing a group of her students in a preliminary survey of the available material as to the cost of administration of criminal justice in Lincoln.<sup>7</sup>

It is not surprising that Williams set her students to work on *prelimi-*

nary inquiries. Olivia Pound (1916: 21) wrote about Williams' work at the University of Nebraska:

Through her official connection with the Department of Sociology of the University she has enlisted a small army of workers who are assisting the schools in surveys, in actual social work in the night school and in social centers and in the work of helping foreign Americans to become fully naturalized.

For years, Williams' graduate students had conducted independent community studies of social conditions and social problems.<sup>8</sup>

In the NCLOE studies, however, students and faculty were not free to design their own investigations. The questions to be asked and the format for reporting answers were standardized and externally determined, Simpson wrote, "to insure the comparability necessary for a statistical analysis of the results."<sup>9</sup> A blue-ribbon advisory panel (including sociologists Edith Abbott and Robert Lynd) reviewed the NCLOE data collection instructions, thus lending expert authority to the NCLOE's field manual of standardized methodological protocols (NCLOE 1931a). It would have been consistent with Williams' open pedagogical approach to graduate student instruction if she resisted making a firm commitment to tie her students to the NCLOE's predetermined research agenda.

By year's end, Simpson had not received clear affirmation of Nebraska's participation. He wrote to Hertzler:

I have been looking forward to hearing from you as to the progress of the study of the cost of administering criminal justice in the state of Nebraska, with particular reference to the cities of Lincoln and Omaha.<sup>10</sup>

The fall semester ended with no firm commitment. Simpson sent reminders during January 1931 and forwarded a copy a model study (NCLOE 1931b) on which all others were to be based.<sup>11</sup>

By March 26, Simpson became impatient and fired a telegram to Hertzler:

Would appreciate it if you would advise us by wire collect as to what progress has been made with the studies of Lincoln and Omaha being carried out by the university.<sup>12</sup>

In fact, no studies were being conducted in Nebraska. Simpson either understood (incorrectly) that researchers at the University of Nebraska had previously agreed to conduct the studies, or he presented that "understanding" to Hertzler as a gesture designed to call forth some degree of administrative guilt. If the latter, the ploy did not work.

Two days later, March 28, Simpson penned an urgent telegram *directly* to Williams. Would Nebraska be the only state in the nation to let down



the Commission?

Vitally important for our investigation that study of the cost of administration of criminal justice in Omaha along lines of manual be made. Stop. Can you advise prior to April seventh whether such study can be made. Stop. We are particularly anxious to cover all the cities of the country over two hundred thousand. Stop. Have arranged studies in all such cities except Omaha and Akron Ohio and are now successfully arranging study in Akron. Stop. In view of this circumstance can we count on university for Omaha study?<sup>13</sup>

Making an end run around Hertzler and Burnett, Simpson's bureaucratic arm twisting was expertly applied. He got a reply from Williams on 31 March:

After conferring with Dr. Senning Chair Political Science Department we have agreed to undertake jointly the completion of Omaha and Lincoln study on basis of Rochester model. Send copy model report to Senning. Am writing details.<sup>14</sup>

Five months after the initial feeler to the University of Nebraska, Williams personally accepted formal responsibility for the Nebraska part of the project. Arrangements that Simpson, Chancellor Burnett, and Chairperson Hertzler could not conclude in five months of letters, telegrams, and memos, Williams finalized in four days. Her activities during the remainder of the 1931 spring semester demonstrated the depth of her personal commitment -- once made.

#### WILLIAMS' NEBRASKA FIELD STUDIES

Williams' telegram of March 31st, and a memo dated April 1, 1931,<sup>15</sup> evidence the expectation of assistance from Professor J.P. Senning in the Department of Political Science. This partnership did not materialize, however, and Williams carried the full brunt of the study alone.

Williams launched the field investigations in Lincoln and Omaha aided only by her two, part-time, undergraduate student assistants. Simpson originally tried to secure data collection by graduate students, but the delays now required Williams' active and direct participation in order to meet Simpson's deadline. Even if Williams had approved such an arrangement, time was much too short for a graduate student to take on the study as a thesis project. Williams wired Washington, D.C., on April 18th:

Today am devoting full time spring vacation to Lincoln Omaha study two students assisting. Stop. Expecting to complete it by May first delivery.<sup>16</sup>

Displaying amazing diligence, Williams was ready on April 22nd to draft

the final report.<sup>17</sup>

When the May 1st deadline was little more than a week away, however, Williams discovered flaws in the data tabulations on which her report was based. At variance with the NCLOE field manual, her undergraduate assistant consistently compiled data for the wrong year! Williams wrote to Simpson on April 24th:

I have been delayed a bit by an error in dates which the student made. She called the year ending August, 1929 as 1929-30! and I did not discover the error until I had the first draft entirely completed. It has been necessary for me to do the whole of Chapters II, III, and V over, but they are now finished and I can keep the stenographer busy.<sup>18</sup>

In two short days, Williams completed the first draft of the Lincoln study, detected the student's data compilation errors, recompiled the data, and completely rewrote three chapters of the report.

The Lincoln study was back on schedule due to Williams' extraordinary personal effort. The Omaha study was another matter. Williams wrote:

My worst difficulty lies in the fact that the student who did the Omaha costs made the same mistake on the year, and I am at a loss to know what to do. She has the data for 1929 instead of 1930. That means that I cannot be sure of having the Omaha study to you by May 1. I have arranged my work at the University so that I could give all next week to the Omaha data, but now that the year is wrong, it will be impossible for me to correct the figures and get them into final shape for you on time. I do not want to send you the Omaha study for a year other than 1930, unless tardiness in receiving the material makes it useless to you. In that case, all I can see to do is to take the data as she has turned it in.<sup>19</sup>

Pressing end-of-semester duties competed her for time, and her student assistants were graduating seniors. She wrote to Simpson:

If I got the 1930 data, I do not see how I can have it to you until the first of June for the students are seniors and the last few weeks of school do not permit extra duties. I have a second student assisting this week who has done excellent work and I only regret that I did not discover her ability and the other's disability until this week. I feel sure that she and I could have the revised data to you within a week or ten days after we can begin work on it.<sup>20</sup>

Williams asked Simpson for guidance: Did he want a timely report with noncomparable data, or an overdue study with appropriate data?<sup>21</sup>

A telegram on April 28th brought Simpson's prompt reply: use the data

as collected, "otherwise report would come in too late."<sup>22</sup> Simpson's adherence to artificial deadlines forced compromises in the empirical database.

But, Simpson apparently had second thoughts. He now urged Williams to make an informed estimate of the degree of divergence between the 1928-29 and 1929-30 data. If known differences were significant, Simpson said:

It may be necessary to make adjustments along these lines, and then work out an estimated figure for 1929-1930. We are doing this in some other cities where 1930 data is not available.<sup>23</sup>

The report for Lincoln was completed and shipped to Simpson in triplicate, but the May 1st deadline passed while Williams juggled her schedule to meet Simpson's request for empirically-grounded projections for Omaha.

Williams' exceptional effort to finish the Lincoln study took its physical toll and delayed her work on the Omaha projections. She wrote to Simpson:

Your letter reached me last Friday noon -- too late for me to plan anything for Omaha for the weekend. It would have been impossible anyway because my eyes gave out, as they always do when I work for ten days or so over figures. It was necessary to rest them for a few days. Monday began registration week -- one of the two busiest weeks of the entire school year.<sup>24</sup>

Undaunted, Williams forged ahead:

I am planning to go to Omaha Monday of next week and stay until I secure the necessary facts. If the two years are not materially different, I shall follow your suggestion to use the data collected and save a few days in getting the report to you.<sup>25</sup>

Williams at last confided that Professor Senning's failure to assist on the project put her in conflict between loyalty to her students and her commitment to the NCLOE project:

I do not see how I can take another week away from my classes -- in justice to my students, and yet I feel under obligation to keep faith with you for the University. Dr. Senning has been unable either to give any help on the study or to furnish any student service -- both of which were contemplated when I made the promise to you for the University.<sup>26</sup>

Simpson replied, expressing his regret to Williams that she "personally should have been put to so much inconvenience in securing the Lincoln and Omaha data."<sup>27</sup>

Williams obtained sufficient data in two difficult days of field inquiry in Omaha to make the projections for 1930. In her report, she wrote:

The Omaha study has been carried on under peculiarly difficult circumstances, the data being secured first by the student who had assisted in the Lincoln study, then checked over, in Omaha, for two days by the writer and an assistant. Unfortunately, there was no opportunity to complete the manuscript while in the city, and further items and verification were secured by letter, wire, and telephone (Williams 1933a: 53).

Bureaucratic obstacles confronted Williams at many turns, including face-to-face data collection in Omaha:

The attitude of officials toward the inquiries has been most interesting, ranging all the way from cordial response and generous assistance to curt refusals to furnish data. In securing the pay roll from one of the offices, the clerk lumped together the salaries of three of the clerical forces. In reply to a request to give the salary of each person separately, she refused on the ground that "no one had any right to ask the amount of her salary." Unless one went armed with the introduction of a prominent or influential citizen, there was a tendency on the part of officials to show annoyance at the request and to question one's right to make the inquiry. One of the most important of the officials gave the least assistance, and that in a most grudging way. And yet, on the face of the leaflet they handed you, was emblazoned this sentence, "These records are open to the public and inspection of the same by the citizens is always welcome" (Williams 1933a: 53-54).

Despite such hurdles, Williams' efforts approached conclusion.

Three weeks after May 1st, she dispatched the Omaha report to Simpson.<sup>28</sup> Subsequently, she discovered and reported a few minor errors in the Lincoln study, and promised to send a corrected copy in the near future:

It involves so little and the figures offset each other that I would not mention it if it were not that I am satisfied with nothing less than perfection in so far as it is possible for me to achieve it.<sup>29</sup>

She concluded, "I am glad the University could at least try to help out the Commission."<sup>30</sup> The study -- as close to perfection as Williams could make it -- was now complete.

#### BUREAUCRATIC ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Upon receipt of the Omaha study, Simpson wrote to Williams expressing his gratitude.<sup>31</sup> George Wickersham, Chair of the Commission, also wrote a brief note of appreciation for Williams' "public spirited cooperation."<sup>32</sup> Despite a thorough archival search, however, there is no record that

her efforts were ever recognized or rewarded by university officials in Nebraska.

Indeed, Chancellor Burnett's only communication to Williams during this entire period was a short letter of admiration (having read a newspaper notice to the effect) commending her for inviting a few students to her home for tea. Williams' reply is a model of restrained incredulity. Perhaps, she hinted, the Chancellor would be better informed about her activities (including the fact that she had for years regularly invited students to her home) if local newspapers (in which she assiduously avoided notice when possible) were not his major source of campus intelligence.<sup>33</sup>

Buried in an appendix to the published report, the NCLOE briefly acknowledged Williams' part in making the studies of Lincoln and Omaha. Bureaucratically "correct" to the end, however, Simpson also acknowledged Chancellor E.A. Burnett and Chairperson J.O. Hertzler for "cooperation in arranging for these studies" (NCLOE 1931d: 498). Within the elastic morality of bureaucratic ethics, Burnett and Hertzler received commendation for manufacturing the severe temporal obstacles that faced Williams in the field.

As an apparent token of thanks, the Commission sent Williams a copy of a report on penal institutions, probation, and parole (NCLOE 1931c).<sup>34</sup> Incredibly, this was not the report in which her data were used. Williams wrote to George Wickersham, Chair of the NCLOE, in search of a full set of the reports on the costs of crime, noting:

I shall be grateful to you if you will direct my inquiry to the proper persons as I do not know whom to address now that the Commission is dissolved.<sup>35</sup>

There is no record of a reply in Williams' correspondence or in the official records of the NCLOE

#### THE UNIQUENESS AND NATIONAL CONTEXT OF WILLIAMS' EFFORTS

The national scope of the NCLOE data collection effort masks the unique character of Williams' studies in Lincoln and Omaha. The nationwide project tapped the resources of 111 research organizations, primarily universities (NCLOE 1931d: 484-509). Of the 300 cities studied, two-thirds were surveyed by university-based investigators. The majority of the remaining studies were conducted by municipal research bureaus and chambers of commerce (Simpson, *et al.* 1931: 257).

Most of the studies were directed by men. Of the studies noted above, 15 were conducted by women, but under the direction of male supervisors. Only three of the 111 research organizations launched studies directed and controlled by women. These three projects were located in Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Nebraska. Of the three studies directed by women, the Nebraska studies were exceptional.

In Wisconsin, the chief investigator was Paula Lynagh, a professional statistician instructed by her employers (The Citizen's Bureau of Milwaukee) to undertake the study as part of her regular duties. She was responsible for only a single city and was supplied with a full-time, male assistant (NCLOE 1931d: 509). In Massachusetts, Professor Amy Hewes (a graduate of the powerful University of Chicago and Chair of the Department of Economics and Sociology at Mount Holyoke College) had the assistance of Helen Bonser and the aid of more than a dozen students within the cohesive atmosphere of an elite, highly-respected women's college (NCLOE 1931d: 494-495). The Nebraska case differed sharply.

Williams was a full-time professor who could not administratively restructure her time. She was not relieved from her classroom duties as were researchers at other schools. The university Chancellor and department Chair who "arranged" the study at Nebraska did not provide adequate clerical aid or any stenographic assistance whatsoever. Williams labored without the support of the male colleague who had promised to share the work. The major source of "assistance" for Williams was an inept undergraduate whose compilation errors only compounded Williams' data collection and editing chores. Williams' studies of Lincoln and Omaha were the only investigations in the nation undertaken, directed, and completed essentially single-handedly by a woman researcher. This significant accomplishment went unrecognized, unappreciated, and unsupported by her colleagues, her university, and her discipline.

## CONCLUSION

With hindsight, Williams' participation in the NCLOE project can be critically evaluated. Although she willingly agreed to complete the project, she was clearly exploited. She worked overtime, gratis, exhausted her eyesight, and devoted her spring vacation to the studies. Her services were obtained without significant cost to the state apparatus that eagerly sought the data she could collect. The NCLOE's only expense was to pay \$42.94 for stenographic services that Williams personally engaged without guarantee of re-payment. Williams undertook the study -- over and above her regular professorial duties -- as a felt obligation on behalf of the University of Nebraska.

Williams succeeded where many would have faltered. She held up what she believed to be her university's end of the NCLOE investigations when no one else would take the assignment or help with the work. She was the only woman in the nation to direct and conduct municipal cost of crime studies for the NCLOE without substantive assistance. She served what she understood to be the interests of her country without at the same time subverting the atmosphere of free inquiry and creativity in which she trained her graduate students. These are values and noteworthy accomplishments that deserve recognition in Weber's rationally-ordered world.

Cooperation, recognition, and support for one's work in the academic world are tied in part to one's position in the hierarchy. Those at or near

the top enjoy the exercise of instrumentality regardless of the potentially exhausting nature of their work. In contrast, the foot soldiers in this system must call frequently upon depleted reserves of courage and perseverance that are not soon or easily replenished. More often than not, membership in the academic proletariat is the undeserved lot of dedicated women sociologists like Hattie Plum Williams.

NOTES

1. This paper is abstracted from a larger chapter in Hill (Forthcoming) which presents a sociobiographical analysis of sociologists' participation in NCLOE projects, specifically: Roscoe Pound, Edith Abbott, Hattie Plum Williams, Henry McKay, and Clifford Shaw. I am especially grateful to Mary Jo Deegan (in whose seminar this paper originated) for helpful critiques of earlier drafts, and to Miguel Carranza whose interest in this project has been particularly instrumental and supportive.
2. For an account of Williams' earlier work in sociology, see G.E. Howard, "Sociology in the University of Nebraska," elsewhere in this issue. Williams was the first known woman to chair a coeducational, doctoral-degree-granting department of sociology.
3. For ASS/ASA membership data, see *Papers and Proceedings of the American Sociological Society*; *American Sociological Review*; and *ASA Directory of Members*.
4. Williams to Catherine Dunn, 13 February 1929, Box 2, Hattie Plum Williams Collection, Nebraska State Historical Society (hereafter, "Williams Collection"). Howard's supportive letters to Williams extend from 1917 to 1925, Box 1, Williams Collection. Howard to Chancellor Avery, 24 June 1915, 17 September 1923, Chancellors Papers, Samuel Avery, University of Nebraska Archives, University of Nebraska-Lincoln.
5. Simpson to Burnett, 16 October 1930, Box 2, Williams Collection.
6. *Ibid.*
7. Simpson to Hertzler, 3 November 1930, Box 2, Williams Collection.
8. Approximately two-hundred-fifty seminar papers prepared by Williams' graduate students between 1918 and 1942 on a variety of community issues, including twenty-one studies on penology, have been archivally preserved in Boxes 25-47, Williams Collection.
9. Simpson to Burnett, 16 October 1930, Box 2, Williams Collection.
10. Simpson to Hertzler, 30 December Box 2, Williams Collection.
11. Simpson to Hertzler, 5 January 1931; 21 January 1931, Box 2, Williams Collection.
12. Simpson to Hertzler, 26 March 1931, Box 2, Williams Collection.
13. Simpson to Williams, 28 March 1931, Box 2, Williams Collection.
14. Williams, draft of telegram, apparently to Simpson, 31 March 1931, Box 2, Williams Collection.

Mid-American Review of Sociology

15. "Studies in Penology," 1 April 1931, unsigned memo, Box 2, Williams Collection.
16. Draft of telegram from Williams to Simpson, 18 April 1931, Box 2, Williams Collection.
17. Draft of telegram from Williams to Simpson, 22 April 1931, Box 2, Williams Collection.
18. Williams to Simpson, 24 April 1931, Box 2, Williams Collection.
19. *Ibid.*
20. *Ibid.*
21. *Ibid.*
22. Simpson to Williams, 28 April 1931, Box 2, Williams Collection.
23. *Ibid.*
24. Williams to Simpson, 6 May 1931, Box 2, Williams Collection.
25. *Ibid.*
26. *Ibid.*
27. Simpson to Williams, 12 May 1931, Box 2, Williams Collection.
28. Williams to Simpson, 30 May 1931, Box 2, Williams Collection.
29. *Ibid.* Williams' unsolicited promise to make corrections at a future time may explain the 1933 date on the typescripts of her reports (Williams 1933a, 1933b).
30. *Ibid.*
31. Simpson to Williams, 2 June 1931, Box 2, Williams Collection.
32. Wickersham to Williams, 23 July 1931, Box 3, Williams Collection.
33. Burnett to Williams, 30 March 1931; Williams to Burnett, 3 April 1931, Chancellors Papers, E.A. Burnett, University of Nebraska Archives.
34. Williams to Wickersham, 3 September 1931, Box 2, Williams Collection.
35. *Ibid.*

REFERENCES

*Manuscript Collections*

Nebraska State Historical Society, Lincoln, Nebraska.

-- Hattie Plum Williams Collection

-- T.F.A. Williams Collection

University of Nebraska Archives, Lincoln, Nebraska.

-- Chancellors Papers

U.S. National Archives, Washington, D.C.

-- Records of the National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement

*Books and Articles*

Foucault, Michel. 1979. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Vintage Books.



- Giddens, Anthony. 1985. *The Nation-State and Violence*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hill, Michael R. Forthcoming. "Roscoe Pound and American Sociology: A Sociobiography." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Nebraska-Lincoln.
- Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. 1979. *Men and Women of the Corporation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Long, Judy. 1987. "Telling Women's Lives: The New Sociobiography." Paper presented at the annual meetings of the American Sociological Society, Chicago, Illinois.
- National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement. 1930. *Outline of Project for Studies of the Cost of Administration of Criminal Justice*. Washington: United States Government Printing Office. (Reprinted as Appendix E in NCLOE, 1931d: 607-633).
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1931a. *Manual for Studies of the Cost of Administration of Criminal Justice in American Cities*. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office. (Reprinted as Appendix C in NCLOE, 1931d: 510-552).
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1931b. *Report on the Cost of Administration of Criminal Justice in Rochester, New York*. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office. (Reprinted as Appendix D in NCLOE, 1931d: 553-606).
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1931c. *Report on Penal Institutions, Probation and Parole*. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1931d. *Report on the Cost of Crime*. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office.
- Pound, Olivia. 1916. "Hattie Plum Williams: Her Service to the Community and the University." *The University Journal* 13(2): 20-21.
- Quinney, Richard. 1970. *The Social Reality of Crime*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.
- Setaro, Franklyn C. 1942. *A Bibliography of the Writings of Roscoe Pound*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Shaw, Clifford R., and Henry D. McKay. 1931. "Social Factors in Juvenile Delinquency." Pp. 1-401 in *Report on the Causes of Crime*, Vol. II, National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Shenton, Clarence G. 1932. "Review of *Report on the Cost of Crime*, National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement." *Journal of the American Institute of Criminal Law and Criminology* 22(5): 782-783.
- Simpson, S.P., R.H. Franzen, and W.B. Hubbell. 1931. The Cost of Administration of Criminal Justice in American Cities. Pp. 244-348 in *Report on the Cost of Crime*, National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office.
- Weber, Max. 1958. *From Max Weber*, edited by Hans Gerth and C. Wright Mills. New York: Oxford University Press.

Mid-American Review of Sociology

- Williams, Hattie Plum. 1928-29. "The Social Philosophy of George Elliott Howard." *Sociology and Social Research* 13: 229-233.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1933a. *Report on The Cost of Administration of Criminal Justice in Lincoln, Nebraska*. Prepared for the National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement. Unpublished typescript. University of Nebraska.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1933b. *Report on The Cost of Administration of Criminal Justice in Omaha, Nebraska*. Prepared for the U.S. National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement. Unpublished typescript. University of Nebraska.